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Abstract

The quality of a thermoelectric material is judged by the size of its temperature dependent thermoelectric-figure-of-merit ($zT$). Superionic materials, particularly Zn$_4$Sb$_3$ and Cu$_2$Se, are of current interest for the high $zT$ and low thermal conductivity of their disordered, superionic phase. In this work it is reported that the super-ionic materials Ag$_2$Se, Cu$_2$Se and Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se show enhanced $zT$ in their ordered, normal ion-conducting phases. The $zT$ of Ag$_2$Se is increased by 30% in its ordered phase as compared to its disordered phase, as measured just below and above its first order phase transition. The $zT$'s of Cu$_2$Se and Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se both increase by more than 100% over a 30 K temperatures range just below their super-ionic phase transitions. The peak $zT$ of Cu$_2$Se is 0.7 at 406 K and of Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se is 1.0 at 400 K. In all three materials these enhancements are due to anomalous increases in their Seebeck coefficients, beyond that predicted by carrier concentration measurements and band structure modeling. As the Seebeck coefficient is the entropy transported per carrier, this suggests that there is an additional quantity of entropy co-transported with charge carriers. Such co-transport has been previously observed via co-transport of vibrational entropy in bipolaron conductors and spin-state entropy in Na$_x$Co$_2$O$_4$. The correlation of the temperature profile of the increases in each material with the nature of their phase transitions indicates that the entropy is associated with the thermodynamics of ion-ordering. This suggests a new mechanism by which high thermoelectric performance may be understood and engineered.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Summary of Introduction

In this chapter I will introduce the motivation and basic concepts that underpin this thesis. In section 1.2 I will discuss the motivations for thermoelectric materials development. In section 1.3 I will describe what the figure-of-merit $zT$ is and explain why it is a good number for describing the performance of thermoelectric devices. In section 1.4 I will discuss the concept of Seebeck and $zT$ enhancement via co-transport of non-electronic entropy. In section 1.5 I will discuss superionic materials and why there is so much recent interest in them as good thermoelectric materials; this section will include a brief discussion of prior work on Ag$_2$Se [26], Cu$_2$Se [23] and Cu$_{1.07}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se [23]. In section 1.6 I will briefly summarize the key challenges and results of this work.

1.2 Motivation of Thermoelectric Research

A critical problem of the twenty-first century is of energy and sustainability. The limited supply of fossil fuels and the growing global population and economy have caused a steadily increasing price of electricity [37]. The massive quantities of CO$_2$ emitted in fossil fuel based energy production is causing worldwide climate change [152]. In order to address these challenges renewable energy sources should be developed and energy demand reduced. Though there is a pilot program to demonstrate cost ef-
effective thermoelectric power generation [146], thermoelectric devices are principally focused on reducing demand without decreasing economic activity [13]. This is accomplished by two different strategies. The first is to develop a thermoelectric cooler that operates more efficiently than commercial refrigerants. The second is to convert waste heat directly into electricity [13].

Thermoelectric waste heat conversion is principally focused on the high temperature exhaust of industrial synthesis [76] (e.g., aluminum refining) and the medium temperature exhaust of automobiles [63]. In both these scenarios heat is rejected incidentally to the system’s needs to reject the mass of the exhaust gas. Systems in which fast heat rejection or heat conservation is required are better served by heat exchange or insulation. These systems also generate heat in a manner that is geometrically inaccessible for higher efficiency heat engines based on the Rankine or Otto cycle. Thermoelectric conversion of high exergy industrial waste heat could provide approximately 10 TeraBTU/year of recovered energy in the United States alone [76].
Conversion of automotive waste heat could improve fuel economy by 5% and thereby save a much larger 1 Quadrillion BTU/year [63], however device integration is more complicated due to the varied operational conditions of automobiles [104]. Therefore the typical strategy for development of thermoelectric waste heat generators is to demonstrate success in industrial applications and then integrate them into automobiles afterwards.

Thermoelectrics generators (TEGs) are compact, silent, and reliable. They are easily controlled with even simple linear PID systems [13]. For this reason they have seen use in a number of niche applications. The most important and famous of these are the Radioisotope Thermal Generators (RTGs) used to power NASA’s deep space missions and its Mars Rovers [168]. In this application the compact size leads to an excellent performance on the Watts per Kilogram ratio essential for mass-limited satellite launches and the reliability ensures operation for multiple decades [202]. However, this application is not cost sensitive. Grid-scale energy conversion requires a good performance on a dollar per watt basis [203].
1.3 Thermoelectric Energy Conversion

The basic unit of a TEG is a unicouple, as depicted in Figure 1.2(a). It consists of two thermoelectric legs that are thermally in parallel and electrically in series. One of these two legs should conduct electrons (n-type) while the other conducts holes (p-type) [180]. An n-type leg will have a higher voltage at its hot side than its cold side, while the converse will be true for a p-type leg. The resulting voltage induces a current, and thereby provides power to an external load.

The voltage is induced by thermoelectric effect, as depicted in Figure 1.2(b). Charge carriers at the hot end of a material will tend to move faster and therefore diffuse quicker than species at the cold end of a material. Under a temperature gradient this results in transport to and build-up of charge carriers at the cold end of the material [67]. This process is referred to as thermodiffusion when the carriers are uncharged. In essence thermoelectric effects are thermodiffusive effects of charged particles [159]. The effects of thermodiffusion are known in a tangible sense from the transport of gas from hot regions to cold regions. The temperature gradient results in a pressure gradient and that induces a flow of particles colloquially referred to as wind.

Analogously, in a conducting material a temperature gradient induces an electrochemical potential gradient ($\dot{\mu}_e$). That gradient in turn induces transport of particles [49]. The quantity $\frac{1}{q}\mu_e$ is known as the Galvani potential or voltage ($V$). (And not the Volta potential typically denoted by $\phi$) [166]. Under open circuit operation the voltage and temperature are related by:

$$\alpha = \frac{\nabla V}{\nabla T} \quad (1.1)$$

Under closed circuit operation the voltage is diminished by the resistive flow of current. The quantity $\alpha$ (in many other documents denoted as $S$) is the Seebeck coefficient. Further detailed derivations of the Seebeck coefficient can be found in numerous sources [147, 32, 132, 69] Domenicali’s work in particular is a detailed approach of
fundamental use to anybody working on thermoelectric metrology [49]. Below I also
draw strongly on Goupil et al.’s excellent review [69, 83].

Clearly, a large induced voltage and therefore a large $\alpha$ is required for a good
thermoelectric material. Intuitively, the power generated will be proportional to the
voltage driving it squared, and so a figure-of-merit should include a $\alpha^2$ dependence.
As joule heating and conduction of heat are both dissipative it can be intuited that a
large electrical conductivity ($\sigma$) and a small thermal conductivity ($\kappa$) are important
for good thermoelectric performance. In fact, thermoelectric materials are judged on
a combination of these properties and the material temperature ($T$) known as the
thermoelectric Figure-of-Merit ($zT$) [69]:

$$zT = \frac{\alpha^2 \sigma}{\kappa} T$$

(1.2)

But what is the meaning of $zT$? How does it relate to the performance of a
thermoelectric as a heat engine? The answer is simple to state but will require some
explanation: $zT$ is a measure of the thermodynamic reversibility of a thermoelectric
material acting as a heat engine [19, 187]. A similar quantity can be derived for
any coupled linear energy conversion process [150]. I will first develop the $zT$ in
sketch from equilibrium thermodynamics and then develop it explicitly from non-
equilibrium thermodynamics.

In 1824 Sadi Carnot proposed that there was a fundamental limit to the efficiency
of a heat engine [33]. This limit depended only on the temperature at its hot and cold
end. Clausius determined this efficiency, thenceforth known as the Carnot efficiency,
to be [38]:

$$\eta_c = 1 - \frac{T_c}{T_h}$$

(1.3)

This limit follows directly from the second law of thermodynamics. To paraphrase
Max Planck’s formulation [158], ”the rate of entropy production of a heat engine is
always equal to or greater than zero.” At the Carnot efficiency the entropy production
is equal to zero. The efficiency of any heat engine is the work ($dW$) done divided by
the heat taken from the hot end ($dQ_H$). The work done is the difference in the heat
rejected from the hot end and the heat provided at the cold end:

\[ dW \leq dQ_H - dQ_c \]  \hspace{1cm} (1.4)

With this and the relationship between entropy and heat, \( dQ = TdS \), the efficiency of any heat engine may be stated as:

\[ \eta \leq 1 - \frac{T_c dS_c}{T_h dS_h} \]  \hspace{1cm} (1.5)

The second law requirement of entropy production indicates that \( dS_c \geq dS_h \) for a closed system. Therefore the limiting efficiency is \( \eta_c \), as expressed in Equation 1.3. The reversibility may be defined as the ratio of entropy production required for the work done to the entropy produced dissipatively. For the perfectly reversible Carnot engine its value is infinity.

While Carnot was formulating his theory of heat engines, Thomas Johannes Seebeck was observing that by applying a temperature gradient he could deflect the needle of a compass [175, 176, 174]. A decade later Peltier determined that a current applied across the interface of a material carried a heat current [155]. William Thomson, later Lord Kelvin, integrated these effects with the nascent field of thermodynamics and postulated that the Peltier and Seebeck effect arose from the same physical effect [135]. The Seebeck coefficient was defined in Equation 1.1. The Peltier coefficient relates the reversible heat flux transported to the current applied as:

\[ \pi = \alpha T = \frac{Q_R}{T} \]  \hspace{1cm} (1.6)

where \( \pi \) is the Peltier coefficient and \( \pi = \alpha T \) is the first Thomson relation [135].

From these relations the reversibility of a thermoelectric material can be found. Figure 1.3 shows a simplified thermoelectric consisting of only a single leg. If the second leg is of equal and opposite Seebeck coefficient and equal \( \sigma \) and \( \kappa \), the analysis below is exact. Suppose the leg has a resistance \( R = \frac{1}{\sigma A} \) and a thermal conductance \( K = \kappa A \). If it is placed under a temperature gradient and connected electrically to a
Figure 1.3: A single thermoelectric leg with all heat and thermal flows. The balance between dissipative thermal conductance and dissipative joule heating leads to constraints on the ideal geometry.

Figure 1.4: $zT$’s for representative state of the art thermoelectric materials.
load of the same resistance, it will produce an electrical power of \( V^2/R_L = \alpha^2 \Delta T^2/R \) while dissipating heat by joule heating \( (I^2R) \) and Fourier law conduction \( K\Delta T \). It will transport by the Peltier effect a quantity of heat equal to the power produced.

Define the thermal conductivity under no particle flow as \( \kappa_j \) and that under no voltage gradient as \( \kappa_e \). Then the two thermal conductivities are related by \( \kappa_e = \kappa_j + T\sigma\alpha^2 \). When the ratio \( \kappa_e/\kappa_j \) is maximized the work produced per heat flow is maximized. This gives:

\[
\frac{\kappa_e}{\kappa_j} = \frac{\alpha^2 \sigma}{\kappa_j} T + 1 \equiv 1 + zT ,
\]

in which maximizing \( zT \) therefore provides maximum power. Re-expressing the above as:

\[
\frac{\kappa_e - \kappa_j}{\kappa_j} = zT
\]

By this equation \( zT \) is the ratio of heat transformed in work by the Peltier effect to the heat that fluxes through the material. Therefore \( zT \) is a microscopic version of \( \frac{dS_c}{dS_h} \) and a good representation of thermodynamic reversibility. The differential efficiency under these conditions is then:

\[
d\eta = \frac{dT}{T} \frac{\sqrt{1 + zT} - 1}{\sqrt{1 + zT} + 1}
\]

Therefore optimization of improved material \( zT \) is essential to increased device efficiency. Recent work on cost models of thermoelectric devices that includes devices costs such as a heat exchangers and metallization has shown that not only is high \( zT \) important for good device efficiency, it also is the most important factor for device cost — excepting perhaps thermoelectrics based on precious metals such as silver, gold, and rhodium. The mantra of thermoelectric material development may very well be stated as \( zT \) at any cost. [203, 117]

What are typical best values for material \( zT \) now and what values are necessary for widespread thermoelectric integration? A summary across a wide temperature range is shown in Figure 1.4; these are materials that have undergone rigorous device testing at JPL and should thus be considered as readily available for commercial
Figure 1.5: Variation of thermoelectric properties with carrier concentration as calculated with a single parabolic band model.

development. At multiple temperatures and for both charge carrier types a $zT$ greater than unity is now available. Recent research has lead to development of materials with $zT$'s that are potentially greater than 2, which is considered to be the threshold for device integration. While typically a publication is judged by the peak value of $zT$, a broad high $zT$ across a wide temperature range is needed for commercial waste heat generation.

### 1.4 Entropy Co-Transport

In the previous section I defined Seebeck coefficient initially as the voltage gradient induced by a temperature gradient. However, I also noted the equivalence of the Seebeck effect and the Peltier effect that Thomson postulated and Onsager later proved explicitly from a microscopic approach based on fluctuation and dissipation. Equation 1.6 says that the Seebeck coefficient is the ratio of the reversible heat flux ($Q_R$) to the applied current ($I$) times the temperature. That is to say $\alpha = -\frac{S_R}{T}$ in
which \( S_R \) is the reversible entropy flux (the minus sign is by convention). If both numerator and denominator are divided by the number of carriers transported per unit time than \([49]\):

\[
\alpha = \frac{S^*}{q} \tag{1.10}
\]

This equation is motivated explicitly from the Onsager formalism in the appendix. In it, \( S^* \) is the entropy transported per particle — an important quantity when considering thermodiffusive transport \([132]\) — and \( q \) is the carrier charge. The negative sign in eq 1.10 is by convention. It ensures that p-type materials have a positive Seebeck and n-type materials a negative Seebeck. Naively, one might say that what is needed is simply to increase the entropy transported per electron; just as naively one might say that one ought increase the electronic conductivity while reducing the thermal conductivity. There is no a priori relation between the transport coefficient and thus a limit on \( zT \). However, good thermoelectric materials are heavily doped semiconductors, and the three transport coefficients are related to one another by their particular material physics \([128, 154]\).

The transport coefficients in typical thermoelectric materials are principally related by their electronic band structure. In this work I study materials that transport thermodynamic quantities other than charge carriers and entropy, and this co-transport appears to lead to both Seebeck and \( zT \) enhancement beyond that of the band structure, and so my treatment of band structure thermoelectrics will be brief. For a more thorough discussion of band structure engineering approach to enhancing \( zT \), the review article of Pei et al. \([154]\) and the CRC chapter by Andrew May and Jeff Synder \([170]\) are excellent resources.

It is often convenient to rewrite \( zT \) in terms of the separate contributions of electrons and lattice vibrations (phonons) to \( zT \):

\[
zT = \frac{\alpha^2\sigma}{\kappa_L + \kappa_e}, \tag{1.11}
\]

in which \( \kappa_L \) and \( \kappa_e \) are the thermal conductivity contributions of the lattice and the electrons directly. The lattice thermal conductivity is purely dissipative and so ought
to be minimized [180]. The lower limit of it is that due to glass-like scattering [28, 29].

An intense subject of research over the last two decades has been to devise methods of scattering phonons to reduce $\kappa_L$ without scattering electrons and thereby reducing $\sigma$. Reduction of $\kappa_e$ is more difficult as it is fundamentally related to the electrical conductivity by the Wiedemann-Franz Law [100]:

$$\kappa_e = L\sigma T$$  \hfill (1.12)

In which $L$ is the Lorenz number of the material. Though the Drude model value of $L_0 = 2.44 \times 10^{-8} W \cdot \Omega \cdot K^{-2}$ is seldom exactly right, it is not violated significantly above the Debye temperature [68]. Even in very low carrier concentration samples a Lorenz number is only 60% of $L_0$ [154]. Both $\kappa_e$ and $\sigma$ should increase as carrier concentration is increased. $\kappa_e$ has a weaker relationship with the Seebeck coefficient. While $\kappa_e$ represents the energy conducted by the kinetic energy of electrons, the Seebeck coefficient also includes the potential energy that is transported [67]. A simple way to conceptualize the Seebeck coefficients is to divide it into two terms as per Emin [49, 61]:

$$\alpha = \alpha_{\text{presence}} + \alpha_{\text{transport}}$$  \hfill (1.13)

The presence Seebeck is the entropy added by adding carrier without regards to how it came to be added. The contributions from its transport through the temperature gradient (e.g. scattering effects are contained in $\alpha_{\text{transport}}$). While the transport term is necessary for the full derivation, the presence term is far more didactic, as it can be derived using only equilibrium thermodynamics as [169]:

$$\alpha_{\text{presence}} = -\frac{dS}{qdN},$$  \hfill (1.14)

where $N$ is the number of particles. It can be re-expressed in terms of the entropy density ($s$) and the carrier concentration ($n$) as $\alpha_{\text{presence}} = -\frac{ds}{qdn}$. The very simplest limit of this is the case in which all electron states have the same energy, i.e., that the band width is small compared to $k_bT$. This is called the Hubbard model [14, 138]. In
that case the presence Seebeck is due only to a change in entropy of mixing:

\[ S_{\text{mixing}} = -N k_b \left( c \ln(c) - (1 - c) \ln(1 - c) \right), \]  

(1.15)

in which \( c \) is the concentration of carriers relative to sites. From this the Heikes formula for thermopower may be derived [135]:

\[ \alpha_p = -\frac{dS}{qdN} = \frac{k_B}{q} \ln \left( \frac{c}{1 - c} \right) \]  

(1.16)

The Heikes formula gives a large magnitude of Seebeck if \( c \) is small or \( c \) is near unity. For \( c \) small the dominant carrier is electrons (n-type) and for \( c \) large it is holes (p-type). Therefore the Seebeck decreases with increasing carrier concentration. This trend is depicted in Figure 1.5, along with the corresponding trends in \( \kappa \) and \( \sigma \). As a result of the differing carrier concentration dependence of \( \alpha \), \( \kappa \), and \( \sigma \), there is a \( zT \) peak at heavily doped carrier concentrations. A typical approach is to find a material with an electronic band structure in which the \( zT \) peak is high and attempt to dope it to the appropriate carrier concentration.

The band structure limited peak in \( zT \) only applies if electrons and heat are the only thermodynamic fluxes that show transport. Co-transport of another flux may lead to an enhancement in the entropy transported and therefore an increase in \( zT \). Without loss of generality, let us call the additional thermodynamic flux that transports, \( J_m \), and its corresponding equilibrium thermodynamic property, \( m \). It will also transport entropy with quantity \( S^*_m \) per unit of \( m \). Its thermodiffusion will have a presence contribution given by:

\[ S^*_{m,\text{presence}} = \frac{dS}{dm} \]  

(1.17)

In the presence limit the amount of \( m \) transported per a quantity of charge carrier transported is \( \frac{dm}{qdN} \). Therefore the entropy co-transport provides an additional contribution to Seebeck of:

\[ \Delta \alpha = -\frac{1}{q} \frac{dS}{dm} \frac{dm}{dn} \]  

(1.18)
The additional negative sign is again due to the sign convention relating $\alpha$ and $S^*$. Though this expression in Equation 1.18 was not rigorously derived, a similar expression can determined from the Onsager phenomenological equations. From that expression Equation 1.18 can again be motivated with better grounding in non-equilibrium thermodynamics. That derivation can be found in Chapter 8.

Such entropy co-transport has been previously observed in three different types of material systems. Vibrational entropy co-transport has been observed in Boron Carbide [61, 7], lattice spin entropy co-transport has been in observed in Na$_x$CoO$_2$ [110, 109], and lattice entropy co-transport has been observed in phonon-drag systems [148]. In the case of Na$_x$CoO$_2$, for example, the differing spin degeneracy of electron-occupied and electron-unoccupied cobalt sites provides the mechanism for this coupling of carrier transport to entropy transport [196]. However, this strategy has thus far been limited to small changes in spin degrees of freedom of single ions; it remains an open question whether structures with more spin degrees of freedom can be coupled to charge transport.

Here we consider coupling the carrier transport to degrees of freedom associated with the entropy associated with an order-disorder phase transition. A phase transition is always associated with an entropy change because there is always a concurrent transformation in system symmetries [162]. If the entropy change of a continuous phase transition can be associated with carrier transport, a substantial enhancement in Seebeck may be obtainable. The number of degrees of freedom associated with a structural transformation scales as the number of atoms in the system rather than the number of carriers. For a typical thermoelectric material with a carrier concentration of $10^{20}$ cm$^{-3}$, there are 100 times as many atoms as there are charge carriers. Thus the potential Seebeck enhancement by this mechanism may be extremely large. Because phase transitions occur at a discrete temperature, it is relatively simple to distinguish the anomalous enhancement due to ordering entropy co-transport from the band structure contribution. In a material without a phase transition such enhancements may be misattributed to the band structure through incorrect determination of one of the band parameters.
1.5 Super-ionic Thermoelectrics

Mixed ion-electron conductors are of recent and increased interest as thermoelectric materials. Though there is long-standing work on the Zn ion conductor Zn$_4$Sb$_3$ [204], recent results have sparked interest in mono-valent coinage metal chalcogenides such as Ag$_2$Se [136, 64, 199, 133], Ag$_2$Te [50, 178], and Cu$_2$Se [84, 122]. These materials all have ion conductivity greater than 1 S/cm at elevated temperatures [21, 87], which qualifies them phenomenologically as super-ionic conductors as defined by Rice and Roth [163]. This is a classification rather than a definition and so it is not held uniformly. Sometimes a material with ion conductivity one to three orders of magnitude smaller is called super-ionic due to its resemblance in structure and behavior to canonical super-ionics. The ion conductivity of 1S/cm is similar to that of a molten salt [87, 70, 34]. For this reason the super-ionic materials are often spoken of as having a molten sublattice. For example, in the Ag$^+$ conductor AgI the I$^-$ are taken to be in a rigid cage, while the Ag$^-$ is free to travel [97].

Why are these materials of such interest as thermoelectrics? Because their lattice
thermal conductivity is extremely low. For example, in Ag$_2$Se$_{0.05}$Te$_{0.05}$ it is only 0.5 W/mK at 400 K [50] and Ag$_8$GeTe$_6$ has been reported as having a lattice thermal conductivity of 0.25 W/mK at 300K with only negligible contribution from electrons. This thermal conductivity is almost certainly at or below the glassy limit proposed by David Cahill.

Super-ionics were divided into three categories by Pardee and Mahan [151] based on the manner by which the super-ionic state is achieved. Their classification system superceded an earlier system based on chemical composition and structure instead of phenomenological behavior. The dependence of ionic conductivity on temperature is plotted for prototypical members of each superionic classification in Figure 1.6. In type I superionics such as AgI [97], the ionic conductivity increases suddenly at a phase transition temperature. In type II superionic such as PbF$_2$ [86], the ionic conductivity increases continuously but super-exponentially to a phase transition temperature. Type III super-ionics such as Na$-\beta$-Al$_2$O$_3$, the ionic conductivity increases according to an Arrhenius behavior with no phase transition.

The super-ionic phase transition is of particular interest to this study. Type I and type II super-ionic conductors are characterized by a structural phase transition with an entropy change close to that of melting (i.e., order 10 J·K$^{-1}$·mol$^{-1}$) and a concurrent increase in ion conductivity [151]. For type I super-ionic conductors there is a sudden enthalpy release at the phase transition temperature (i.e., a first order phase transition) and a concurrent discontinuous increase in ionic conductivity. For type II super-ionic conductors the ionic conductivity increases super-exponentially up to the phase transition temperature, the structure changes continuously, and there is a lambda-shaped peak in heat capacity like that characteristic of a second order phase transition [87]. In the final chapter of this work I will show that Ag$_2$Se is a type I super-ionic, while Cu$_2$Se is a type II super-ionic. This difference is essential to understanding their behavior in their ordered phases just below their respective super-ionic phase transitions.
1.6 Key Challenges and Results

Having outlined the motivations for this study, I should also present a brief outline of the thesis. In the course of thesis I had to overcome a number of challenges in order to come to my conclusions, and I had to develop a broad theoretical understanding to interpret my data. I needed to measure the chemical and transport properties of these materials, see Chapter 2. Metrology of the Seebeck coefficient near phase transitions was a particularly challenging part of the work for which new methodology was developed, see Chapter 3. The most common question I faced with respect to the applicability of my work to real thermoelectric device was whether ion conducting materials would be stable under applied current. In Chapter 4 I examine this question both by a review of a past attempt by JPL and the DOE to use Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se as a super-ionic material and through experimental tests designed to simulate device conditions. Determination of the nature of the phase transition is particularly important to this work. In the course of this work we proved that contrary to all previously published literature, Cu$_2$Se's phase transition is second order not first order, see Chapter 5. This understanding was crucial to calculating correctly its $zT$. In Chapter 6 I report my data and analysis of the transport behavior of Ag$_2$Se. I also give an overview of why super-ionics are of interest as thermoelectrics and of band structure modeling of thermoelectrics. In Chapter 7 I introduce the concept of entropy co-transport as means of enhancing thermoelectric performance, and I present the transport data and analysis of both Cu$_2$Se and Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se. In the final chapter I integrate my results and a full phenomenological explanation of the thermoelectric enhancement of Ag$_2$Se and Cu$_2$Se. From the basis of this hypothesis a series of future experimental goals are proposed.
Chapter 2
Experimental Methods

This chapter discusses the basic methods used to characterize the materials in this study with the exception of Seebeck coefficient metrology, which is described in detail in Chapter 3.

2.1 Transport Measurements

Thermoelectric materials are characterized by the figure-of-merit \( zT \). In the introduction I discussed the thermodynamic meaning of \( zT \). However, that is only one half of its utility. The other half is that it is composed of material properties which are readily measured. We have:

\[
zT = \frac{\sigma\alpha^2}{\kappa} T
\]  

(2.1)

In this work \( \kappa \) was not measured directly. Instead the thermal conductivity is expressed as:

\[
\kappa = \rho D T
\]  

(2.2)

And each component of Equation 2.2 is measured separately. To obtain \( zT \) six quantities must be measured: \( \rho, D T, \alpha, \sigma, c_p, \) and \( T \). Additionally, for characterization of the band structure properties the Hall coefficient \( (R_H) \) is measured. From \( R_H \) and \( \sigma \) it is possible to determine the Hall carrier concentration \( (n_H) \) and the Hall mobility \( (\mu_H) \). These quantities are macroscopic measurements of the band structure and can be used to determine its form.
Thermal diffusivity \( (D_T) \) was measured via the laser flash method. In this method a laser is pulsed upon the sample quickly, and the temperature on the other side is measured as a function of time. By fitting the temperature rise data a thermal diffusivity can be obtained. The timescale of the laser pulse must be much smaller than the rise time. The measurements presented in this thesis were measured using a Netzsch LFA (Laser Flash Analysis) 457 MicroFlash apparatus, see Figure 2.1.

The density \( (\rho) \) was measured by direct geometry. Measured samples typically have a regular geometry — either a rectangular prism or a cylinder. By measuring these regular dimensions with a pair of calipers or a micrometer the volume can be calculated. The sample mass is then measured on a calibrated scale. From measured mass and volume the geometric density is calculated.

Differential scanning calorimetry was used to obtain the specific heat capacity using a Netzsch DSC 404. In the case of \( \text{Cu}_2\text{Se} \) the measurements were confirmed using a Quantum Design PPMS. The measurements are courtesy of Huili Liu and Xun Shi of the Shanghai Institute of Ceramics at the Chinese Academy of Sciences (SIC-CAS) and also of Pawan Gogna of the JPL Thermoelectrics Group. The working principle of DSC is to increase the temperature of a heat bath in contact with both a sample and a reference at a constant rate. Due to the fixed rate of heat transfer there
will be a lag in the measured temperature of a sample that is proportional to its heat capacity, see Figure 2.1. The PPMS $c_p$ measurement is similar except quasi-static. The sample is brought to a stable temperature and then a reservoir temperature pulse is applied while the sample temperature deviation is measured.

Two Van der Pauw geometry resistivity systems were used in this study to obtain $\sigma$, $n_H$ and $\mu_H$. Both systems are of identical design. A system with a 1 T magnet at the JPL thermoelectrics group was used to obtain the Hall data for Cu$_2$Se; all other data was obtained with a 2 T system at Caltech. The design and function of these particular systems is described in a recent publication by Borup et al. [20].

The Hall coefficient is measured by applying a magnetic field, measuring the voltage, and applying a current in three orthogonal directions. In Figure 2.2 the magnetic field would be applied through the sample, while the current is applied from lead 1 to lead 3 and voltage measured from lead 2 to 4. The current direction and leads used were alternated in accordance with the Van der Pauw resistivity method. The measurement were made at both positive and negative applied field to eliminate magnetoresistive offsets. In the case of a single carrier the Hall resistance is related to the carrier concentration by [160]:

$$ R_H = \frac{1}{n q} $$  \hspace{1cm} (2.3)

If there are carriers of multiple type their contribution to the Hall resistance will depend on the applied field ($B$) as detailed in Jaworski et al. [92] and a recent publication I authored [25]. Though the full expansion is extremely complicated, for
either the limit of $B \gg \mu^{-1}$ or $B \ll \mu^{-1}$ the form is much simpler. This condition corresponds to whether the carrier velocity is primarily due to electron drift (small $B$) or cyclotron acceleration (large $B$). The high field limit is:

$$R_H = \frac{1}{n_1q_1 + n_2q_2}$$ (2.4)

While the low field limit is:

$$R_H = \frac{n_1\mu_1^2 + n_2\mu_2^2}{(n_1\mu_1 + n_2\mu_2)^2}$$ (2.5)

In the low-B limit $R_H$ is dependent on the square of carrier mobility, while in the high-B limit it only depends linearly on band mobility. Therefore if there is a high mobility minority carrier and a low mobility majority carrier, the minority carrier will dominate the behavior at low-B while the majority carrier dominates at high-B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>$\sigma$</th>
<th>$D_T$</th>
<th>$C_p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ag$_2$Se</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu$_2$Se</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu$<em>{1.97}$Ag$</em>{0.03}$Se</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: Temperature Shifts for Transport Properties

The instruments described in this chapter are designed for typical thermoelectric samples in which transport properties have slowly varying temperature dependences. A temperature misreading of 10 K or 20 K will have no noticeable effect on the progression of $zT$ in such materials. Near the phase transition it can lead to crucial misinterpretation of the results.

The abruptness of the phase transition allows a ready means of determining the actual offsets. The temperature of the phase transition in Seebeck was taken as the phase transition temperature. In a Seebeck measurement care is taken in instrument design to ensure that the temperature measured is that of the sample. Two thermocouples are used, which allows determination of thermocouple failure through comparison. Finally the Seebeck measurement is path independent [49] — the voltage only depends on the temperatures at the measurement points without regard for temperature
irregularities in the sample. This contrasts to the volumetric measurements of \( D_T \), \( c_p \), and \( \sigma \).

The temperature peak of heat capacity agreed with where the transition temperature determined by Seebeck measurement. The temperature offset in thermal diffusivity was due to misplacement of the measurement thermocouple. By moving the thermocouple into position the error could be reduced substantially. An encapsulated sample of Indium was measured during thermal diffusivity and the difference between its observed temperature of melting and its literature value (156.6 °C) was used to confirm the calibration. Electrical conductivity could not be checked the same way, and its calibration could not be confirmed. The values of these calibrations are in table 2.1.

\section*{2.2 Synthesis}

The samples measured for this thesis were synthesized by Tristan Day at Caltech. A more detailed report on their synthesis will be available in his Ph.D. thesis (expected publication 2015). Ingots of Cu\(_2\)Se and Cu\(_{1.97}\)Ag\(_{0.03}\)Se were prepared from mixtures of copper shot (Alfa Aesar, Puratronic, 99.999\% pure on a metals basis), silver shot (Alfa Aesar, Puratronic, 99.999\% pure on a metals basis), and selenium shot (Alfa Aesar, Puratronic, 99.999\% pure on a metals basis) in stoichiometric ratios. The mixtures were placed in carbon-coated quartz ampoules evacuated to a pressure of less than 5 \times 10^{-5} \text{torr}. The ampoules were heated to 1273 K at 100 K/hr and held at that temperature for five days. The ampoules were cooled to 973 K and annealed for three days, after which the ampoules were quenched in water. The ingots were then ball-milled. The resulting powder was hot-pressed [116] at 40 MPa and 923 K for five hours under argon flow. The pressed pellets were then cooled to room temperature at a rate of 5 K/min to avoid cracking.

Ag\(_2\)Se polycrystalline ingots were prepared by melting Ag (shot, 99.9999\% pure, Alfa Aesar, Puratronic) and Se (shot, 99.999\% pure, Alfa Aesar, Puratronic) in the desired mass ratios inside fused quartz ampoules evacuated to less than 6 \times 10^{-5} \text{torr}. 
The elements were slowly brought to 1273 K, held at that temperature for 12 hours, cooled to 973 K over three hours, annealed at 973 K for three days, then quenched in water. Disk-shaped samples were cut from the ingots and used directly for the experiments.

### 2.3 Chemical Characterization

X-ray diffractometry was performed with the assistance of Kasper Borup, Sebastian Christensen, and Bo B. Iversen of Aarhus University. PXRD was performed using a Rigaku SmartLab diffractometer configured with a Cu Kα source and a Rigaku D/TEX detector. Temperature were performed using the same system and an Anton-Paar DHS-1100 furnace. The FullProf software suite was used for the refinements. X-ray diffraction allowed confirmation of composition by crystallography. Temperature resolved crystallography was used to determine the nature of the phase transition.

The Pair Distribution Function (p.d.f.) derived from total scattering measurements was performed on Cu$_2$Se to further elucidate the nature of the phase transition. The data was collected at beamline 11-ID-B, APS and analyzed by Sebastian Christensen. The utilized wavelength was $\lambda = 0.2128 \text{ Å}$ giving a $Q_{\text{max}} = 26 \text{ Å}^{-1}$. Samples were packed in 1.1 mm glass capillary within a glove box and sealed using epoxy glue. A dataset was obtained for every $\approx 5$ K. Data collection time per dataset was 1 minute. Data was collected at equivalent temperatures on an empty capillary for background subtraction. Data was integrated using Fit2D. All datasets needed to be normalized to the incoming intensity because the ring was in decay mode during the experiment. The reduced pair distribution function, $g(r)$ was calculated by PDFgetX3. For the calculation we chose: $q_{\text{min}} = 0.8 \text{ Å}^{-1}$ and $q_{\text{max}} = 26 \text{ Å}^{-1}$.

Secondary measurements were performed via scanning electron microscopy (SEM) and electron probe microanalysis (EPMA). Wavelength dispersive spectroscopy (WDS) and energy dispersive spectroscopy (EDS) were performed respectively during EPMA and SEM. SEM (ZEISS 1550 VP) and EDS of Ag$_2$Se and Cu$_2$Se indicated them to be phase pure. EPMA and WDS were performed by Tristan Day with assistance from
Figure 2.3: Electron micrographs of Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se (a) and Cu$_2$Se (b). Black features are cavities. While Cu$_2$Se is single phase, Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se has inclusions of a silver rich phase (white) identified as CuAgSe by crystallography.

Dr. Chi Ma using a JEOL JXA-8200. WDS is considered to be more accurate than EDS and this advantage is amplified by the careful calibration to standards of the WDS detector. WDS on Cu$_2$Se confirmed the sample to be stoichiometric within the uncertainty of the measurement (0.5%). However, SEM of Cu$_2$Se indicated the presence of small cavities along the surface, see Figure 2.3(b). These cavities have been observed previously and identified as being from cavitation of Cu$_2$O and Se$_2$O$_3$ from trace oxygen in the material [101]. Any such oxygen secondary phase is undetectable by WDS due to the surface morphology and was also below the quantity for detection in any of the many X-ray measurements done during my studies. Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$ shows a secondary silver rich phase that is identified as CuAgSe, see Figure 2.3(a).
Chapter 3

Seebeck Metrology

The Seebeck coefficient is unique to the metrology of thermoelectric materials. While the purely thermal transport properties \((c_p, D_T, \text{ and } \kappa)\) and the electrical properties measured using the Van der Pauw method \((n_H, \sigma, \text{ and } \mu_H)\) are essential to thermoelectric characterization, they are also essential to other fields of scientific inquiry. For this reason Seebeck metrology is far less advanced and far less understood than that of the other variables, though great effort is being made by many to rectify that shortcoming. [47, 130, 94, 90]

On my first day working at the Caltech Thermoelectrics Group I was introduced to a moth-balled pair of Seebeck metrology devices and asked to restore them to full functionality. I spent many hours calibrating these systems and I eventually constructed my own Seebeck measurement system with the help of my undergraduate assistant David Neff. Over this time I learned many of the details and potential failings of Seebeck metrology.

This understanding of Seebeck metrology was essential to the work presented in this thesis. The materials that I studied were substantially more difficult to measure than typical thermoelectric materials. The Seebeck coefficient has a much stronger first and second temperature derivative near its phase transition temperature, requiring greater stability and resolution. To illustrate this I plot in Figure 3.1 both the Seebeck coefficients of \(\text{Cu}_2\text{Se}\) and \(\text{Na}_{0.01}\text{Pb}_{0.99}\text{Te}\) [153] on the same axis.

The presence of the phase transition itself warrants more detailed investigation. The structural transformations of a phase transformation may be associated with
Figure 3.1: Seebeck coefficient of Cu$_2$Se compared with that of Na$_{0.01}$Pb$_{0.99}$Te. Cu$_2$Se’s strong peak near its phase transition requires more precise measurement than is typical for thermoelectric materials. PbTe data courtesy of Yanzhong Pei [153].

time dependent kinetics. These time dependent kinetics may result in chimerical transport properties.

3.1 Measuring the Seebeck Coefficient

The essence of a Seebeck measurement is to measure the voltage difference ($\Delta V$) across a sample under a fixed temperature gradient ($\Delta T$) at some fixed temperature $\bar{T}$. The Seebeck coefficient ($\alpha$) is then taken as $\Delta V/\Delta T$; this quantity I shall sometimes refer to as the nominal Seebeck coefficient or $\alpha_m$. By convention $\Delta V$ is defined at the voltage on the cold side minus the voltage on the hot side, while $\Delta T = T_h - T_c$. Both the voltage and temperature are measured at the same nominal point on the sample. This is done by pressing one thermocouple onto a hotter point of the sample and one thermocouple onto a colder point on the sample, see Figure 3.2. The Seebeck coefficient is, as defined in Equation 1.1 is actually the ratio of the gradients of $V$ and $T$. Single point Seebeck measurements are therefore an approximation to $\Delta V/\Delta T \approx \nabla V/\nabla T$. This may cause an error and these errors are discussed in the context of typical metrology techniques below in reference to Cu$_2$Se. It will be shown
that these errors are of greater concern near the super-ionic phase transitions studied for this thesis.

A more pernicious and frequently large error is the small voltage measured even when $\Delta T = 0$ [90, 129]. This offset is colloquially referred to as the dark voltage, $V_D$, though one should not be misled into thinking it is a voltage error. It may be caused by error in temperature measurement. That quantity I refer to as the dark temperature. It is defined as the $\Delta T$ for which $\Delta V = 0$ and is related to $V_D$ by $T_D = V_D/\alpha$. The intercept error, whether formulated as $T_D$ or $V_D$, is problematic for single point Seebeck measurements. The error induced is determined by:

$$\alpha_m = \alpha \left( 1 + \frac{T_D}{\Delta T} \right)$$

(3.1)

Because of this error single point Seebeck metrology is no longer used. An example is discussed in section 3.3 in the context of Cu$_2$Se [144].

To compensate for these variations on the oscillation Seebeck measurement is
now used almost universally [47, 94]. In this technique $\Delta T$ is varied while $\bar{T}$ is held constant and $\Delta V$ is measured. The resulting data is plotted as in Figure 3.3 and a line fit to it. This compensates for $T_D$, which is the intercept of such a plot. The slope of that line is taken as $\alpha$, though errors other than $T_D$ may still effect its value. These issues are discussed more explicitly later in this chapter.

Measuring Seebeck coefficient correctly is technically challenging partially due to a lack of standardized samples. Though many metals used in thermocouples are well calibrated, they have relatively low Seebeck coefficient (e.g., $10 \mu V/K$) and high thermal conductivity (e.g., $50 W/m \cdot K$). Good thermoelectrics have a much higher Seebeck (e.g. $\alpha > 100 \mu V/K$) and lower thermal conductivity ($\kappa < 3/m \cdot K$). Due to the great mismatch between the thermal conductivities of metals and good thermoelectrics, an apparatus designed for one will be inappropriate for the other. Round robin testing has lead to the development of a $\text{Bi}_2\text{Te}_3$ standard below 400 K [124, 126, 125]. No such standard is available at higher temperatures, though such standards are under current development at both NIST [125, 131] and ORNL [195].
The Seebeck of Bi$_2$Te$_3$ standard varied by 5% from lab to lab during the round-robin test [124], and I take this as the current upper limit of accuracy for Seebeck metrology.

The lack of standards for Seebeck measurement means care must be taken in instrumentation design. A Seebeck measurement may have low Gaussian noise but still exhibit large systematic errors. For example, Dr. Joshua Martin at NIST has made a strong case that instruments designed using an infrared furnace, such as that of the commercially available ULVAC ZEM-3 and Linseis LSR-3, produce repeatable errors in Seebeck measurement [94]. Dr. Johaness de Boor of DLR in Germany found that systematic error may be present in data for which the linear fit has $1 - R^2 < .01$; further order of magnitude reductions in the deviation of $R^2$ from unity resulted in systematically improved data [47]. Correct apparatus design is therefore crucial for accurate Seebeck metrology.

The principle challenge of Seebeck measurement is accurate thermal measurement rather than accurate voltage measurements. Determination of the electrical contact to be ohmic and small is insufficient for determination of good thermal contact [94]. In making a Seebeck measurement it is assumed that the temperature of the thermocouple is the temperature at a particular point on the sample. If there is a combination of heat flux to or through the thermocouple and a thermal resistance from the sample point to the measurement point on the thermocouple, then an error will result. Because the heat flux through the thermocouple tip is driven by the system’s various parasitic couplings to low or ambient temperature, this is referred to as the cold finger effect. A good Seebeck metrology apparatus reduces the cold finger effect.

There are three standards designs (Figure 3.4) of a thermocouple measurement apparatus commonly used today. The first is the two point design, in which the sample is sandwiched between electrically conductive heater blocks and the electrical and thermal properties measured from within the blocks. The second is the four point linear design in which the thermocouples touch the sample from its side instead of being inside the heater block. The final design, which was created by NASA JPL in support of their radio-isotope thermal generator program [90], is the four point co-linear design. Like in the four point design, the thermocouples directly touch the
Figure 3.4: The three principle Seebeck geometries. Sample is shown in yellow, heater block in green, and thermocouple in blue. (a) the two point linear design. (b) the four point linear design. (c) the four point co-linear design. Image adapted from Iwanaga et al. [90].

sample, but here they pass through the heater block. The four point co-linear design was used for this experiment.

The two point design (Figure 3.4(a)) is the most traditional as it is relatively easy to construct. In this design the thermocouple can be extremely well thermalized to the block and that should mitigate its coupling to cold or ambient temperatures. However, while the thermalization with the heater block is excellent, the thermalization to the sample itself is problematic. As a result, two point designs consistently over-estimate $\Delta T$ and therefore under-estimate the Seebeck coefficient. The apparatus used in this experiment had thermocouples both in the heater block approximately 1 cm from the sample and thermocouples in direct contact with the sample. As shown in Figure 3.5, the thermocouples in the heater block had a small offset from those touching the sample. Although it only causes a small error in absolute temperature, there is a much more significant (30% here) difference between the $\Delta T$ in the blocks and at the sample.

The four point linear design (Figure 3.4(b)) is used in commercial systems such as the ULVAC ZEM-3 and Linseis LSR-3. It is popular because it can be used for
Figure 3.5: Temperature readings on the sample and in the block as $\Delta T$ is varied. Magenta represents thermocouples on the top side. Blue represents thermocouples on the bottoms side. Squares represent thermocouples in the heater block while triangles represent thermocouples in direct contact with the sample.

near simultaneous measurement of electrical conductivity and Seebeck coefficient. Its principle flaw is the cold finger effect. The thermocouples do not run through the heater block and so are thermalized via their signal path to the ambient environment. While in theory this may be mediated by heat sinking the thermocouple wires to a hot block, in practice these instruments are only thermalized using an infrared furnace. As a result they tend to underestimate $\Delta T$ and therefore overestimate Seebeck. Work at NIST constructing a system with the same configuration found that an overestimate of up to 15% in Seebeck coefficient may result at high temperatures [94] This casts into doubt some of the highest zTs reported as very many of them were measured on ZEM-3s.

The four point co-linear design (Figure 3.4(c)) is meant to include the best features of the other two designs without their defects. The thermocouples contact the sample without intermediation by the heater block as in the four point linear design. The thermocouples are well heat sunk into the heater block itself, as in the two point design. Together these should mitigate both the thermal resistance from sample to thermocouple and minimize the heat flux from the thermocouple into the bath.
However, there may still be temperature fluxes through the thermocouple if there are non-uniformities in the temperature of the block. Such differences have been observed in our apparatus, see Figure 3.5. The temperature difference is in the block in that measurement was 30% higher than that at the sample surface.

A simple method for improving thermal contact is the use of a thin graphite-base foil (brand name *grafoil*) between the sample and the pair of block and thermocouples. Due to the conformation of the flexible foil to both sample and thermocouple, the effective thermal contact area is increased and thermal contact resistance decreased. Furthermore, the improved thermal contacts between the heater block and the sample ensure that the best path for thermal conduction goes directly into the block instead of into the thermocouple. The grafoil may cause a small underestimate in $\Delta T$. As the grafoil is only 100$\mu$m thick with a thermal conductivity of chem10 W/mK, its thermal resistance is a small fraction of sample thermal resistance (less than 2%). The effect on the measured $\Delta T$ is therefore negligible.

The consistency of thermal contacts may be tested by measuring the Seebeck both at ambient pressure and under vacuum. Ambient pressure mediates the contact between sample, heater blocks, and thermocouples, thereby reducing the sample thermal contact resistance. Dr. Martin at NIST tested this effect both with and without the use of grafoil to mediate the contact, see Figure 3.6. When no grafoil was present, reducing the pressure from atmosphere to rough vacuum resulted in a 10% shift in the measured value of Seebeck. This 10% shift was eliminated by the inclusion of grafoil contact. The foil also acts as a diffusion barrier to protect the sample and the thermocouple from chemical reactions. Given the high diffusivity of Ag and Cu into other materials, this is an important concern for this work in particular.

### 3.2 Apparatus and Protocols

The Seebeck apparatus used in this experiment is diagrammed in Figures 3.7(a),3.7(a). This diagram was originally published in Iwanaga *et al.* [90]. A photograph of the actually apparatus is displayed in Figure 3.7(b). In describing it I will refer to the
Figure 3.6: The effect of ambient pressure on measured Seebeck. Seebeck coefficient as a function of helium (circles) and nitrogen (squares) gas pressure at 295 K for Bi$_2$Te$_3$ SRM 3451 measured under a poor thermal contact (unfilled circles) and the Seebeck coefficient using a graphite-based foil interface (filled circles). Image from Martin et al. [131].

Figure 3.7: Diagram of Seebeck apparatus in profile (a) and three-quarter view (b). Photograph of apparatus used in this research (c). Figures part (a) and (b) were previously published in Iwanaga et al.[90]
labels within Figure 3.7(a). The sample (a) is compressed between two cylindrical Boron Nitride (Saint Gobain AX05) heater blocks (b) by three springs (f) pushing through a top plate (d) and three Inconel rod (c). The Boron Nitride blocks contain six symmetrically placed heater cartridges. The measurement thermocouples (g) run through the centers of the heater blocks in order to thermalize them and eliminate the cold finger effect. Compression of the thermocouple onto the sample for good contact is achieved by a spring (h) and plate (i) combination. The thermocouple apparatus is mechanically connected to the top plate by two threaded rods (j). The relative position of the thermocouple is adjusted by two wingnuts pushing on a small plate. The small plate is connected mechanically to the thermocouple by a spring (h). Adjustment by the wingnuts and spring are minor compared with constructing the thermocouple such that the length between the spring and the thermocouple tip is appropriate. An error of one quarter of an inch in this aspect of thermocouple construction will result in an insurmountable error. The thermocouple is put on and removed from the sample via holdoff bolts (l).

The loading procedure for the system is as follows. Wingnuts are located underneath the top plate and are used to separate the two boron nitride blocks without external mechanical support (e.g., the user’s arm). If the thermocouples are extended by releasing the hold-offs (l), they should extend 2-4 mm out of the block. The wingnuts for the thermocouples (j) should be set such that the thermocouple can be pushed back mechanically with a single finger with 3-5 pounds of force. If the thermocouple extends less than 2 mm out of the block than the thermal contact may be too poor, and it may even lose contact at higher temperatures due to the thermal expansion of the block. If the thermocouple extends too far it will require too great a force to contract it — Hooke’s law being proportional to displacement. This will result in mechanical degradation of the thermocouple tip. The thermocouple tip should be cleaned with isopropanol using a tweezer and a folded Kimwipe in the same gentle fashion by which optical lenses are cleaned. Then the thermocouple holdoffs should be re-engaged.

The sample should then be sandwiched between two pieces of graphoil cut to
the appropriate size and placed on the center of the bottom heater. The top heater should then be carefully lowered onto the top side of the sample. One hand should gently stabilize the top heater block while the other hand lowers the top plate (d) and adjusts the top wingnuts (f). Once the top heater block is on top of the sample the top plate wingnuts (f) should be tightened until resistance is felt. Then each should be tightened by one half a turn; this tightening should be done three times. This will ensure firm contact between the sample and the heater block. Then the thermocouple hold-offs should be disengaged. The heat shield (n) should then be tied onto the threaded rods (e) above the top plate. On occasion — for example, immediately after new thermocouples are installed — the Seebeck should be tested just above room temperature (40 to 50 °C) both in air and in vacuum to ensure that the pressure is sufficient to overcome the thermal contact errors described above.

A schematic of the measurement and control instrumentation for the apparatus
is shown in Figure 3.8(a). The measurement and control electronics and sensors are kept completely separate. Custom thermocouples with a combination of Niobium and Chromel are used to measure the sample. The thermocouple wires exit to a thermocouple scanner card that includes an aluminum block with built-in resistive thermal device (RTD). To measure the temperature on each side of the sample, the voltage from that channel is read on a multimeter. That voltage and the temperature of the cold junction block are input into a look-up table by which the temperature at the thermocouple tip is obtained. The voltage is obtained via the Niobium wires. Niobium was chosen for its relatively low Seebeck coefficient as the Seebeck voltage must be compensated for during measurement.

A k-type thermocouple inserted separately in the block is used to measure and control its temperature. The k-type thermocouples output is connected directly to an Omega CN7000 temperature controller. This value and the temperature set-point allow for PID control of the heater cartridges in the heater block. The heaters are resistive elements that are powered directly from the wall through solid state relays. The PID controllers alter the duty cycle time of the solid state relays and therefore the thermal power. All control is computer controlled through a Visual Basic program written by Dr. G. Jeffrey Snyder with some modifications by this author to deal with particular challenges. At present the author has begun the process of transitioning to python-based control software.

Above 300 °C the dissipation of heat in the system is driven by black body radiation. This was empirically determined via liner fitting of input power and the fourth power of temperature (Figure 3.9) with fitting coefficient $R = 0.99459$. The scatter in the data is due to the functioning of the PID control system. Blackbody radiation may cause thermal fluxes out of the side of the heater block and induce a temperature offset between the two thermocouples and lead to cold finger errors. For this reason heat shielding is installed in the apparatus. In later revisions radiation heat shielding was replaced with direct thermal insulation of the apparatus.
Black body radiation is the dominant thermal loss mechanism at high temperatures. When the apparatus is run at 1000 °C the radiant heat is sufficient to warm the metal bell jar to 50 °C.

3.3 Challenges of Phase Transition Seebeck

Though materials based on Ag$_2$Se and Cu$_2$Se are of great current interest in thermoelectrics, they are not new materials. Both are binary chalcogenides and are even present as uncommon earth minerals as Berzelianite (Cu$_2$Se) and Naumanite (Ag$_2$Se). Despite this rich history, my work is the first to successfully measure their phase transition thermoelectric properties correctly. I provide an example of literature attempts to measure their Seebeck coefficient in Figure 3.10. The plot is from Okamoto (1971) [144] and includes data from Bush and Junod (1959) [27]. These two data sets used different approaches and these different approaches led to different errors. My understanding of these two approaches and their errors indicated that a different technique was necessary. This method is described in detail in section 3.4 below.

Okamato’s data superficially resembles my own, but his approach suffered from systemic problems. First, he used a two point Seebeck geometry with the heater blocks made of copper. This raises the possibility of transfer of copper in and out of Cu$_2$Se from the heater blocks; thereby making the exact stoichiometry uncertain. He also used a variation of the single point Seebeck method that I will call the *single ramp technique*. Each data point he measured was derived from a single $\Delta V$, 

![Figure 3.9: Black body radiation is the dominant thermal loss mechanism at high temperatures. When the apparatus is run at 1000 °C the radiant heat is sufficient to warm the metal bell jar to 50 °C.](image)
Figure 3.10: Literature Seebeck (Thermoelectric Power) data on Cu$_2$Se. Image extracted from Okamoto (1971) [144]. Data points labeled Junod originally from Bush & Junod [27]. Okamotos data was obtained using a single point technique. Bush & Junods data was obtained using an oscillation technique. Both were insufficient for correct determination of the Seebeck Coefficient.
$\Delta T$ pair. Therefore any offset temperature or voltage would skew the value as per Equation 3.1. The $\Delta T$ used was up to 5 K and that therefore limits the resolution at or near the phase transition. That limitation is sufficient for determining the existence of a phase-transition anomaly; it may be insufficient for the proper calculation of $\varepsilon T$.

Methodologically, he ramped the average temperature at a constant (but unreported) rate while performing single point Seebeck data. He observed the peak in Seebeck, but there is no way to determine whether the data is accurate or chimerical.

Bush and Junod used the oscillation method. Variants of this technique are in standard use at Caltech, JPL, and in commercially available instruments. Ideally in this technique, the sample is kept at an average temperature ($\bar{T}$), while the voltage ($V$) is measured at various temperature differences ($\Delta T$). The Seebeck coefficient ($\alpha$) is taken as the slope of the best fit line to $V$ and $\Delta T$ data. This standard method is not ideal for the assessment of phase transition properties for three reasons: drift in temperature during a Seebeck oscillation, the instability due to kinetics associated with the phase transition, and limits on its temperature resolution. Bush and Junod caught hints of the phase transition anomaly using this technique, but without the resolution necessary to make a definitive statement.

The finite temperature shifts of an oscillation sequence causes errors when measuring near a phase transition. To make a Seebeck fit, the temperature of the two sides of the sample must deviate through a range of $\Delta T$’s. This range is typically 5 K or 6 K to ensure a good Seebeck fit. For a typical sample with a slowly varying Seebeck coefficient this range is insufficient to cause a significant error. However, near the peaked Seebeck second order transition of Cu$_2$Se or the step change in Seebeck at a first order transition, the finite temperature range used can be problematic.

The essence of a Seebeck fit is to make the approximation to a set of $N$ ($V, \Delta T$) points taken at the same $\bar{T}$.

$$\alpha \equiv \frac{\partial V}{\partial T} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \frac{\Delta V_i - V_{\text{dark}}}{\Delta T_i},$$

if $N$ points are measured. The process is therefore to approximate to a Taylor expan-
Figure 3.11: Sample oscillation sequence. Magenta and blue triangles are the temperature at the top and bottom side of the sample. Black squares are the average temperature. There is a small variation of average temperature that is correlated with the direction of $\Delta T$.

Expansion to first order, and so intuitively as $\Delta T$ becomes larger this approximation error gets more and more significant. The full Taylor expansion for the Seebeck coefficient about $\bar{T}$ is:

$$\alpha(T) = \alpha(\bar{T}) + (T - \bar{T}) \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial T} + \frac{1}{2} (T - \bar{T})^2 \frac{\partial^2 \alpha}{\partial T^2} + ... \quad (3.3)$$

Defining $\delta T = T - \bar{T}$, the corresponding voltage error at a given $\Delta T$ is:

$$V_{error}(\Delta T) = \alpha(T) - \alpha(\bar{T}) = \int_{-\Delta T/2}^{\Delta T/2} d\delta \left( \delta T \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial T} + \frac{1}{2} \delta T^2 \frac{\partial^2 \alpha}{\partial T^2} \right) \quad (3.4)$$

Inspection of Equation 3.4 reveals that the odd terms of Equation. 3.3 do not contribute to $V_{error}$. However, if there is a correlation between the deviations in $\delta T$ and $\Delta T$, there will be an error term on order of $\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial T} \langle \delta T^2 \rangle^{1/2}$. Inspection of oscillation data from our apparatus reveals that $\langle \delta T^2 \rangle^{1/2}$ is of order 0.25 K. This problem is therefore significant near 406 K in Cu$_2$Se — the temperature of the $\tau T$ peak — at which $\alpha = 140 \mu V/K$ and $\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial T} = 20 \mu V/K^2$. It may result in a several percentage error.
Figure 3.12: Raw Seebeck data for Cu$_2$Se measured at $\bar{T} = 410\,K$. There is a distinct cubic contribution and deviations from a consistent curve.

Ignoring correlations between $\Delta T$ and $\bar{T}$, we can simplify Equation 3.4 as:

$$V_{\text{error}} = \frac{\Delta T^3}{24} \frac{\partial^2 \alpha}{\partial T^2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.5)

As Seebeck is typically cited with a 10\% error, the condition for this effect being significant is:

$$\frac{\partial^2 \alpha}{\partial T^2} = 0.72\alpha \Delta T^{-2}$$ \hspace{1cm} (3.6)

While for a typical thermoelectric material this error is small, for phase transition materials it can be significant. For a typical thermoelectric material $\alpha$ varies gradually while temperature $\frac{\partial^2 \alpha}{\partial T^2}$ is very small ($< 0.01 \mu V/K^3$). Even in the most extreme case with $\alpha = 100 \mu V/K$ and $\frac{\partial^2 \alpha}{\partial T^2} = 0.1 \mu V/K^3$, the condition of Equation ref:Verror3 is met only for $\Delta T > 25K$. However, near the Seebeck peak of Cu$_2$Se $\frac{\partial^2 \alpha}{\partial T^2} \approx 3 \mu V/K^2$ and the relevant $\Delta T$ from Equation 3.6 is the only 5 K. This error can be seen in Figure 3.12.

In the case of a step change in Seebeck at a first order transition, the Taylor expansion formalism of Equation 3.3 must be modified to contain two piecewise functions
above and below the phase transition. These piecewise functions will be slowly varying, thereby making further Taylor expansion unnecessary for the argument above. Raw Seebeck plots in which a portion of the $\Delta T$ are above and below the phase transition are difficult to analyze. For a typical oscillation through a phase transition the resulting data will be disjointed and non-linear.

During a typical Seebeck oscillation $\bar{T}$ deviates slightly from its average value, as can be seen in Figure 3.11. These deviations occur in the system described above due to imperfect PID control and the use of separate thermocouples for temperature control and temperature measurement. The Seebeck error for a single point will be only of order $\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial T} \Delta T$; in typical thermoelectric materials (e.g., $\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial T} = 1 \mu V/K^2$, $\alpha = 100 \mu V/K$, this error is only a few percent. The point by point error itself will only effect the overall Seebeck if there is a correlation between $\Delta T$ and $\bar{T}$. Otherwise these terms in Equation 3.2 will average to zero, and the leading term will be that of $\frac{\partial^2 \alpha}{\partial T^2}$. As argued above, this term is small for typical thermoelectrics.

For phase transition thermoelectrics the drift in $\bar{T}$ during an oscillation measurement can have large effects. Near the Seebeck peak of Cu$_2$Se $\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial T} \Delta T$ is as much as 8% of $\alpha$. The result of this error would be inaccuracies (reduction) in the peak value of Seebeck measured. For a first order transition such as Ag$_2$Se, crossing the phase transition temperature will result in errors greater than 10% in measured voltage.

3.4 The Multi-Ramp Seebeck Technique

To minimize error and increase the resolution of the Seebeck data near the phase transition, a modification to the standard Seebeck metrology was made. I named this technique the ”Ramp Seebeck” technique. While in the Oscillation Seebeck technique $\bar{T}$ is held nominally constant while $\Delta T$ is varied and the resultant voltage measured, in the Ramp Seebeck technique $\Delta T$ is held nominally fixed while the $\bar{T}$ is steadily increased or decreased.

During each ramp the ($\Delta T, V$) pairs are measured continuously. In our apparatus the effective $\bar{T}$ steps between data points was on average 0.25 K when ramping at 15
Figure 3.13: Data from multiple ramp sequences are combined point by point to create $\Delta V$ versus $\Delta T$ from which point by point Seebeck values may be extracted K/min. Each separate ramp has a slightly different set of $\bar{T}$ values. The $(\bar{T}, \Delta T, V)$ data sets from each ramp were interpolated onto the same $\bar{T}$ values for comparison. The spacing of the new $\bar{T}$ was the average temperature step between data points, as that sets a resolution limit on the measurement procedure.

This process is illustrated in Figure 3.13, in which the coefficient is plotted point by point without compensation for the voltage offset. If data from a single $\bar{T}$ is explicitly plotted, than a raw Seebeck plot ($V$ vs $\Delta T$) is created from which a single $(\bar{T}, \alpha)$ point may be determined. This process is done at all temperatures using the combined heating and cooling data and is illustrated in Figure 3.13.

The proof of the superiority of the multi-ramp method for this problem is its superior results. In Figure 3.14 I plot the Seebeck coefficient and dark temperature measured on Cu$_2$Se by both the oscillation and ramp method. While the oscillation method shows the general trend of the anomalous Seebeck peak, it lacks sufficient resolution and clarity to fully describe the phase transition region. The temperature intercept is also of much smaller magnitude during the ramp measurement. The reason for this happy situation is unclear, but it is possible that the multiple ramps through the phase transition temperature allow the thermal contacts to stabilize into
Figure 3.14: Comparison of oscillation (black triangles) and multi-ramp method data (blue circles) for Cu$_2$Se in proximity to its phase transition. The ramp data is superior.

a better position. Therefore the thermal contacts are superior and thus the Seebeck value more trustworthy for data using the multi-ramp technique rather than the oscillation technique.
Chapter 4

Operational Stability

A major question for the future development of ionic conducting thermoelectrics, particularly Cu$_2$Se and Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se, is whether these materials will be stable under device conditions of sustained temperature gradients and currents. Both copper and silver show fast interdiffusion in many materials [52, 89]. Therefore there is strong concern about the decomposition of these materials when operated under the device condition of steady state current operation. Indeed, Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se, Cu$_2$Se, and Cu$_2$Se are empirically known to be unstable under current density of 10 A/cm$^2$ at elevated temperatures in their super-ionic phase [24, 48]. However, while these issues may occur at elevated temperatures, my empirical testing shows no evidence of electrochemical degradation at the phase transition temperature.

In section 4.1 I will discuss the publication [24] I wrote summarizing the DOE/NASA studies of Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se in the 1970s. In this publication I also repeated and re-demonstrated the electrochemical effects in Cu$_2$Se. In section 4.2 I show the work I did repeating this experiment in the low temperature phase. I will also discuss the possible reasons for the difference in degradation behavior between the high temperature and low temperature phase, with particular reference to the extensive studies on Cu$_2$Se performed by Mikhail Korzhuev of the Baikov Metallurgical Institute.
4.1 \( \text{Cu}_{1.97}\text{Ag}_{0.03}\text{Se} \) at NASA

In the late 1960s the 3M corporation designed and patented a set of highly efficient selenide thermoelectric materials to be used for the next generation of radioisotope thermal generators (RTGs) and for other DOE applications [72, 73, 74, 40]. The n-type material developed was based on \( \text{Gd}_2\text{Se}_{3-x} \). The p-type material was \( \text{Cu}_{1.97}\text{Ag}_{0.03}\text{Se}_{1+y}, y < 0.01 \) [75]. This proprietary material was referred to as TPM-217. 3Ms reports indicated good thermoelectric properties that were stable over 4000 hours, though typically the material would take several hundred hours to become stable [72]. Further material studies were done by the General Atomics Corporation [58, 59, 57, 55, 56, 60] and NASA Jet Propulsion Laboratory [183, 182, 181]. Device and generator development was done by 3M and Teledyne Energy Systems [149].

The technical reports cited in this thesis are merely a representative sample of the dozens of quarterly and annual reports available from the DOE OSTI database and easily searched for with the key word "TPM-217." There is significant overlap between many of these reports; the set referenced above is representative of the program as a whole. General Atomics images of the material as synthesized by 3M showed clear Cu and Ag rich regions, which could be eliminated by further hot-pressing and annealing of the material [71]. The 3M reports also indicate that there was a small problem of Cu extrusion at the interface between the \( \text{Cu}_{1.97}\text{Ag}_{0.03}\text{Se}_{1+y} \) and the cold side end-cap [72]. Though this issue was identified at the beginning of the program, it was not addressed until it began to cause systematic issues, such as increasing device contact resistances under extended operation [80]. The failure of the TPM-217 program was as much or more a failure of program management as it was of the materials’ properties themselves.

Data from 3M indicates that \( \text{Cu}_{1.97}\text{Ag}_{0.03}\text{Se}_{1+y} \) has a peak \( zT \) of 1.2 at 1000 K, [9] see Figure 4.1. 3M typically synthesized 0.1% excess selenium samples. Data from JPL indicated a peak \( zT \) of 0.8 at 800 K. JPL bonded their samples to copper at the cold end. Therefore the equilibrium Se excess in their samples varied from 0.02% to 0.08% depending on the temperature as the copper in the cold junction
Figure 4.1: $zT$ data for Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se (TPM-217) as extracted from JPL status reports. Blue circles are data from 3M Corporation tests. Green squares are data from JPL tests [71]. Red triangles represent data from Liu et al. [122].

block diffused in and out of the bulk sample. (See Figures 1 and 2 of reference [181])

Electrical conductivity and thermopower were measured via a four-point technique. Thermal conductivity was directly measured by steady-state direct calorimetry, as was typical then, [81] rather than by separate measurement of thermal diffusivity and heat capacity, as is done in modern thermoelectric laboratories. The material was also evaluated over a ten year period by the General Atomics corporation. Most of the information in the General Atomics reports evaluates Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se$_{1+y}$ in a device setting, with particular focus on high-temperature (1000 K to 1200 K) stability and operation under typical device thermal gradients with a cold-side at 400 K to 600 K and a hot side at 1000 K to 1200 K, as well as under conditions of applied current and in segmented legs and devices. These tests revealed problems that were not reported in Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se$_{1+y}$ original material testing at 3M.

The biggest problem observed was material loss rate, see Figure 4.1. At 1200 K the loss rate under zero current was found to be $10^{-4} \text{ g} \cdot \text{cm}^{-2} \cdot \text{hr}^{-1}$, and under conditions of applied current the loss rate was measured as high as $10^{-2} \text{ g} \cdot \text{cm}^{-2} \text{hr}^{-1}$ at $iL/A = 8.6 \text{ A/cm}$ [40]. For a reasonable sample geometry, these loss rates would
Figure 4.2: Weight loss rates for TPM-217 as a function of temperature. Figures 6, 7, and 8 from reference [183]. (a) Comparison between unprotected and baffled TPM-217. (b) Comparison between TPM-217 in vacuum and in 750 mbar argon atmosphere. (c) Loss rates at different applied currents. Il/A ranges from 0 A/cm to 16.6 A/cm.

Cause rapid deterioration of the material. Quantitatively the fraction loss rate per hour is a function of the loss rate (LR), the geometric density (ρ) and the leg radius (r) as:

\[ fLR = \frac{2LR}{\rho r} \]  

(4.1)

This gives for a 1 cm radius leg a loss of mass equal to 0.3% of total mass per hour under applied current. The mechanism for this loss was believed to be evaporation of Se at the hot end.[9] As thermal and electrical potential gradients created a Cu concentration gradient with a low concentration of copper at the hot end, the Se activity increased and thereby increased its vapor pressure. The evaporation of the selenium causes the solid state precipitation of the copper there. Under conditions of applied thermal and electrical gradient, it was found that the percent excess selenium in the material varied with temperature. 3M and JPL found that excess selenium percent increased by the factor of 0.0095 iL/A over the zero-current concentration with iL/A in Acm. To mitigate this problem the p-leg was partitioned with a diffusion barrier. This diminished the problem of Se evaporation but also decreased zT by 25% [181].
To address this issue, General Atomics developed systems to suppress the evaporation of Se. They would baffle the $\text{Cu}_{1.97}\text{Ag}_{0.03}\text{Se}_{1+y}$ with boron nitride and boron oxide glassy coatings [79]. With greater baffling thickness they would find a reduction in material loss rate of up to two orders of magnitude, but this baffling decreases device efficiency by acting as a thermal short. This provides a limiting condition on the thickness of the baffling that can be effectively added to the module. They further found that they could suppress the weight loss rate by one order of magnitude if they operated in a low (2.5 torr) atmosphere of Argon instead of in vacuum [79]. The combination of these effects reduced the loss rate to a level that allows potential operation of the leg for multiple years without significant degradation. Another option for reducing the effect might be to decrease the hot end temperature, as evaporative material loss was is an exponential function of that temperature. (Figure 4.1)

The second major problem was the chemical degradation of the material and device, particularly under conditions of applied current. In the original 3M studies, these effects were obscured by the use of Cu as both hot and cold-side contacts. General Atomics found that at elevated temperature the Cu in $\text{Cu}_{1.97}\text{Ag}_{0.03}\text{Se}_{1+y}$

---

**Figure 4.3:** Degradation of segmented modules. Data from General Atomics final report [57], representing Figure 2-21 and Figure 2-31. (a) Depiction of chemical degradation after isothermal test of p-type leg after 2490 hr at a 1027 K/380 K thermal gradient. (b) Depiction of resistivity ratcheting under conditions of applied current. $iL=A$ is in units of A/cm. $T_h = 1023$ K, $T_c = 473$ K.
would react with the Fe in 316 stainless steel contacts [79]. Tungsten, molybdenum, and tungsten-rhenium were found to be chemically unreactive to Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se$_{1+y}$. However, these materials showed a coefficient of thermal expansion one-fifth that of Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se$_{1+y}$, resulting in micro-cracks through which Cu could diffuse at elevated temperatures [79]. It is also possible that these cracks were related to the approximately 1.4% volume expansion at the 410K phase transition of the material [191]. In the final General Atomic tests during the late 1970s, Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se$_{1+y}$ was used as the low temperature segment. Fe was used as the diffusion barrier for the segmented tests, because it was known to be compatible with (Bi, Sb)$_2$Te$_3$ [80]. During isothermal tests it was found that the Fe reacted with the Cu in Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se$_{1+y}$, see Figure 4.1a. A region of mixed Cu and Fe was found in between the Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se$_{1+y}$ and the Fe, as well as a region of Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se$_{1+y}$ with inclusions of Cu, Fe, and Cr from the coating of the 316 Stainless Steel end caps. Under conditions of applied current these segments failed dramatically. At different factors or IL/A ranging from 0 to 6 A/cm the segments were measured to have a resistivity ranging from 15 to 9 mΩ·cm when T$_h$ = 1023 K and T$_c$ = 473 K. The measured Seebeck coefficient and electrical resistivity would also show ratcheting behavior: at regular intervals the transport quantity would suddenly increase for a short period of time and then decrease down to the baseline, see Figure 4.1b. The ratcheting frequency depended on applied current, but was typically on order one ratchet per 15 minutes. These results were interpreted as being due to an irregular electrochemical process — plate out of copper followed by reabsorption of copper. Work done at 3M indicated that under accelerated conditions (Il/A = 15 A/cm), contact resistance increased to up to 700% of leg resistance after 100 hours. Upon thermal cycling, the device was re-stored to its original contact resistance. After these tests, the TPM-217 project was terminated [80].
Figure 4.4: (a) Thermopower measurement apparatus with modification to allow operation with applied current. Conductive graphite contacts are used for the current source and sink. (b) Seebeck coefficient stability during measurement of sample under conditions of applied current and temperature gradient. It is unclear whether the transients represent instrument error or relaxation of the concentration gradient produced by turning off the current source immediately before the measurement.
Figure 4.5: (a) Sample after applying current for 24 h. (b) Optical microscopy image of the current-sink face of the sample after applying a current for 24 h. Copper can be clearly seen precipitated on the surface. (c) SEM micrograph of top surface of sample after applying current for 24 h. The electromigrated copper grows into nanowire bundles (whiskers).
4.2 Degradation Testing of Cu$_2$Se

In order to understand these results and test their applicability to stoichiometric Cu$_2$Se, we performed a short electro-migration experiment. A piece of copper selenide with cross-sectional area of 11.47 mm$^2$ and length of 10.7 mm was placed in a modified Seebeck apparatus, see Figure 4.2a. This Seebeck apparatus allows for simultaneous measurement of voltage and temperature and application of a current of up to 10 A. The sample was placed under a thermal gradient of 275 K for 16 hours with $T_h = 795$ K and $T_c = 520$ K. The sample was not visibly affected. Current was varied from 0 to 10 A under the same thermal gradient as before. The resistivity did not depend upon applied current, in contradiction to the General Atomics reports [57]. The sample was then run under the same temperature gradient and in current continuously for 24 hours. The magnitude of this current was such that the voltage it induced was half the thermoelectric voltage. The direction was such that it transported Cu$^+$ in the opposite direction of thermal diffusion; Cu$^+$ should electromigrate to the hot-side and thermally diffuse to the cold side. The applied current was 1A. The applied current density was $j = 9$ A/cm$^2$. There was no noticeable degradation of the average Seebeck coefficient over this period (Figure 4.2,b), which is consistent with the reports by JPL, 3M and General Atomics. When the sample was removed, visual inspection showed that it had undergone deformation at the hot end. Copper residue was visible on the face that had been against the hot-side heater and the current sink. The copper residue was inspected via optical microscope (Figure 4.2ab) and SEM (Figure 4.2c). The non-uniformity of the surface copper may have been due to spatial inhomogeneity in the contact resistivity between the current electrodes and the sample face. The SEM image reveals that the copper grows as bundles of nanowires. The result is a clear indication that electromigration drives physical degradation of Cu$_2$Se.

It has yet to be shown that liquid-like thermoelectrics based on fast-ion conductors can be used effectively in thermoelectric devices. The historical work by General Atomics, the 3M Corporation, Teledyne Energy Systems, and the NASA Jet Propul-
Table 4.1: Electromigration Experiments on Cu₂Se. No electromigration was observed below the phase transition temperature. When tested slightly above the phase transition temperature there was no plate out observed but there was copper observed on the side of the sample near the hot end.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\bar{T}$</th>
<th>$\Delta T$</th>
<th>$J(A/cm^2)$</th>
<th>Duration (hr)</th>
<th>Plate out?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>658K</td>
<td>275K</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404K</td>
<td>23K</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387K</td>
<td>19K</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423K</td>
<td>6K</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>See Text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

sion Laboratory gives reason to be cautious in assuming that the excellent material properties observed in Cu₂Se will necessarily lead to a high quality thermoelectric module. There were three major problems observed. The first was electrochemical process resulting in weight loss via selenium evaporation. The 3M and General Atomics reports indicate that this problem was solved via baffling of the thermoelectric leg and operation in an Argon atmosphere. JPL and Teledyne expressed skepticism that the problem had been sufficiently reduced to prevent mechanical and chemical degradation of the thermoelectric generator. The second major problem was that of chemical reactivity at high temperature. In the view of all four major organizations involved in this work, this problem was never solved. Changes in contact resistance over time due to chemical process at interfaces between (Ag, Cu)₂Se and diffusion barriers and bond pads led to unacceptable degradation of overall module performance. This last problem appears to be the principle reason the program was cancelled in 1979. If Cu₂Se is to be used for thermoelectric generators, these problems must be solved or evaded. Possible solutions would be the development and use of different diffusion barriers and contact materials, and the operation of the material only at lower temperature. The authors own work shows that physical degradation of Cu₂Se can be induced with currents similar to those needed to build a practical thermoelectric generator.

Fortunately these problems are eliminated below the phase transition temperature. The author performed high current density plate-out tests at three additional temperatures, the results of which are summarized in table 4.1. Currents and dura-
tions far in excess of that applied above the phase transition resulted in no observed
copper plate out or altering of the transport properties. A further test was performed
just above the phase transition temperature. It also showed no whisker-growth or
plate out at the end of the sample, however there was a small quantity of Cu on the
side of the sample near the hot end. This may result from loss of selenium due to
evaporation or the piezodiffusion of Cu$_2$Se that has been noted by prior authors [107].

Why should copper excrescence growth occur and why should it only in the high
temperature phase? Korzhuev provides a compelling answer [106, 103] that relies
on the comparative thermodynamics of the solid, super-ionic, and melt phases. The
sub-lattice melting and super-ionic transition causes a decrease in the melt entropy
of transition of the super-ionic phase. He prepared two samples of nominal com-
position Cu$_{1.77}$Se and Cu$_2$Se [106]. Denote the entropy of transition of the super-
ionic transition as ($\Delta S_C$) and that of the melt transition as ($\Delta S_m$) and their sum
($\Delta S_T = \Delta S_C + \Delta S_M$). $\Delta S_T$ differed by less than 2% between the two samples. In the
Cu$_2$Se 62% of the total was released at the superionic transition, while in Cu$_{1.77}$Se only 29% was released. This resulted in a significant change in melt morphology
between the two samples. Korzhuev also suggested [103] that the entropy of the Cu
in the superionic phase might be larger than that in the liquid phase. Therefore the
material under external force (e.g. piezodiffusion, electrodiffusion) may be extremely
unstable and tend to copper excrescence growth.

In general the super-ionic phase, in addition of course to its elevated ionic conduc-
tivity, is thermophysically quite distinct from the low temperature phase. It shows
ultrafast chemical diffusion [107, 102, 108] and superplasticity [177]. In this context
it is unsurprising that the ion-ordered phases do not show the same thermophysical
instability as the super-ionic phase.
Chapter 5

Structural and Phase Transition Classification

Knowing the order of the structural phase transitions of Ag$_2$Se, Cu$_2$Se, and Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se is essential to understanding their thermoelectric properties in the vicinity of those phase transitions. Structure effects the transport properties through the mechanism of the electronic band structure and the phononic band structure. A change in band structure should always be accompanied by some, though perhaps subtle, change in structure. In later chapters I will present the transport properties of Ag$_2$Se, Cu$_2$Se, and Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se, and there will be direct correlations between the structural changes of their phase transitions in their transport property. Understanding the nature of that transformation will allow me to develop the phenomenology necessary to explain them.

In the case of Cu$_2$Se there is an important scientific question that was answered by the work presented here. All previous authors considered Cu$_2$Se to be a first order phase transition [21, 41, 188, 191, 123, 121]. The work presented here shows it to be definitively second order [23]. This question of is central importance; the $\varepsilon T$ of Cu$_2$Se can not be properly calculated without understanding the nature of its phase transition. The determination of the Differential Scanning Calorimetry (DSC) data depends on the order of the phase transition. A substantial broad peak is seen in the DSC for Cu$_2$Se, see Figure 5.1. If the transition is second order the DSC measurement must be treated as $c_p$. If it were first order, it would be more proper to
use the Dulong-Petit heat capacity instead.

As $\kappa$ is calculated from $c_p$ by the formula $\kappa = \rho c_p D_t$, and $zT$ from $\kappa$ by $zT = \alpha^2 \sigma T / \kappa$, this argument has an order of magnitude impact on the $zT$ calculated. Treating Cu$_2$Se as a first order transition results in a five-fold overestimate in $zT$ above its true value. Answering this question is particularly pressing due to recent published articles, [121, 123], claiming $zT$'s two to five times that published here based on a first order treatment of $c_p$ data.

Ag$_2$Se has a much simpler story. Prior literature shows understanding of its transformation as first order [15, 137, 21]. The work presented below agrees with that assessment. Still, it serves an excellent contrast to Cu$_2$Se and therefore illuminates the contrast between first and second order behavior in structural measurements.

Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se has the most complex story and one that this thesis does not fully resolve. As temperature is increased from room temperature it follows a trend similar to than of its Cu$_2$Se main phase. However, this trend is interrupted by the dissolution of a secondary phase of CuAgSe, eventually leading to a first order phase transition
at a temperature lower than Cu$_2$Se’s second order phase transition.

In the next section I will discuss the definitions, different categorizations of, and phenomenology of structural phase transitions. There will be particular emphasis on order-disorder phase transitions. In section 5.2 I will discuss the measurements made on Ag$_2$Se, in section 5.3 I will discuss the characterization made of Cu$_2$Se, and in section 5.4 I will discuss measurements made on Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se.

From understanding of the structure of a material, great insight can be obtained into its chemical performance can be obtained. For example, if the structure is well-understood, calculations of the electron and phonon band structure can be accomplished by Density Functional Theory (DFT). Super-ionic materials are a particularly challenging and interesting topic for structural studies. The high mobility and interstitial occupation probabilities of their ions means that determining the average location of the ions is insufficient for understanding their transport. For this work I am of course interested primarily in the nature of the superionic phase transition of Cu$_2$Se, Ag$_2$Se, and related materials.

5.1 Phase Transitions

A phase transition is a transformation in the symmetry of a system. The symmetries are understood in terms of the mean location or state of the degree of the system (e.g., atoms, molecules, spin states). For example, the Arrhenius activation of Frenkel ion defects does not affect the mean symmetries and so is not a phase transition. Phase transitions are a very broad category. In a glass transition the symmetry reduction is purely local [162]. In crystal twinning or martensite transitions the reduction in order is between large ordered grains rather than due to a local effect [162]. In order-disorder transitions a local change in coordination results in a long-range transformation in symmetry [95]. An excellent summary of phase transitions in the solid state is available in Rao and Rao [162]. Super-ionic phase transitions are order-disorder phase transitions [21, 151].

The disordering is frequently modeled as due to the creation of Frenkel defects [163,
Figure 5.2: Free energy versus temperature for a first order phase transition. At $T_c$ the free energy of both phases is equal.

22, 70, 34] in the high temperature phase; while this may be true for other super-ionics, the pair distribution function (PDF) data measured for my publication on Cu$_2$Se [23] contradicts this explanation. Super-ionics typically have an ionicity close to the critical value of 0.785 [22] described by Phillips [156]. Therefore there is almost equal preference for coordination into sites preferred by ionic coordination as those preferred by electronic coordination. Aniya [4, 5] suggested that it is the fluctuations between these two co-ordinations that are characteristic of superionic materials; this explanation is more compatible with our PDF data.

In an order-disorder phase transition all high-temperature symmetries are preserved in the low temperature phase. Solidification of a liquid, in which the rotational freedom of the liquid is lost but the chemical coordination maintained, is a very common instance of an order-disorder transition [31]. In an order-disorder transition the ordering is typically long range, mathematically defined as a very slow decay of correlations between states of the ordering element with increasing distance. The kinetics of an order-disorder transition are relatively fast, as they are not limited by atomic
Figure 5.3: Free energy ($F$) versus order parameter ($m$) for a second order transition. Each of the curves is on its separate axis. The dotted line represents the equilibrium order parameter. As $T$ goes to $T_c$, $m$ goes continuously to zero.

diffusion.

5.1.1 Order-Disorder Phase Transitions Type

There are two principle types of order-disorder phase transitions. First order transitions are characterized by a first derivative discontinuity in a thermodynamic state parameter. This is typically measured by the instantaneous change in the volume or enthalpy as a thermodynamic parameter is changed [162]. A second order transition shows a discontinuity in a second or higher order derivative of the thermodynamic quantities. Certain second order transitions, including that of Cu$_2$Se, have a derivative of free energy that diverges to infinity at the phase transition temperature. Under the old classification system of Ehrenfest these were not considered second order transitions [53]. Instead they were called $\lambda$-transitions for the characteristic $\lambda$-shape in the dependence of their heat capacity on temperature [65, 157]. In more modern classification systems based on the work of Landau and Ginzburg, all phase transitions with continuous transformation of free energy are considered to be second order or
continuous [95].

Thermodynamic stability must be determined by a formulation that includes it. This formulation is the Free Energy. Without loss of generality, I use the Helmholtz Free (F) energy rather than Gibbs Free Energy. The difference between these two formulations is whether the system is held at constant volume (Helmholtz) or constant pressure (Gibbs); that detail is irrelevant to the argument below. For any given phase, defined as a set of symmetries obeyed by its degrees of freedom, the free energy is:

\[
F_i = U_i - TS_i
\]  

(5.1)

There are as many phases as one can dream up. Very few are thermodynamically favorable. At a given set of thermodynamic conditions (e.g., P,T) there will be only one phase or set of phases stable at a temperature. This phase or combination of phases is that which has minimal \( F_i \). Each of these different phases will have a different \( U_i \) and \( S_i \). A phase with higher entropy and high internal energy (i.e., a gas) will be more stable at high temperatures than phase with low internal energy and low entropy (i.e., a liquid); the converse is also true. If \( U_i \) and \( S_i \) are known for both phases the temperature of transition me determined by setting Equation 5.1 equal for each phase. Defining \( \Delta U = U_i - U_j \) and \( \Delta S = S_i - S_j \), this is equivalent to:

\[
\Delta U = T\Delta S
\]  

(5.2)

As a very simple example consider the dissociation of diatomic oxygen into monatomic oxygen. In this hypothetical example \( \Delta S = R/2 \) where \( R \) is the gas constant while \( \Delta U = 495kJ/mol \). Therefore the temperature of the phase transition is \( \approx 60,000 \text{ K} \) — and indeed monatomic oxygen is very rarely observed.

In the case of the super-ionic transition \( \Delta U \) is the energy that prefers the ions to be ordered in some way — perhaps a bond energy or the effect of alignment of a dipole with the crystal field — while \( \Delta S \) is the additional configurational entropy available to the disordered phase. This may not be straightforward to calculate, as a substantial portion of the lifetime of super-ionsics is spent between lattice sites in
regions of non-minimal potential [87]. Still, a simple configurational entropy argument helps to contextualize the scale of the phase transition. Following Korzhuev [103], if we assume that there are \( n_0 \) accessible vacancies per mobile ion in the super-ionic state then \( \Delta S \) should be:

\[
\Delta S = R \ln(n_0)
\]  

(5.3)

For \( n_0 = 3 \), \( \Delta S = 9.1 \text{ J} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}\text{K}^{-1} \). This is comparable to the entropy of melting.

If \( \Delta S \) and \( \Delta U \) are themselves independent of temperature, then there will be a first order phase transition. The difference in the free energy between the two states decreases until the high entropy state becomes more favorable at \( T = T_c \) (Figure 5.2). Because the high entropy phase requires input of heat equal to \( T \Delta S \) in order to form, there is frequently hysteresis in measurements through first order phase transitions. On heating the temperature rises above \( T_c \), but the material remains ordered until sufficient heat has been absorbed to complete the phase transition. On cooling at a steady rate, a similar but opposite effect occurs. Measurements on heating overestimate the phase transition temperature while measurements on cooling underestimate it.

The assumption that \( \Delta U \) and \( \Delta S \) are constant as a function of temperature is generally invalid. Disordering can occur without a phase transition at all. For a phase transition to occur there must be a fundamental change in the symmetry of a system. For example, Arrhenius activation of defects will increase the internal energy and entropy slightly. This will increase \( T_c \) slightly and decrease the enthalpy of formation of the transition, but it will not eliminate it. That entropy increase is still much smaller than the entropy increase of the disordering phase transition. It will change the slopes and perhaps add curvature to the lines in Figure 5.2, but the lines will still intercept at an angle. That angle represents the entropy of the transition.

In order for the transition to be continuous rather than abrupt the two curves in Figure 5.2 must intercept tangent to one another, as thermodynamics requires the free energy by analytic for any given phase [31]. Therefore a continuous transition requires that the entropy of the ordered phase increases continuously and that its
internal energy increases continuously to the phase transition temperature. This requires the disordering process to be continuous rather than abrupt.

In proximity to an order-disorder phase transition the free energy is described in terms of an order parameter. For example, in the canonical case of a spin-ordering transition the order parameter is the average spin magnetization. The super-ionic order parameter is theorized to relate to the relative population of different sites by the mobile ion [151, 70]. The free energy contribution associated with the ordering — which is the only free energy terms that differentiates the ordered and disordered phase — is for a first order transition:

\[ F = am^2 + bm^4 + cm^3 \]  

(5.4)

The cubic term leads to a discontinuity in the value of \( m \) at \( T = T_c \).

For a second order transition the Landau Free Energy is:

\[ F = am^2 + bm^4 \]  

(5.5)

As the phase transition is approached thermodynamic quantities follow critical power laws. For example, the order parameter decreases to zero continuously:

\[ m = m_0 \left( \frac{T_c - T}{T_c} \right)^\beta \]  

(5.6)

In which \( \beta \) is called the critical exponent. Order parameter in a structural transformation is related to the diffractogram peaks, so a related power law should be discoverable by analyzing those peaks. A similar power law is expected for heat capacity.

Another type of phase transition is a co-existence phase transformation. This is a temperature extended first order phase transition. Some interaction (i.e., pressure) between the concentration of the two phases elongates the region over which the low-temperature phase transforms into the high temperature phase. This sort of phase is easily distinguished from a true second order transition by diffractogram. In a
coexistence transition the intensities will vary as one phase steadily appears and the other steadily disappears, but the angles at which they have diffraction peaks will remain steady.

A final type of phase transition is a *weakly first-order* phase transition [16]. In this type the symmetry between the multiple minima in free energy is weakly broken so that the two minima in Figure 5.3 are slightly displaced from one another. At temperatures well below the phase transition temperature the symmetry breaking appears very similar to a second order transition, except that one minima is global and so slightly preferred. At temperature near the phase transition this tiny offset is large compared to the difference between the ordered state’s minimum and the disordered states minimum, and a first-order aspect of the transition appears. Whenever a lambda type second order transition is heated or cooled through its phase transition at a finite rate, it is to some degree weakly first order. The heat capacity at $T_c$ is infinite and so for even a very slow heating rate and very good connection of the sample to a thermal bath, there will be a moment at which the correct heat cannot be supplied.

### 5.2 Ag$_2$Se

The high temperature structure and phase transition of Ag$_2$Se were first noted by Rahlfs in 1934 [161]. In the high temperature structure (Im3$m$) the selenium is body-centered cubic, while silver ions occupy the interstitial sites. The more complex low temperature phase was described by Wiegers [198]. The silver sits on two sites in the low temperature phase. One of the silver sites is coordinated tetrahedrally by four selenium atoms and the other is coordinated trigonally planar to three selenium atoms.

A diffractogram was measured at room temperature from $2\theta = 10^\circ$ to $2\theta = 100^\circ$. The sample was then heated at 1K per minute to 450 K (well above the nominal phase transition temperature of 413 K [136]. A diffractogram was measured at that temperature as well. The sample was cooled at 1K per minute to room temperature and
Figure 5.4: Low Temperature (a) [15] and high temperature (b) [18] structure of Ag$_2$Se

Figure 5.5: Powder X-Ray Diffractogram for Ag$_2$Se above and below its phase transition. All symmetries of the high temperature phase are present in the low temperature phase.
Figure 5.6: Temperature dependent X-ray diffractograms measured on heating (a) and on cooling (b) of Ag$_2$Se. A first order transition is seen at 415 K on heating and 401 K on cooling.

Both above [145] and below [207] the transition the measured peaks index to previously published data, however large intensity mismatches are observed. These intensity mismatches were also observed by Billeter et al. [15] and ascribed to Se precipitation. This problem is likely more significant in the powder XRD as compared to bulk samples due to their larger surface area to volume ratio. No Ag is visible in the diffraction patterns at any temperature. Since a bulk synthesis product was used, large grain sizes are expected and the observed intensity mismatch is ascribed to this. The low temperature modification is orthorhombic (Space group P2$_1$2$_1$2$_1$) which explains the different dependences of the peak positions below the transition. The low temperature space group maps homomorphically to the high temperature space group (Im$ar{3}$m); that is, all symmetries of the low temperature phase are preserved in the high temperature phase.

During the heating and cooling process diffractograms were measured from 2$\theta$ = 20$^\circ$ to 2$\theta$ = 52$^\circ$ in order to determine the nature of the phase transition. The duration of each scan was three minutes and consequently the temperature changed by 3 K from start to end of each scan. From inspection of a color map of this data there is a first order phase transition observed at 415 K on heating (Figure 5.6(a)) and 401 K on cooling (Figure 5.6(a)), with the phase transition temperature halfway in between
at $T_c = 408\,\text{K}$. This is consistent with literature reports [15, 136]. The discrepancy of the phase transition on heating and cooling is characteristic of a first order process and a consequence of the non-adiabatic heating.

The color maps show strongly diffuse background scattering. While significant in the low temperature phase, in the high temperature phase it makes distinguishing the peaks visually almost impossible. This suggests diffuse scattering, much like in a glass, that may cause phonon scattering and low thermal conductivity. The exception is a sharp peak at $2\theta = 37.2^\circ$ that is visible on cooling but not on heating.

Differential scanning calorimetry data for $\text{Ag}_2\text{Se}$(Figure 5.7(a)) shows a sharp symmetric peak centered at 414 K. This peak is characteristic of a first order transition. Due to the preponderance of literature [15, 137, 21] evidence and the crystallographic evidence presented above for $\text{Ag}_2\text{Se}$’s first order transition, it was unnecessary to confirm the order of the phase transition via altering the heating rate. The region of elevated calorimetry data extends from 402 K to 426 K. The DSC curve of a first order transition should \textit{begin} to increase at the phase transition temperature. By
Figure 5.8: Phase diagram (a) of Cu-Se system in the vicinity of Cu$_2$Se adapted from Heyding [78]. The phase transition is between the $\beta$ - Cu$_2$Se(RT) phase and the $\alpha$ - Cu$_2$Se(ht) phase. Anti-fluorite structure (b) of which $\alpha$ - Cu$_2$Se is a modification. Se is coordinated FCC and is represented in red. Ground state Cu is tetrahedral coordinated to the Se though significant occupation of trigonal planar and octahedral interstitials has been measured. The structure of $\beta$ - Cu$_2$Se is unknown.

drawing intercepting tangents to the behavior before and during the rise, the phase transition temperature is determined to be approximately 407 K. This agrees with the temperature of 408 K determined above by crystallography.

Both crystallographic and calorimetric studies indicate Ag$_2$Se to have a phase transition at 408$^\circ$K.

5.3 Cu$_2$Se

The description of the phase transition behavior of Cu$_2$Se is complicated by the unsettled argument over the nature of that phase transition and the structure of the low temperature phase. The high temperature phase is at this point fairly well understood. The material is a known, if not abundant, mineral under the name of Berzelianite. During the same work in which he indexed high temperature Ag$_2$Se, Rahlfs also indexed high temperature Cu$_{1.85}$Se [161]. All the compositions of Cu$_{2-\delta}$Se
from $\delta = 0$ to $\delta = 0.2$ appear to have the same high temperature anti-fluorite cubic structure [78, 194, 201]. (Figure 5.8) Though that phase is on average anti-fluorite, significant Cu$^+$ occupation of trigonal planar and octahedral interstices is observed [201]. Hopping through these interstices is the mechanism of fast copper ion transport; the ion transport pathways have been successfully determined to be along the [111] direction from tetrahedral to trigonal planar interstices [43, 42].

Despite Cu$_2$Se presence in mineral form and its binary composition, the ordered low temperature structure is yet unknown. This is not for lack of trying. In 1987 Milat et al. [134] proposed a monoclinic supercell and in the course of that work noted eleven other proposed structures. They proposed a structure that assumed significant octahedral occupation. Later authors proposed more complex superstructures [123, 96]. These structures are insufficiently complex to explain the crystallography data presented below.

Multiple authors have proposed a co-existence transformation between the $\alpha$ and $\beta$ phase with a temperature width of 10’s of Kelvins [41, 188, 121]. This hypothesis, though reasonable, is contradicted by the data presented in this chapter. There are three reasons for this. The Cu$_{1.8}$Se is commensurate with the $\alpha$ Cu$_2$Se. In the region $\delta = 0.05$ to $\delta = 0.2$ there actually is a coexistence of the $\beta$-Cu$_2$Se phase and the Cu$_{1.8}$Se; if the phase diagram is determined imprecisely, the single phase region goes unnoticed. Finally, unknown errors in synthesis have led to samples showing impurity phases of Cu$_{1.8}$Se [121]. As room temperature Cu$_{1.8}$Se has the same structure as $\alpha$ − Cu$_2$Se [78], this is an easy confusion to make. There is indeed co-existence of $\beta$ − Cu$_2$Se and $\alpha$ − Cu$_{1.8}$Se in such samples, but it is a co-existence of admixture rather than that of synthesis. Vengalis et al. [190] observed that this phase tends to form on the grain boundaries of copper rich phases.

Prior to this work the 410 K phase transition was believed to be first order. This is unsurprising, as it takes careful measurement and analysis to differentiate a lambda second order transition from a first order transition. The difficulties of this determination are well illustrated in the case of the lambda transition of $\beta$ quartz [184, 82]. As late as 1980 authors were still confused about the lambda nature of its
phase transition [82]. While structural second order transitions with diverging heat capacity are of interest to the physics community, they are far less common than first order transitions. Korzhuev determined Cu$_2$Se’s transition to be first order on the basis of the Clausius-Clapeyron relations [105]. However, Pippard showed than an analagous relation holds for lambda-type transitions [157]. Vucic determined it to be first order on the basis of its sharp feature in their dilatometry data [191]; again, such sharp features are also expected in the case of a lambda-type second order transition [157]. Qualitative assesment of sharpness of thermophysical peak at a phase transition temperature can differentiate a first order transition from a second order transition without diverging heat capacity [140]; it is insufficient for differentiating a first order transition from a lambda-type second order transition.

Despite this confusion there is some certainty about the phase diagram at room temperature. By electrochemical determination [197] Korzhuev et al. found there to be a single phase region of Cu$_{2-\delta}$Se [101] for $\delta = 0$ to $\delta = 0.05$ and a range of co-
existence of Cu$_{1.95}$Se and Cu$_{1.8}$Se from $\delta = 0.05$ to $\delta = 0.20$. Temperature dependent dilatometry was performed by Vucic et al. in the single-phase region, and he developed a phase diagram on this basis, see Figure 5.9. Vucic’s collaboration made follow up transport measurements [194, 134, 84, 192]. In general our sample shows the properties that Vucic observed in his samples of nominal composition Cu$_{1.99}$Se.

### 5.3.1 Diffractometry

A diffractogram was measured at room temperature from $2\theta = 10^\circ$ to $2\theta = 90^\circ$. The sample was then heated at 1 K per minute to 425 K (above the nominal phase transition temperature of 410 K. A second diffractogram was taken at 425 K. These diffractograms are shown in Figure 5.10. The low temperature diffractogram is consistent with literature reports [96]. The bifurcation of the major $\alpha$ – Cu$_2$Se peaks in the $\beta$ – Cu$_2$Se phase is consistent with the $\beta$ phase being a monoclinic or orthorhombic modification of the anti-fluorites structure. Cu$_{1.8}$Se impurity phase observed by Liu et al. was not observed here [121].
Figure 5.11: High flux low angle synchotron data of Cu$_2$Se (a) shows significant strong reflections, indicating that a large unit cell to explain the data. The recent models of Liu et al. [123] show a better fit than those previously published, [134, 96] but cannot explain all the low angles peaks observed (b). In (b) the black line is the data, the red line the model, and the blue line their discrepancy. Courtesy of Kasper Borup.

My crystallography collaborators were unable to resolve the low temperature structure. They determined that though many authors have proposed structures for Cu$_2$Se, these structures use a large enough unit cell to explain all of our observed peaks and their intensities. Many of these proposed structures are based on analysis of lower signal to noise diffraction data than that presented here; consequently, those authors propose structures that are too simple. Kashida and Akai [96] proposed a monoclinic unit cell (a = c = 7.14 Å, b = 81.9 Å, $\beta = 120^\circ$) with ordering of copper vacancies, while Milat et al. proposed an even larger monoclinic cell (a = c = 12.30 Å, b = 40.74 Å, $\beta = 120 \pm 1^\circ$). [134] Neither of these unit cells were able to describe the position of all reflections at low angles observed via high flux synchrotron.(Figure 5.11(a)). This indicates the structure to be even more complicated. These low angle peaks were not measured previously with the precision done in this experiment. Since publication of my paper [23], Liu et al. [123] proposed a triclinic unit cell (a = 7.12 Å, b = 7.14 Å, c = 7.51 Å, $\alpha = 98.6^\circ$, $\beta = 107.6^\circ$, $\gamma = 60.1^\circ$) and a monoclinic unit cell (a = 7.13 Å, b = 12.36 Å, c = 14.47 Å, $\beta = 100.4^\circ$) with larger unit cells than that proposed before. These structures were also unable to clar-
Figure 5.12: Temperature varied diffractograms of Cu$_2$Se. Data is presented as stacked diffractograms (a) and as a color map (b). The peak intensities and angles shift continuously from the low temperature to the high temperature phase.

ify all of our observed peaks nor determine their intensities correctly. This is shown for the proposed monoclinic structure in Figure 5.11(b). Therefore, no structural refinement below the phase transition is possible from PXRD at present, and the order parameter is not easily obtained from this method.

The 425 K diffractogram (Figure 5.10) is well fit by an anti-fluorite structure with the exception of a few anomalous peaks. These anomalous peaks are not present in the synchrotron data from 450 K, see Figure 5.11, suggesting that either the phase transition is not fully complete at 425 K or that insufficient time was taken to let the kinetics stabilize at 425 K before measuring the diffractogram. Based on the PXRD and synchrotron data I conclude that the Cu$_2$Se measured for this study is single phase and in concordance with other single phase samples synthesized for literature studies.

For crystallographic determination of the nature of the phase transition, diffractometry must be performed at a series of temperatures that transverse that transition. During the heating process to 425 K for obtainment of the diffractogram of $\alpha$ – Cu2Se (Figure 5.10), diffractograms were continuously measured from $2\theta = 23^\circ$ to $2\theta = 45^\circ$. The duration of each scan was three minutes and consequently the temperature changed by 3 K from start to end of each scan. The $2\theta$ range was chosen
Figure 5.13: Peak intensities versus temperature (a) for selected peaks of Cu$_2$Se. These peaks were chosen because they only appear in the low temperature phase. They show a continuous decrease to the phase transition temperature. This decrease corresponds well with a critical power law, as seen by the linearity of log-intensity versus log-reduced temperature.

because of the excellent signal intensity and the two separate bifurcated peaks seen. Visualization of this data (Figure 5.12) shows a continuous evolution of the bifurcated peaks at low temperature into the single peaks at high temperature. Both the peak intensities and angles shift continuously from the low temperature to the high temperature phase. This strongly contrasts with the abrupt change that would be seen as in a first order transition (i.e., that of Ag$_2$Se presented above in Figure 5.6). Cu$_2$Se does not have a first order transition.

Detailed analysis of the temperature resolved PXRD data confirms Cu$_2$Se’s phase transformation to be continuous. For a second order phase transition, it is expected that a crystallographic order parameter should go to zero with some exponent of the reduced temperature $\tau_r = (T_c - T)/T_c$. To examine this effect, we plot the peaks that disappear at the phase transition temperature (Figure 5.13(a)). These peaks show critical power law behavior as the phase transition temperature is approached (Figure 5.13(b)). The data at the phase transition is insufficiently detailed to ex-
Figure 5.14: Temperature dependence of the peak shift for representative diffraction peaks of Cu$_2$Se. The peak shifts are incompatible with a coexistence transformation.

To extract a precise critical exponent; the data resolution for such a fit must be increase exponentially higher as the phase transition temperature is approached. The critical exponents so obtained would be far larger than unity. This is greater than the critical exponent expected for the Ising model [95] and found in other super-ionic transitions [118]. It is therefore likely that while the critical exponents of the peaks are related to the order parameter, their critical exponent is not that of the order parameter (canonically labeled $\beta$). $T_c$ was determined to be 408 K, as that temperature gave approximately the same slope in Figure 5.13(b) for angles analyzed. This critical temperature is consistent with that found in the literature and determined by other thermophysical measurements for this thesis. The noise floor near the phase transition temperature prevented analysis of the critical exponent for the $2\Theta = 37.9^\circ$ peak.

The shift in peak angles with temperature is inconsistent with an $\alpha \rightarrow \alpha + \beta \rightarrow \beta$ coexistence transformation. In a coexistence transformation the secondary peak in the bifurcation should be stable in peak position as its intensity increases, varying only due to thermal expansion. In contrast a second order transition the peaks will bifurcate smoothly from one another. The peak positions of Cu$_2$Se show such shifts in the temperature range from 360 K to 410 K. (Figure 5.14) Notably the $2\Theta = 25.2^\circ$
and 26.4° shift in opposite directions; this is inconsistent with thermal expansion.

The phase diagram of Vucic (Figure 5.9) anticipates a (non-lambda) second order transition at a lower temperature. At 360 K there is a point of inflection in the peak shift of the $2\Theta = 25.2°$ and 26.4° peaks. The peak intensity and shifts in general begin to shift significantly at this temperature. While that is not definitive evidence of a second order transition at 360 K, more data relevant to that point will be presented later in this document.

A pair distribution function (p.d.f.) was obtained from total scattering data. It describes the distribution of distances between pairs of atoms in the structure. The changes of the p.d.f. are gradual, indicating that the ordering of Cu-interstitials occurs over a wide temperature range. There is no evidence of a first order discontinuity in peak positions nor of the β phase being present below 410 K. The phase transition does not appear to be complete until 450 K; transformation above the phase transition temperature is characteristic of second order transitions. The $Q_{\text{max}} = 26\text{Å}$ used is insufficient for truly accurate quantitative fitting, as indicated by the presence of substantial integration error ripples below the first peak maxima.

Even without modeling the data it is possible to extract qualitative information. By studying the high-temperature structure of Cu$_2$Se it is clear that the peak at 4.1 Å (Figure 5.15(a)) is a superposition of the shortest Cu-Cu and Se-Se distances in the [110]-direction. Above 300 K the peak becomes increasingly asymmetric, indicative of multiple Cu-Cu distances in the high-temperature phase related to the disorder of Cu interstitials. At low temperature the Cu order to form a superstructure. The superstructure formation is most clearly seen in the region 8 Å to 9.5 Å (Figure 5.15(b)). This range corresponds to Cu-Cu distances in the [110]-direction in adjacent cubic unit cells. Below 410 K there are two distinct peaks at 8.2 Å and 9.3 Å. However in the high temperature phase the same region is a continuum of overlapping peaks arising from the disorder of Cu.

Theoretical models of super-ionic conductivity assume that it is due to Frenkel defect formation — that a number of interstitial sites similar to the number of ions become occupiable in the higher temperature phase [21, 163, 70]. Such significant
Figure 5.15: Pair distribution function data for Cu$_2$Se. The unit cell size is 5.8 Å. The coordination number remains the same through the phase transition (a) but correlations between high temperature equivalent unit cells breaks down. (b) Full data set. (c)
Frenkel defect formation should result in new peaks in $g(r)$ for $r$ less than the lattice spacing of the high temperature phase (5.8 Å). While the peaks in this range are broadened, Figure 5.15(a), there is nothing to suggest significant new site occupation. For unit cells greater than 5.8 Å a much more substantial change is observed. (Figure 5.15(b)) This suggests that the correlations between high temperature unit cells breaks down substantially. The implication of this is that rather than the disordering being due to Frenkel defect formation, it is primarily due to a breakdown of correlations between unit cells, as represented by the 8.2 Å and 9.3 Å peaks. It is unclear at this time what the microscopic mechanism for correlations between unit cells is. One possibility is that the order state of the super-ionic transition is supported by a local electronic polarization like in a ferroelectric.
5.3.2 Cu$_2$Se Calorimetry

Calorimetry data also supports Cu$_2$Se being a second order transition. In order for a DSC measurement to accurately represent a material’s heat capacity, the heating rate should be much faster than the timescale of thermal equilibration. At a first order transition there is an instantaneous enthalpy release. This enthalpy cannot be transported out of the material instantaneously, and so a temporary difference between the temperature of the bath and the temperature of the sample occurs. Therefore, a first order phase transition will show a peak of finite width at its phase transition. For example, in the Ag$_2$Se calorimetry curve presented above (Figure 5.7(a)), the heat capacity is elevated over the Dulong-Petit baseline from 405K to 420K. Over this temperature range the sample is not in thermodynamic equilibrium with the bath. For the phase transformation to be complete a quantity of heat equal to the enthalpy of formation may be added, but the rate at which heat may be added is limited by the material’s thermal diffusion time scale ($t_D$) and its heating rate ($\dot{T}$). This can be written mathematically as:

$$\delta T = A t_D \dot{T}, \quad (5.7)$$

in which $A$ is a constant term that serves as a catch-all for the geometric configuration of the apparatus and sample. As discussed in Chapter 2 in the context of thermal diffusivity measurements, the diffusion time scale is related to the diffusion length ($l_D$) by $t_D = l_D \cdot D^{-1}$. This provides a scaling relation by which measurements on different size samples and heating rates can be compared.

$$\delta T = A \frac{l_D^2}{D_T} \dot{T}, \quad (5.8)$$

Because of the smearing of the enthalpy of formation, it is easy to accidentally mistake a second order transition with diverging heat capacity for a first order transition. The historical case of the $\beta$-quartz transition exemplifies this difficulty [85]. Considerations based on heating rate and sample size have proved successful in the past for differentiating first and second order phase transitions [140].
The enthalpy released per unit temperature of a lambda-type transition is always finite. However, the low thermal diffusivity and non-linearity in the heat capacity may still lead to errors in the DSC derived heat capacity. A fixed temperature rate induces an error in the heat capacity resolution due to the sample’s thermal diffusivity. Two separate samples were sent to SIC-CAS and JPL for DSC measurement. The heat capacity measured at these two facilities showed markedly different calorimetry curves (Figure 5.16) that can be explained by Equation 5.7. The JPL sample had a thickness of 2.5 mm, while the SIC-CAS sample had dimensions of approximately 0.8 mm. On this basis the 5 Kelvin per minute and 10 Kelvin per minute JPL measurements are expected to have a temperature errors 10 and 20 times that of the SIC-CAS sample. The maximum of three curves are at 412 K, 420 K, and 427 K, which corresponds well to the predicted trend and indicates an error on the SIC-CAS temperature resolution of less than 1 Kelvin.

On this basis the $c_p$ derived from the SIC-CAS DSC measurement is judged to be accurate enough for calculating transport data. The DSC heat capacity was further confirmed via the quasi-static method of the Quantum Design Physical Property Measurement System to 400 K with the assistance of Dr. Xun Shi of SIC-CAS. In this methodology the temperature is stabilized before the heat capacity is measured. Within each three point set the variation in measured heat capacity is less than 1%, indicating that the equilibrium condition was met. These measurements confirm that the heat capacity is increased at the phase transition temperature.

At 355 K there is a distinct change in the slope of the heat capacity. (Figure 5.17) This is consistent with a (non-lambda) second order phase transition and the predictions of Vucic. This extended elevation is inconsistent with a first order transition and consistent with a second order transition. There is a distinct change in the slope of $c_p$ with $T$ at 355 K. That feature is indicative of another second order phase transition and accords with the phase diagram of Vucic. A feature near this temperature was observed in the temperature crystallographic measurements discussed in the previous subsection. The calorimetry data is consistent with two second order phase transitions at 360 K and 410 K. The transition at 360 K has a heat capacity that converges
Figure 5.17: Heat capacity minus Dulong-Petit heat capacity below the phase transition temperature. Data is shown both for the DSC measurement and the quas-static PPMS measurement. The non-linear elevation in heat capacity begins at 355 K.

to zero, while the transition at 410 K has a divergent heat capacity.

5.4 \( \text{Cu}_{1.97}\text{Ag}_{0.03}\text{Se} \)

At room temperature the material’s main phase has a structure related to the room temperature structure of Cu$_2$Se. This structure has not been satisfactorily solved in the literature but it is believed to be equivalent to the high temperature structure but with ordered Cu vacancies and interstitials. The ordering is believed to depend highly on the exact stoichiometry, which may explain the lack of a unit cell that describes the low temperature structure. Of the peaks that could not be related to Cu$_2$Se peaks, CuAgSe and at least two distinct impurity phases are identified. At least one impurity phase is still present at high temperature and at least one impurity phase dissolves at the phase transition at 400 K, see Figure 5.18. The CuAgSe impurity phase is clearly visible in scanning electron micrographs of the sample, see Figure 5.19. The impurity peaks that dissolve do not have corresponding peaks in Cu$_2$Se and are hence believed to be impurities; however, it is possible that they belong to the main phase if this has
Figure 5.18: Room temperature (a) and 450 K (b) diffractograms of Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se. Impurity peaks marked v disappear at the phase transition, while those marked * remain. Peaks marked with an arrow correspond to CuAgSe. Courtesy of Kasper Borup.
Figure 5.19: Scanning electron micrograph of Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se courtesy of Tristan Day. Gray areas are Cu$_2$Se phase, black areas are voids and white areas are CuAgSe.
A structure different from Cu$_2$Se.

Diffractograms were measured on constant heating continuously from 2$\theta$ = 24° to 2$\theta$ = 55°. A color map is presented in Figure 5.20(a). The duration of each scan was three minutes and consequently the temperature changes by 3 K from start to end of each scan. During heating, dissolution of CuAgSe was observed at 380 K. At $\approx$400 K there was a structural transition of the primary phase to a high temperature structure, which remained present and unchanged to 500 K. All peaks except few low intensity impurity peaks (also present at room temperature) can be indexed and refined with the high temperature Cu$_2$Se structure. Every 20 K higher quality diffractograms were recorded, during which the sample was held at constant temperature for at least 45 minutes. At 380 K, CuAgSe was present and unchanged both before and after the 45 minute scan, and hence this is not believed to affect the dissolution. No change in CuAgSe is observed until the diffractogram labeled 384 K (scans are labeled according to the sample temperature when they are started). The same is true for the primary phase and dissolved impurity at 400 K.

The structural phase transition has both a first and second order component. The
Figure 5.21: Comparison of the $2\Theta = 26.2^\circ$ peaks of both Cu$_2$Se and Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se. All units are arbitrary and scaled to be identical at $T = 300$ K. Up to 380 K the peak of Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se follows the second order trend of Cu$_2$Se. On dissolution of CuAgSe at 380 K its intensity stabilizes while temperature increases, until the first order transition at $\approx 400$ K eliminates the peak entirely.

structure is gradually changing from room temperature and up. This is evidenced by the peaks moving relative to each other while the intensities also change. At the dissolution of CuAgSe there is a strong change, and again this appears not to be due to the 45 minute rest at 380 K. The dissolution of CuAgSe seems to result in a faster rate of transition. Contrary to pure Cu$_2$Se, many peaks seem to be shifting position, while others seem to only change intensity (except for a slight shift due to thermal expansion).

5.4.1 Cu$_2$Se and Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se

From the crystallography data Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se appears to have an interrupted and distorted version of the second order transition of Cu$_2$Se, i.e., it appears to be a weakly first order transition. The distortion occurs on dissolution of the secondary CuAgSe phase near 380 K. The interruption occurs at 403 K at which point the transition becomes first order. This behavior is best seen by comparing the temperature dependence of peak intensity of the $2\Theta = 26.2^\circ$ peaks of both Cu$_2$Se and Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se.
Figure 5.22: Differential scanning calorimetry for Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se in comparison with that of Cu$_2$Se.

Up to 380 K the peak of Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se follows the second order trend of Cu$_2$Se. On dissolution of CuAgSe at 380 K its intensity stabilizes while temperature increases, until the first order transition at $\approx 400$ K eliminates the peak entirely. These trends strongly affect the temperature dependence of Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se’s transport behavior, as is to be discussed later in this thesis.

The heat capacity of Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se shows a doubled peak, see Figure 5.22. The temperature of the first peak corresponds to the temperature dissolution of the CuAgSe phase observed by crystallography. The temperature of the second peak corresponds to the first order transition. Some of what is labeled as specific heat in Figure 5.22 is surely enthalpy of formation due to the first order component of the phase transition. However, at this time I am unable to distinguish which portion belongs to the second order transition and which to the first order transition. I will treat all the measured enthalpy from the DSC measurement as if it were due to a second order transition. This will lead to an overestimate in $c_p$ and therefore an underestimate of $zT$, but I feel it is best to be conservative in my calculation.
Chapter 6

Transport in $\text{Ag}_2\text{Se}$

This chapter is principally about the thermoelectric performance of $\text{Ag}_2\text{Se}$ near its phase transition. In the sample studied here the Hall carrier concentration does not differ measurably in the order and disordered phases; this fact considerably simplifies arguments based on band structure analysis. While many samples show similar behavior, other samples show a sharp increase in $n_H$ in the disordered phase; the reason for this distinction remains unclear. Without any measured difference in band structure, the Seebeck and $zT$ are enhanced in the ordered phase compared to the disordered.

This increase in $zT$ is not easily explained using standard band-structure analysis ($e.g.$, BoltzTraP) [127]). In this chapter I will introduce super-ionics as thermoelectric materials and explain why they are of interest. Then I will provide a brief overview of the band structure modeling used for this thesis. After this I will present and analyze the transport data of $\text{Ag}_2\text{Se}$ and argue that the difference in its properties above and below its phase transition are not easily explained by band structure modeling.

In the final chapter, after I have also presented the transport of $\text{Cu}_2\text{Se}$, I will develop an explanation for its physics on the basis of the phenomenology of order-disorder transitions [95] and Onsagers phenomenology of non-equilibrium thermodynamics [132]. I will suggest that these effects may occur broadly; it may be that the sudden transformation of the phase transition brings a more general effect into contrast.
6.1 Ion conducting thermoelectrics

Mixed ion-electron conductors (MIECs) are of recent and increased interest as thermoelectric materials [1, 199, 50, 133, 200, 206, 121, 30, 179, 185, 66, 45]. MIECs are materials that conduct both ions and electrons [167]. This is of course a very broad category that includes semiconductors and solid electrolytes. They can be subcategorized by the relative size of ionic conductivity ($\sigma_i$) and electronic conductivity ($\sigma_e$) with the physics varying substantially from the $\sigma_i \gg \sigma_e$ regime to the $\sigma_e \gg \sigma_i$ regime. In some materials such as solid oxides used in fuel cells, these regimes may be bridged in a single material under varying conditions of oxygen partial pressure and temperature.

Thermoelectric ion conductors operate entirely in the $\sigma_e \gg \sigma_i$ regime. This regime is inescapable unless an entirely new conception of what makes a good thermoelectric material is made as compared to what is studied now. A good thermoelectric is a heavily doped semi-conductor with a carrier concentration generally optimized at between $10^{18}$ cm$^{-3}$ and $10^{21}$ cm$^{-3}$ [180], and an electrical conductivity in the $10^4$ S/m to $10^6$ S/m regime in which the electronic ($\kappa_e$) and lattice ($\kappa_L$) portion of thermal conductivity are nearly the same. Super-ionics are by their phenomenological definition the best ionic conductors. They have ion conductivities that are similar to that of a liquid, $\approx 10^2$ S/m. Therefore even in the most extreme conceivable case an ion-conducting thermoelectric has $\sigma_i$ less than 5% of $\sigma_e$.

Direct enhancement of thermoelectric material conductivity by adding ionic conduction is therefore impossible. Fortunately, this simplifies the measurement procedure for total thermal and electrical conductivity; the great care must be taken in making DC measurements of materials with two species with order of magnitude different diffusion timescales [167, 164, 165] can here be ignored. The principal consideration is that the electrodes are blocking to ions so that the ion conducting specie does not leave the material. Empirically the graphite blocker layer between thermocouple and electrode accomplished this purpose. When that layer was forgotten or broken through, the Niobium thermocouple wire used for the electrode developed a
fine metallic coating and was rendered useless.

The driver of recent interest in MIEC thermoelectrics has been their extremely low thermal conductivity. A principal problem of engineering good thermoelectric material is to find methods for scattering lattice vibrations (phonons) and thereby reduce $\kappa_L$ without also scattering electrons and thereby reducing $\sigma$. In $\text{Ag}_2\text{Se}_{0.05}\text{Te}_{0.05}$ $\kappa_L$ is only 0.5 W/mK at 400 K [50] and $\text{Ag}_8\text{GeTe}_6$ has been reported as having a glass-like thermal conductivity of 0.25 W/mK at 300 K with only negligible contribution from electrons. Though these noble metal chalcogenides are the subject of this thesis and in fact have a longer history as thermoelectric materials than is commonly appreciated [24], the driver of the recent interest in MIECs has been $\beta - \text{Zn}4\text{Sb}3$.

In 1997 Caillat et al. first synthesized $\beta - \text{Zn}4\text{Sb}3$ as a thermoelectric material [30]. They determined it to have a maximum $zT$ of 1.3 at 670 K which at the time was the highest ever measured at that temperature. This was driven by a $\kappa_L$ at or slightly above 0.65Wm$^{-1}$K$^{-1}$ from 400K to 650K. They determined this to be very close to the thermal conductivity of a glass in accordance with Cahill's formalism [28, 29]. On the basis of crystallography Snyder et al. [179] suggested that this low $\kappa_L$ was due to scattering off of disordered interstitals.

Density functional theory analysis by Toberer et al. [186] showed that the Zn interstitial sites were of almost identical energy to the ground state sites, with metastable pathways connecting them. Both a nearly isoenergetic interstitial site and meta-stable energetic pathways are considered necessary conditions for super-ionic conduction [87]. Tracer diffusion experiments confirmed $\text{Zn}_4\text{Sb}_3$ to have a liquid-like ion diffusivity with site hopping activation energy only 20% higher than that of AgI [35]. $\text{Zn}_4\text{Sb}_3$ is therefore a super-ionic thermoelectric material [21, 151].

Super-ionic materials are often written about as having a molten sub-lattice of conducting ions [22, 103]. As this analogy was coined in reference to the liquid-like diffusivity of the conducting ion ($10^{-5}$ cm$^2$/s) and the enthalpy of formation comparable to that of their melt, [21, 22] care must be taken in extending it beyond its physical underpinnings. It has been suggested in two ways that the lattice thermal conductivity may have properties similar to that of a liquid: that they should show
Figure 6.1: Heat capacity of liquid lead and rubidium with fit to theory. As temperature increases low frequency transverse modes disappear and thereby reduce $c_V$. Figure from Bolmatov et al. (2012) [17].

phonon softening due to coherent oscillations like a liquid [6], and that their constant volume heat capacity ($c_V$) should decrease with increasing temperature like a liquid [122, 189, 17].

The liquid-like heat capacity was proposed by Liu et al. in order to explain a decrease in $c_P$ they observed above 800K in Cu$_2$Se [122]. While a solid has $c_V = 3k_b$, a liquid only has $c_V = 2k_b$ [189]. The solid heat capacity is due to the kinetic and potential energy contributions to heat capacity by the equipartition theorem. As in a mono-atomic gas, there are three degrees of freedom for position and momentum each and so $c_v$ of a solid is $6 \times k_b/2 = 3k_b$. In a crystalline solid these contributions are split between two longitudinal and one transverse (or shear) propagation modes. A liquid is incapable of propagating all transverse oscillations and therefore loses the heat capacity associated with the potential energy of those modes (up to $k_b$).

In real liquids $c_V$ is observed to decrease with temperature. Bolmatov et al. compiled data for twenty-one liquids showing this trend [17]. As an example, their data for Pb is shown in Figure 6.1. They model this trend as being due to two characteristic frequency. The first is the characteristic frequency of lattice oscillations, the Debye frequency ($\Omega_D$). The second is the characteristic frequency of liquid hopping, which they call the Frenkel frequency ($\omega_F$). Only shear modes with characteristic frequency ($\omega < \omega_F$) disappear. In this frequency regime the liquid atoms move fast enough to
Figure 6.2: The fluctuations of ions between interstitial sites causes phonon mode to soften and scatter. In Zn$_4$Sb$_3$ Schwelka et al. [173] observed a strong anharmonic ratting of an Sb-dimer that they found could explain its anomalously low thermal conductivity. This behavior was found to effect the heat capacity even in the ordered phase, as evidenced by an Einstein peak in the heat capacity. If this behavior is a more general attribute of super-ionic materials in both their ordered and disordered phases, it may cause their low thermal conductivity. In his studies on single crystal Cu$_{1.8}$Se Danilkin found substantial mode softening in Cu$_{1.8}$Se [44].
damp out the oscillation. Above this frequency the liquid atoms move slow compared to the perturbation and so appear as a solid. As temperature increases more lattice vibration modes and ion hopping modes contribute to this behavior, with their contribution determined by the characteristic quantity. At \( k_{B}T \gg \hbar \omega_{D}, \hbar \Omega_{F} \), the heat capacity simplifies to:

\[
c_{v} = k_{b} \left( 3 - \left( \frac{\omega_{F}}{\omega_{D}} \right)^{3} \right) \tag{6.1}
\]

From inelastic neutron scattering measurements, the Frenkel timescale of Cu$_{2}$Se is 1 picosecond at 430K [42]. This corresponds to \( c_{v} = 2.98k_{b} \). Though this casts doubts on the explanation of Liu et al. [122], this author is unaware of any experiments showing the ion hop time of Cu$_{2}$Se at high temperature. One should also not discount the possibility that another material may show liquid-like reduction in its heat capacity much more strongly than Cu$_{2}$Se does.

While the liquid-like fluctuations of ions may not eliminate phonon propagation modes, they may scatter them. Ultra-sonic attenuation is a common feature of many solid electrolytes [3]. The theoretical explanations of Aniya for this behavior treats the mobile ions as a liquid free to move through out the lattice and thereby collide with the mobile cores [6]. A treatment of this class of materials that ignores the significant portion of ion life-time spent between interstitial sites [87] may not be able to fully capture their behavior.

### 6.2 Band Structure Modeling

In order to understand how Ag$_{2}$Se may have enhanced thermoelectric performance as compared to predictions based on its band structure, a brief overview of the relationship between band structure and Seebeck coefficient is necessary.

The electronic transport properties of heavily doped thermoelectrics can be typically described by modeling their electronic band structures [180, 127]. If the full electronic band structure is known — or more realistically predicted by density func-
Figure 6.3: Left: Example of a single parabolic band. The band shown is a valence band as for a p-type conductor. The effective mass ($m^*$) determines the curvature of the band. The carrier concentration is the number of carriers between the band edge and the Fermi level.

Right: Example $\alpha$ versus $n_H$ or Pisarenko plot. As $m^*$ increases at constant $n_H$, $\alpha$ increases.

Numerical theory — then the transport coefficients could be computationally determined (e.g., by BoltzTRaP [127]). However, simplified models that take into account only part of the band structure are extremely successful at predicting transport properties [154]. These models are successful because only band states within $3k_B T$ of the electron chemical potential (i.e., the Fermi level) contribute significantly to electron transport [128]. The starting point for these models is the single parabolic band [170]. Thermoelectrics are heavily but not metallically doped, so that the band of the dominant conductor tends to dominate, but the Fermi level is not far from the band edge.

A single parabolic band (SPB) has a dispersion relationship of form:

$$E = \frac{\hbar^2(k - k_0)^2}{2m^*} \tag{6.2}$$

This structure is shown in Figure 6.3(a). The effective mass ($m^*$) is typically given in units of electron masses ($m_e$). A heavier band (large $m^*$) has a low rate of curvature
of \( E \) with respect to \( k \); increasing \( k \) increases \( E \) only slightly. In a light band (small \( m^* \)) increasing \( k \) increases \( E \) significantly.

If \( m^* \) and the band chemical potential (\( \mu \)) are known, than the carrier concentration may be written as:

\[
n = 4\pi \left( \frac{2m^* k_b T}{h^2} \right)^{3/2} F_{1/2}(\eta),
\]

in which \( h \) is Planck's constant, \( \eta = \frac{\mu}{k_b T} \) is the reduced chemical potential and \( F_j(\eta) \) is the Fermi integral of order \( j \).

If the energy dependence of scattering (\( \lambda \)) is also known, than transport variables may be modeled as well. In the case of scattering by acoustic phonons \( \lambda = 0 \). This is a good assumption for thermoelectric materials above the Debye temperature. In this model the Seebeck coefficient may be expressed as:

\[
\alpha = \frac{k_b}{e} \left( \frac{(2 + \lambda) F_{\lambda+1}}{(1 + \lambda) F_\lambda} - \eta \right)
\]

The general behavior can be understood well if the degenerate (\( e.g. \), metallic) limit of Equation 6.4 is taken.

\[
\alpha = \frac{\pi^{8/3} k_b^2}{3qh^2} n^{-2/3} T m^* (1 + \lambda)
\]

The inverse dependence of Seebeck on \( n \) argued for generally in the introduction is again present. Notably increased \( m^* \) results in increased Seebeck coefficient. This can be explained by a two step argument. A heavy band will have a lower \( \eta \) for the same \( n \) compared with a light band. A lower \( \eta \) results in a larger Seebeck coefficient by equation 6.4. This effect is depicted in Figure 6.3(a) by means of a Pisarenko (\( \alpha \) versus \( n \) or \( n_H \)) plot.
6.3 Prior Work on Ag$_2$Se

As established in Chapter 5 Ag$_2$Se shows a first order transition at 408 K as seen in both crystallography and calorimetry. Electronically Ag$_2$Se is a n-type material with high electron mobility and low thermal conductivity. These two attributes in combination give it promise as a high $zT$ material near room temperature [1], but with two principal problems. The first is carrier concentration control, for which there is some uncontrolled effect in synthesis. The sample I will discuss below showed no carrier concentration shift through its phase transition, but many of the samples show a significant shift at that temperature [46]. The Seebeck coefficient of a second sample, produced by a different laboratory, shows the same trend as the sample principally studied here.

The second problem is hysteresis observed in transport properties in the low temperature phase and near the phase transition temperature [2]. These effects may be due to the kinetics of microstructural reorganization, as they appear in multiple materials. One example of this is Ag$_2$Se$_{0.5}$Te$_{0.5}$ [50]; other materials showed this effect but these instabilities rendered writing a meaningful publication on their thermoelectric performance impossible. In his paper on Ag$_2$Se my colleague Tristan Day applied band structure modeling to estimate the effective mass of the low temperature phase $0.2m_e$ and that of the high temperature phase to $0.3m_e$ [46].

6.4 Transport Measurements

Electrical conductivity (Figure 6.4(b)) was measured in the Van der Pauw geometry (see Chapter 2). Substantial hysteresis was observed both in the phase transition temperature and in the data in the low temperature phase. The data above the phase transition temperature is consistent on heating and on cooling. Though the data values on heating and cooling are inconsistent, the shape of the curves shows the same general trend. Above room temperature the conductivity linearly increases with temperature and then flattens out before the phase transition temperature. The
Figure 6.4: Seebeck Coefficient (a) and Electrical Conductivity of Ag$_2$Se measured on both heating and cooling.

The Seebeck coefficient (Figure 6.4(a)) was measured by the ramp method discussed in Chapter 3 at 10 Kelvin per minute. It shows a similar behavior to the conductivity. At the temperatures at which the electrical conductivity increases, the Seebeck decreases. At the temperatures at which the electrical conductivity flattens, the Seebeck coefficient flattens. At the phase transitions it decreases slightly. During the phase transition the voltage versus $\Delta T$ data could not be fit to a line and so is not shown. The phase transition occurs at 405 K on heating and on 390 K on cooling. This hysteresis is expected for a first order phase transition. A second sample produced in a different lab by Dr. Fivos Drymiotis was measured by the oscillation method and showed a comparable change in the Seebeck coefficient through the phase transition.

The thermal diffusivity (figure 6.5(a)) also shows a hysteresis in its phase transition temperature. The thermal diffusivity shows far less consistent behavior on heating and cooling than the electrical properties. In the high temperature phase there is a 10% discrepancy between the heating and cooling data. The phase transition range is extended on cooling over a 15 K range. The low temperature data shows a more significant discrepancy between the heating and cooling data.
Figure 6.5: Thermal diffusivity (a) and Calorimetry data (b) for Ag$_2$Se measured on both heating and cooling.

In the context of identification of the order of the phase transition, the calorimetry was also discussed in Chapter 5.2 As Ag$_2$Se has a first order phase transition, the peak in its calorimetry at 410 K represents an enthalpy of formation. At temperatures further below 400 K and above 420 K it is an accurate measurement of the heat capacity, and is used to calculate $\kappa$ and $zT$. Between 400 K and 420 K the heat capacity used is that measured at 400 K — 0.317 J/gK.

Figure 6.6: Hall Carrier Concentration (a) and Hall Mobility (b) for Ag$_2$Se measured on both heating and cooling.
The Hall coefficient was measured concurrently with the electrical conductivity via the Van der Pauw method at 2 Tesla. The Hall carrier concentration (Figure 6.6(a)) and Hall mobility (Figure 6.6(b)) were thereby determined on heating and cooling. The Hall carrier concentration of Ag$_2$Se varies smoothly through the phase transition. This suggests that the band curvature (i.e., effective mass) and the doping level are not altered measurably by the structural changes of the phase transition. The Hall mobility decreases by 50% through the phase transition. This is consistent with a sudden increase in the ion disorder and conductivity leading to increased scattering of electrons. It also explains the decrease in electrical conductivity observed at the phase transition temperature. Pardee and Mahan suggested that a steady Arrhenius increase in ion conductivity is observed due to Frenkel defect formation in both type I and type II super-ionics [151]. Such defect formation in Ag$_2$Se may alter the carrier concentration by localizing electrons more or less than the ground state sites. This would be indicated by a difference in Ag ion effective valency.

Below 360 K, the cooling Hall carrier concentration increases steadily with temperature; over the same range Seebeck decreases steadily. As the Hall carrier concentration become constant, so does the Seebeck coefficient. The data was of insufficient quality to prove this connection as causal. The Seebeck coefficient shows a 15% decrease from the low temperature to the high temperature phase, despite no measured shift in the carrier concentration. This data is inconsistent with the band model advanced in equation 6.5.

The total thermal conductivity of Ag$_2$Se is decreased by a factor of two in the disordered high temperature phase as compared to the ordered low temperature phase, see Figure 6.7(a). The Lorenz number of $L = 1.8 \times 10^{-8}$ WΩK$^{-2}$ was used to calculate the electronic portion of the thermal conductivity. This quantity is taken from Day et al.’s [46] single parabolic band model of data from their samples and literature samples. From this Lorenz number $\kappa_e$ and $\kappa_L$ may be calculated. The lattice thermal conductivity of Ag$_2$Se decreases only slightly as the temperature increases through the phase transition temperature, indicating that the majority of the change in total thermal conductivity is due to the decrease in electrical conductivity, see Figure 6.7(a).
Figure 6.7: Left: Measured total and modeled lattice thermal conductivity of Ag\textsubscript{2}Se. Right: $zT$ of Ag\textsubscript{2}Se. The $zT$ in the ordered phase is markedly higher than the $zT$ in the disordered phase.

The resulting lattice thermal conductivity is 0.35 W/mK below the phase transition temperature and 0.25 W/mK above it. This indicates that the Lorenz number of Day et al is correct.

From the transport data presented above, the $zT$ of Ag\textsubscript{2}Se was determined on both heating and cooling, see Figure 6.7(b) Where necessary corrections to the temperature were made to align the phase transitions of all transport properties. In the calculated range between 320 K and 420 K $zT$ is bound between 0.3 and 0.4, and it decreased upon transition to the disordered phase. The decrease in $zT$ is 30%, which is consistent with the anomalous 15% decrease in the Seebeck coefficient at the phase transition temperature as $zT$ varies with Seebeck squared. What explains this anomalous enhancement in Seebeck and $zT$?

One possible explanation would be a decrease in $m^*$ from the ordered to the disordered phase. By equation 6.5 decreasing $m^*$ should result in a decreased Seebeck coefficient. However, the band structure model of Day et al. suggests a moderate increase in $m^*$ from the ordered to the disordered phase, see Figure 6.8(b). Such an increase is not compatible with the observed decrease in Seebeck coefficient. Day et al suggest that the increase is from 0.2$m_e$ to 0.3$m_e$, but the error bars on their fit are
Figure 6.8: The ratio \((a)\) of \(\kappa_E\) to \(\kappa\) is nearly identical on either side of the phase transition.

Pisarenko plot \((b)\) for Ag\(_2\)Se. The disorder phase has a slightly larger \(m^*\) than the ordered phase. Modified version of Figure 2a in Day et al. [46] Courtesy of Tristan Day

such that the increase may be much smaller even than that.

Thermoelectric performance can also improve a more favorable portion of thermal transport due to electrons rather than the lattice; this is certainly possible given the decrease in \(\kappa_L\) observed, see Figure 6.7(a). The formula for \(zT = \sigma\alpha^2/\kappa T\) can be reformulated in terms of \(L\) and \(\kappa_e\) as:

\[
zT = \frac{\alpha^2 \kappa_e}{L \kappa} \tag{6.6}\]

With the contribution due to \(\alpha\) discussed above and \(L\) varying significantly only for large changes in the Fermi level, the remaining contribution can be expressed as \(\frac{\alpha^2 \kappa_e}{\kappa}\). This term varies by less than 5% through the phase transition temperature, see Figure 6.8(a). This indicates that the enhancement in \(zT\) is entirely due to the enhancement in \(\alpha\) noted above.

The enhancement in \(zT\) and \(\alpha\) requires an alternate explanation from the single parabolic band model. More complex band effects such as band convergence [153] or resonant impurities [77] might be considered to explain the behavior. However,
these features are inconsistent with the constant $n_H$ observed and the near constant $m^*$ [154]. This suggests that an alternate explanation for the Seebeck and $zT$ enhancement is required. This explanation must in some way be beyond that which even complex band structure modeling can capture. Over the next two chapters I will develop that explanation: co-transport of entropy associated with the order process leads to enhanced Seebeck and $zT$. 
Chapter 7

Transport in Cu$_2$Se and Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se

In the previous chapter I introduced super-ionic materials and band structure modeling of thermoelectrics. In that context I introduced the thermoelectric super-ionic material Ag$_2$Se, and in analyzing its transport I noted an increase in its Seebeck in its ordered phase compared to its disordered phase that appeared directly responsible for an increase in its thermoelectric performance. This change in its Seebeck coefficient was not explained with the band structure models typically used to explain thermoelectric transport.

In this chapter I will discuss Cu$_2$Se, which also shows an unexplained increased in its Seebeck and $zT$ at its phase transition. In chapter 5 I noted that Cu$_2$Se shows a second order transition while Ag$_2$Se shows a first order transition. Its phase transition thermoelectric behavior reflects that characteristic. Before I discuss the transport behavior of Cu$_2$Se and Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se I will introduce the concept of coupled entropy transport; this concept can be used to explain the behavior of these materials which will be done in detail in the concluding chapter.

7.1 Entropy and Charge Transport

A thermoelectric material is treated as having two principal interacting thermodynamic quantities: heat and electron current [31]. The equilibrium thermodynamics
of such a system are described by:

\[ dS = \frac{1}{T}dU - \frac{\tilde{\mu}}{T}dN, \]  

(7.1)

in which \( S \) and \( U \) are the entropy and internal energy of the system and \( N \) is the number of particles (carriers). Though I will address this part of my analysis in terms of these extensive quantities, it is often convenient to use the corresponding intensive quantities of entropy density \( s \), energy density \( u \), and carrier concentration \( n \). Conversion from extensive to intensive quantities in these formulations is simply a matter of substituting the intensive variable for an extensive variable.

The nature of an irreversible process is that it produces entropy. A thermodynamic formulation in which the extensible quantities are expressed as differentials, as in Equation 7.1, will have a simple equivalent in irreversible thermodynamics. The entropy production associated with a linear process is: Equation 7.1 is [32]:

\[ \dot{S} = \nabla \frac{1}{T} \cdot J_U - \nabla \frac{\tilde{\mu}}{T} \cdot J_N, \]  

(7.2)

in which the \( J_x \) are thermodynamic fluxes and the gradient terms are thermodynamic affinities. Under a given set of boundary condition, \( i.e. \), a particular resistor acting as a load and under steady state, the systems properties will be arranged such that \( \dot{S} \) is minimized. This theoretical result is known as the minimum entropy principle. Of course \( \dot{S} \) is always greater than or equal to zero, or else the second law of thermodynamics would be violated. The ratio of the second term in Equation 7.2 to its first terms describes the reversibility of the heat engine. When the load is varied to maximize that ratio, that maximal value is \( zT \).

On the micro-foundation of the fluctuation-dissipation theorem Onsager proved that thermodynamics forces and fluxes associated in entropy production could be related linearly [147]. Generally:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
J_1 \\
J_2
\end{bmatrix} = - \begin{bmatrix}
L_{11} & L_{12} \\
L_{21} & L_{22}
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
\nabla X_1 \\
\nabla X_2
\end{bmatrix}
\]  

(7.3)
The \( L_{xy} \) are known as the Onsager coefficients and they may depend on any set of thermodynamic quantities that describe the system. By the Onsager reciprocity theorem \( L_{12} = L_{21} \). For the specific case of thermoelectricity:

\[
\begin{bmatrix} J \\ J_S \end{bmatrix} = - \begin{bmatrix} L_{ee} & L_{es} \\ L_{se} & L_{ss} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \nabla V \\ \nabla T \end{bmatrix}
\]  

(7.4)

Here I use entropy transport instead of heat transport to avoid the confusion between the two different definitions of heat flux commonly used \cite{49}. The Callen heat flux \( Q \equiv TJ_s \) describes the heat transport through the material, while the DeGroot heat flux \( J_q \equiv \mu J_e + TJ_s \) describes that transporting from one heat reservoir to another \cite{132} In the case of thermoelectrics that distinction does not lead to any difference in description of the Onsager coefficients \cite{49}.

The Onsager coefficients may be related to \( \sigma, \alpha, \) and \( \kappa \) by:

\[
\alpha = -\frac{L_{es}}{L_{ee}}
\]  

(7.5)

\[
\sigma = L_{ee}
\]  

(7.6)

\[
\kappa = T \left( \frac{L_{ee}L_{ss}L_{es}^2}{L_{ee}} \right)
\]  

(7.7)

While ideal for describing the macroscopic relations between the phenomenological transport coefficients, the irreversible thermodynamics of the Onsager relations cannot actually produce the values of those coefficients. The kinetic theory approach is therefore preferred for understanding how chemical structure, bands structure, and doping give the values of these coefficients. For this the Boltzmann transport equation is used:

\[
\frac{\partial f}{\partial T} = \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial T} \right)_{force} + \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial T} \right)_{diff} + \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial T} \right)_{coll}
\]  

(7.8)

Here \( f \) is the electron state occupation probability density. When eq (7.8) is solved
it will generally have the form given by Kubo [112, 113]:

\[ q\alpha = -\frac{\mu}{T} - k_b T \frac{M_{qe}}{M_{ee}} \] (7.9)

\( M_{qe} \) and \( M_{ee} \) are transport integrals representing heat transport per electron and current transported per electron. A comparable expression may be derived from only non-equilibrium thermodynamics considerations [49].

\[ \alpha \equiv -\frac{\mu}{T} + \frac{1}{qT} J_q \] (7.10)

From comparison with Equation 7.10, we see that Equation 7.9 is actually the sum of two separate thermodynamic transport quantities. The first term represents the entropy transport due to the change in the number of carrier present. It is the thermodynamic equivalent of heat transport by mass flow in a liquid-based heat exchanger. Following Emin [61], we refer to the first term as the presence Seebeck, \( \alpha_{presence} \). The presence Seebeck is convenient to work with because it can be expressed entirely in terms of equilibrium thermodynamics:

\[ \alpha_{presence} \equiv -\frac{\mu}{qT} \equiv \frac{1}{q} \left( \frac{\partial S}{\partial n} \right)_U \] (7.11)

The second term in Equations 7.9,7.10 represents the part of the Seebeck that results from the manner in which charge is transported. It reflects contribution from the scattering interaction of the moving heat and charge and the distortion transport effects on the state occupations and energies. For this reason, again following Emin, we refer to it as the transport portion of Seebeck, \( \alpha_{transport} \). Solving for \( \alpha_{transport} \) exactly would require a perfect understanding of all electron scattering mechanisms and the band structure, and its determination is the primary focus of band structure modeling.
7.2 Entropy Co-Transport

In the discussion in section 7.1 above we implicitly assumed that the only thermodynamic quantities that transported were charge and entropy. While the formulations of eqs. 7.4, 7.9 are completely phenomenological and general, calculating the Onsager coefficients under this assumption will lead to a discrepancy with measurement. The entropy associated with co-transport of the non-electronic thermodynamic flux will be attribute to $\alpha_{\text{transport}}$; however, the transport calculations based on a static band structure will be unable to replicate that effect.

To include the effect of another thermodynamic variable, I first add an additional term to equation 7.1.

$$dS = \frac{1}{T}dU - \frac{\tilde{\mu}}{T}dN + hdm$$  \hspace{1cm} (7.12)

There will be a thermodynamic flux ($J_m$) associated with $m$ and a thermodynamic force ($\nabla h$) associated with $h$. If a flux of electrons drags a flux of $m$, then that the entropy transported per carrier should be enhanced by the presence entropy of those units of $m$. The presence entropy is then:

$$\alpha_{\text{presence}} = \frac{1}{q} \left( \frac{\partial S}{\partial n} \right)_{U} + \frac{1}{q} \left( \frac{\partial S}{\partial m} \right)_{U,N} \left( \frac{\partial m}{\partial n} \right)_{U,S}$$  \hspace{1cm} (7.13)

In chapter 8 this relation will be motivated from non-equilibrium thermodynamics.

Entropy co-transport enhancements to Seebeck and $zT$ have been observed in several material systems. Aselage et. al [7] determined $B_{12+x}C_{3-x}4$, $0.15 < x < 1.7$ to have a Seebeck coefficient of $\approx 200 \mu V/K$ despite a carrier concentration of $\approx 10^{21} \text{cm}^{-3}$. A Seebeck coefficient of $10 \mu V/K$ would be expected at such a high carrier concentration. In this material carriers transport as polarizable pairs, called bipolarons. The presence of these bipolarons modifies by a dipole interaction atomic vibrational frequencies [62]. By modeling the entropy contribution associated with this bipolaron mode softening, Emin was able to explain the behavior of these Boron Carbides as due to phonon entropy co-transport [61] Such vibrational softening enhancements of Seebeck are referred to as phonon drag Seebeck effects, and they have
been observed in other systems [39, 11, 10]. By coupling the spin degree of freedom to entropy transport, increased Seebeck in Na$_x$CoO$_2$ has been shown [196, 110, 139]. The differing spin degeneracy of electron-occupied and electron-unoccupied cobalt sites provides the mechanism for this coupling of carrier transport to entropy transport [138]. Here we consider coupling the carrier transport to degrees of freedom associated with the structural changes of a phase transition. A phase transition is always associated with an entropy change because there is always a concurrent transformation in system symmetries [162]. In continuous (i.e., second order) phase transitions the entropy will change over an extended temperature range. In chapter 5, we found the phase transition of Cu$_2$Se to have a substantially elevated heat capacity over a wide temperature range. If some part of the entropy associated with the phase transition is coupled to transport, a large Seebeck enhancement may be possible.

### 7.3 Cu$_2$Se Transport near the Phase Transition

Copper (I) selenide is a p-type semiconductor [54]. Above 410 K Cu$_2$Se becomes super-ionic, which is characterized by its disordered Cu$^+$ ions, and shows good thermoelectric properties [122]. Except at the highest temperatures, charge transport is dominated by holes rather than Cu$^+$ ions. As the temperature drops below 410 K the ion mobility decreases [84] and eventually the Cu ions become ordered [96]. It is known that copper (I) selenide can be copper deficient (Cu$_{2-\delta}$Se) with copper vacancies, and this has a large effect on transport properties and the phase structure [194].

Horvatic et al. showed that the ion conductivity of Cu$_{1.99}$Ses increases from 1 S/m at 374 K to almost 100 S/m at 410 K [84], demonstrating it to have a super-ionic phase transition. Below 374 K and above 410 K, he found that the ion conductivity followed an Arrhenius law with $E_A = 0.29$ eV and $E_A = 0.07$ eV, respectively. Each of these temperatures had been previously identified as corresponding to a phase transition in Cu$_{2-\delta}$Se ($\delta < 0.045$) [194, 177]. In the intermediate temperature range, the ion conductivity changed rapidly. This behavior is indicative of a continuous phase
transition in a super-ionic material [21, 118]. An observation of not only structural entropy change at the phase transition but also of structural entropy transport is given by Korzhuev and Laptev [107]; they measured a sharp peak in the thermodiffusion of Cu\(^0\) in Cu\(_2\)Se at the 410 K phase transition. From this they calculated a heat of transport of Cu atoms of 1 eV.

Unusual transport effects have been observed before near the critical temperature in Cu\(_2\)Se [54, 122, 143, 144, 123, 200, 27], however, this is the first work that also considers changes in all thermal transport measurements (\(D_t, \kappa, c_p\)) to derive an improved value for \(zT\). Liu et al. report a \(zT\) greater than 1 [121], however their work assumes all the heat released as measured by DSC is due to a first order structural transformation. In that case it would be appropriate, as is done by Liu et. al., to calculate \(\kappa\) and \(zT\) using the smaller Delong-Petit heat capacity. As discussed in detail in chapter 5 the elevated peak in calorimetry is an equilibrium rather than kinetic aspect of the system behavior and must be used to determine \(zT\).
Figure 7.2: Electrical conductivity (a) and Seebeck Coefficient (b) measured through the 410K phase transition.

The study of electrical transport near the phase transition of Cu$_{2-\delta}$Se owes mostly to the work of Zlatko Vucic and his collaborators at the University of Zagreb [84, 194, 192, 191, 134, 193]. His measurements spanned the $\delta = 0$ to $\delta = 0.045$ single phase range [106]. Based on dilatometric measurements he developed a phase diagram for Cu$_{2-\delta}$Se, see Figure 7.1. At all compositions he found a phase transition at $\approx 410$ K and a second phase transition at a lower temperature with temperature dependent on $\delta$. The data presented on the sample of Cu$_2$Se presented here corresponds generally to his observations of his $\delta = 0.01$ sample. WDS data on Cu$_2$Se bounded $\delta < 0.005$ for this sample; the reason for this disagreement is unclear.

Electrical conductivity (Figure 7.2(a)) was measured at a heating rate of 10 K/hr. It shows three main features: a knee at 355 K, a minimum at 400 K, and a kink at 410 K. The kink at 410 K corresponds to the observed phase transition in my crystallography data (section 5.3). In general shape $\sigma(T)$ strongly resembles the data in Vucic’s studies (Figure 7.1), though it corresponds best to his Cu$_{1.99}$Se stoichiometric sample.

The knee in conductivity at $T_{c2} = 355$ K corresponds to the lower temperature second order phase transition measured by Vucic [192]. He empirically determined a
power law for $\sigma$ below $T_{c2}$:

$$\sigma = \sigma_0 \left(1 - \frac{T}{T_{c2}}\right)$$

(7.14)

From the low temperature slope a predicted $T_c = 360$ K was determined, which is consistent with the $T_{c2}$ determined by inspection. Above the phase transition the conductivity is again linear, though 20% lower than the value predicted by extrapolation from the low temperature behavior.

Seebeck was measured first by the standard oscillation method as described in chapter 3, see Figure 7.2(b). This showed a clear peak in the Seebeck, but the rapid non-linear change raised clear questions about the accuracy of those results. For this reason the ramp Seebeck approach was developed as described in chapter 3, allowing for detail temperature-resolved measurement of Seebeck through the phase transition. The three significant features observed in $\sigma$ are echoed in $\alpha$. There is a kink in the Seebeck at 410 K, corresponding to the main phase transition observed in crystallography. Below 360 K $\alpha$ is a linear function of temperature; above it shows non-linear behavior. There is a maxima in $\alpha$ at 403 K, at a slightly elevated temperature compared to the 400 K minima in electrical conductivity. Above the phase transition the Seebeck is locally linear, though 10% lower than the value predicted by extension of the low temperature trend.

Thermal conductivity was calculated from measurements of density($\rho$), DSC heat capacity ($C_p$) and laser flash diffusivity ($D_T$) as detailed in chapter 2. Density was measured to be 6.7 g/cm³ by geometric calculation and confirmed by principle of Archimedes. Thermal diffusivity decreases linearly from 300 K to 360 K, see Figure 7.3(a). From 360 K to 410 K the thermal diffusivity shows an excellent fit to a critical power law with $T_c = 410$ K and critical exponent $r = 0.80$. Above the 410 K phase transition the thermal diffusivity is again changes only in a steady linear fashion with temperature.

Heat capacity is presented here in Figure 7.3(b), but it was discussed in great detail in section 5.3. Below 360 K and above 425 K the heat capacity gives a baseline value of 0.374 J · g⁻¹K⁻¹, consistent with the Dulong-Petit $c_p$ for Cu₂Se, 0.361 J · g⁻¹K⁻¹.
The 60 K breadth of the peak is indicative of the continuous nature of the transition. In the transition region there is a lambda-type peak, as is characteristic of continuous phase transitions in ionic conductors [118].

From the transport properties described above, $zT$ was calculated. (Figure 7.4). $zT$ doubles over a 30 K range peaking at 0.7 at 406 K. Though strong non-linearity in each of the individual transport variables onsets at 360 K, there is no non-linear in $zT$ until 390 K. This suggests that more than different effects — perhaps associated with the multiple Cu$_2$Se phase transitions — are needed to explain the anomalous transport behavior between 360 K and 410 K.

7.3.1 Analysis

Excepting the region of elevated $zT$ (390 K to 410 K) all the observed variation in transport can be explained by a simple band structure model. From knowledge of the band structure, the energy dependence of scattering, and the reduced chemical potential, all thermoelectric transport properties can be modeled for typical systems. Though $\eta$ cannot be easily measured, it can be inferred from the Seebeck coefficient from Equation 6.3. In the degenerate (metallic) limit this dependence can be
Figure 7.4: $zT$ for Cu$_2$Se from its room temperature through its 410 K phase transition.

Figure 7.5: Hall Carrier Concentration (a) and Hall Mobility (b) of Cu$_2$Se. The minimum of $n_H$ is at 390 K, while $\mu_H$ decreases until 410 K. $\mu_H$ could be fit to a power law with critical exponent $r = 0.32$
expressed in a simple closed form:

\[ n = 4\pi \left( \frac{2m^*kT}{\hbar^2} \right)^{3/2} F_{1/2} \] (7.15)

The Hall coefficient \((R_H)\) and electrical conductivity were measured via the Van der Pauw method using a 1 Tesla magnetic field at the NASA-JPL thermoelectrics laboratory. From these measurements \(n_H\) and the Hall carrier mobility were extracted, see Figure 7.5. From 300 K to 360 K \(n_H\) is constant while \(\mu_H\) steadily decreases. The linear decrease in \(\sigma\) (Figure 7.2a) observed is entirely due to a decrease in mobility. Given the association with the copper disordering phase transition, it is possible that a scattering mode like the dumb-bell mode of \(\text{Zn}_4\text{Sb}_3\) is steadily activated in this temperature range [173]. Between 360 K and 410 K, the Hall carrier concentration dips until it reaches a minimum of \(2.7 \times 10^{20} \text{ cm}^{-3}\). This minimum occurs at 393 K, 10 K lower than the minimum in electrical conductivity and the maxima in Seebeck coefficient. This minima is also very close in temperature to where the \(zT\) shows its non-linear increase in temperature, suggesting that the mechanism that causes the increase in \(zT\) also cause the change in trend of \(n_H\). During this temperature range \(\mu_H\) could be fit to a power law with critical exponent \(r = 0.32\). The Hall mobility remains low in the high temperature phase — the mobility is 30% below the value expected from extrapolation of low temperature behavior. This is unsurprising given the phonon softening observed in the structurally identical room temperature \(\text{Cu}_1.8\text{Se}\) [44].

Equation 7.15 suggests that three factors may cause an anomalous increase in the Seebeck coefficient: a decrease in the carrier concentration \((n_H)\), an increase in the scattering parameter \((\lambda)\), or an increase in the band effective mass \((m^*)\). An increase \(\lambda\) is unlikely. The structural delocalization as presented in our p.d.f. data in section 5.3 may lead to an increase in the intensity of acoustic phonon scattering, but it will not alter that effect’s energy dependence. Near a phase transition a low frequency optical phonon mode — a Goldstone mode — may be present. However, the energy dependence of optical phonon scattering via lattice deformation is the
Figure 7.6: Band effective mass needed to explain the $n_H$ and $\alpha$ data for Cu$_2$Se. The transient 50% increase in $m^*$ needed to explain the data is inconsistent with the continuous transformation observed in crystallography.

same as that for electrons and the dependence via dipole effects is only slightly larger than that for acoustic phonons [8].

By modeling with a single parabolic band using measured values of temperature, Seebeck, and $n_H$, the shift in $m^*$ required to explain the data can be calculated, see Figure 7.6. Up to 380K the data can be explained entirely with a SPB with $m^* = 2.3 m_e$ (±5%). Above this temperature an increase in $m^*$ of up to 50% is required followed by an even more sudden decrease. This is physically inconsistent with the continuous transformation observed via crystallography, see section 5.3. Effective mass can be related to the band structure at the Fermi level by the formula:

$$m^* = \hbar^2 \left( \frac{\partial^2 E}{\partial k^2} \right)^{-1}$$  \hspace{1cm} (7.16)

Equation 7.16 means that a substantial change in $m^*$ requires a substantial change in the reciprocal space band structure. As the reciprocal space band structure is related by Fourier transformation to the physical spatial representation of the atomic orbitals and thus the coordination of the atoms. A substantial change in $m^*$ would therefore require a significant change in local electron coordination — a change that is inconsistent with the minor change in band structure seen in temperature-resolve
Figure 7.7: Measured Seebeck coefficient compared with predictions from band structure model with $m^* = 2.3m_e$ and measured $n_H$ (a). The square of the Seebeck excess to the band structure prediction (b) explains the $zT$ peaks size and breadth.

PXRD. It would further require this change to be transient, existing only in proximity to the 410 K. However, the electron bands are dependent on the average structure rather than the correlation length of the order parameter. Thus we expect the effective mass and other band structure attributes should vary smoothly from one phase to the other, rather than peaking at the phase transition.

While the observed shift in carrier concentration cannot explain the peak in Seebeck, it does elucidate one apparent anomaly in the transport data. As discussed in the previous section the onset of non-linear transport behavior occurs at 360 K, but the $zT$ shows a visible deviation from a linear trend only at 393 K. In Figure 7.6 it is seen that deviation from a constant $m^*$ begins at 380 K to 385 K. The measured Seebeck coefficient and that predicted by Equation 6.5 and a single parabolic band model with $m^* = 2.3m_e$ are compared in Figure 7.7. Near 385 K both models show a increasing deviation from the measured data. This increase is of order of the natural scale of Seebeck, $k_b/2q = 43 \mu V/K$; the increase corresponds to transport of the entropy of an additional degree of freedom per electron.

When the square of the measured Seebeck divided by the band structure predicted Seebeck is compared with $zT$, as in Figure 7.7b, it is seen that the anomalous increase in Seebeck almost explains the observed breadth and height of the $zT$ peak. The measured Seebeck is 48% higher than the prediction of the SPB model and 40% higher
than the prediction of the degenerate band model at the temperature of peak $zT$, 406 K. The measured $zT$ is 60% higher at its 406 K peak compared to linear extrapolation from its increase from 360 K to 385 K. The excess Seebeck ($\Delta \alpha$) compared to the band structure slightly overestimates the height of the $zT$ peak. Both the $zT$ and $\Delta \alpha$ are increased noticeably over the exact same temperature range of 393 K to 410 K. This suggests that some aspect of the lambda-type phase transition is increasing the $zT$ of Cu$_2$Se.

Figure 7.8: Decreasing thermal conductivity does not cause the $zT$ peak. (a) The decrease in $\kappa$ is due to the electronic contribution ($\kappa_e$). (b) Electrical properties decrease slower than thermal properties in the phase transition region and thereby diminish the $zT$ peak.

The $zT$ increase cannot be explained by a relative improvement of phonon to electron scattering; that is by the $\sigma/\kappa$ contribution to $zT$. While there is insufficient data to truly determine the Lorenz number ($L$) over the entire phase transition region, single temperature estimates bound it between 1.8 and 2.0 WΩ$^{-1}$K$^2$. This allows estimation of $\kappa_e$ by the formula, $\kappa_e = L\sigma T$. The estimated electronic portion of the thermal conductivity qualitatively explains the observed decrease in total thermal conductivity, see Figure 7.8(a).

Direct comparison of electron ($\mu_H, \sigma$) and thermal transport ($\kappa, \kappa_L$) indicates that the $zT$ is not increased by preferential scattering of phonons over electrons, see Figure 7.8(b). Though thermal conductivity decreases between 360 K and 410 K, this decrease is more than counteracted by a decrease in electrical mobility over the same
range. The observed increase in $zT$ is not due to the reduction of the thermal conductivity via preferential scattering of phonons over electrons. This trend is particularly clear when comparison is made with $\kappa_L$ instead of $\kappa$. This suggests that across the entire temperature range $\kappa_L$ is close to its glass-like minima, such that further increased scattering from thermally activated modes associated with ion disordering cannot reduce it significantly further. This contradicts the proposal of Liu et al. that the increase in $zT$ is due to preferential scattering of phonons as compared to electrons due to interaction with a soft optical (Goldstone) mode [123].

![Figure 7.9: Low temperature heat capacity of Cu$_2$Se (a) indicates an Einstein mode (b) at approx 400 GHz.](image)

It is likely that the measured $\kappa$ is at or close to its particular glassy limit; this is a major reason for the excellent thermoelectric performance of Cu$_2$Se. A true glass is characterized by occupation of localized vibrational states instead of extended phonon states. These states will be of relatively low frequency — less than a terahertz — and their occupation will be by the Bose-Einstein distribution:

$$P = \frac{g_i}{e^{\hbar\omega/k_B T} - 1}$$  \hspace{1cm} (7.17)
With resulting heat capacity contribution of:

\[ c_V = 3k_b \left( \frac{hf}{k_b T} \right)^2 \frac{e^{hf/k_b T}}{(e^{hf/k_b T} - 1)^2} \]  \hspace{1cm} (7.18)

When \( c_V / T^3 \) is plotted as a function of \( T \) for a Bose oscillator, it indicates a peak at approximately \( h_f = -0.2k_b T \) [98]. This peak is known as a Bose peak and it is characteristic of glassy behavior. A similar feature was observed in the heat capacity of low-temperature \( \text{Zn}_4\text{Sb}_3 \). That feature was successfully associated with phonon softening and that material’s low thermal conductivity [173]. Analysis of low-temperature heat capacity data shows \( \text{Cu}_2\text{Se} \) to have a pronounced Boson peak at 4 K, see Figure 7.9. This suggests a vibrational mode at 400 Gigahertz, and it is strongly indicative of glassy behavior.

We observed a \( zT \) peak concurrent with the lambda-type phase transition in \( \text{Cu}_2\text{Se} \). Simultaneously, there is a dramatic increase in thermopower which cannot be explained in terms of a single parabolic band model using the measured Hall carrier concentration and transport data. Transport parameters are strongly affected by the continuous phase transition, with Hall mobility and thermal diffusivity in particular clearly following a critical power law, and the heat capacity showing a characteristic lambda shape. This behavior strongly suggests that \( \text{Cu}_2\text{Se} \) phase transition \( zT \) peak is driven by entropy co-transport.

7.4 \( \text{Cu}_{1.97}\text{Ag}_{0.03}\text{Se} \)

In the prior section I explored how at the phase transition the figure-of-merit of \( \text{Cu}_2\text{Se} \) can be measured and a strong enhancement shown. However, it is unlikely that \( \text{Cu}_2\text{Se} \) is the ideal thermoelectric material of its class. In synthesizing the samples no care was given to the stoichiometry or the grain structuring. In fact, the source of the intrinsic high carrier concentration we observed in \( \text{Cu}_2\text{Se} \), see Figure 7.5(a), remains a mystery. And though our understanding of the mechanism behind \( \text{Cu}_2\text{Se} \) phase transition performance is incomplete, we hope that by examining materials with
similar compositions that these properties may be expanded upon. Unfortunately, substituting a different element for the copper or the selenium may lead to secondary phase formation; the dissolution of these secondary phases — perhaps more soluble in $\alpha - \text{Cu}_2\text{Se}$ — may alter the nature of the phase transition and thereby destroy the effect in question of this study.

An interesting case is that of Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se. In Chapter 5, section 5.4 I examined its structural phase transition through temperature-resolved PXRD. I determined it to show both a first order transition at 403 K, slightly lower than of Cu$_2$Se, but also to show a similar peak evolution as Cu$_2$Se below 380 K. At 380 K the secondary phase of Cu$_2$Ag$_3$Se dissolves, and while some peaks change with the Cu$_2$Se trend until the first order phase transitions, others showed quite different behavior. There are a few other peaks which slowly diminish to the phase transition temperature; it is unclear if they are an unidentified impurity or additional peaks of a main phase that is slightly different from Cu$_2$Se.

The transport properties of Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se were measured via the same methods as those described for Cu$_2$Se in section 7.3 as well as in the chapters on experimental methodology (Chapter 2) and Sebeck metrology techniques (Chapter 3). For the sake
of comparison I plot the data for Cu$_2$Se and Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se together.

The electrical conductivity of Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se, see Figure 7.10(a), is visually similar to that of Cu$_2$Se, showing all three characteristic features: a knee at 370 K, a minimum at 395 K, and a kink at 403 K. All three of these features occur at slightly different temperatures for the two samples. The decrease in temperature for the kink corresponds to the sudden first order transition observed. The slope of the conductivity below the knee at 370 K does not follow the power law described by Vučić; the temperature his empirical model predicts for Cu$_2$Se is 270 K. The concavity of the conductivity of Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se changes sign near 380 K, coincident with the dissolution of the CuAgSe secondary phase into the matrix.

While the value of electrical conductivity is similar for both compositions in the phase transition range, the Seebeck of Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se, see Figure 7.10(b), is markedly higher than that of Cu$_2$Se from 370 K to 400 K. In its increase it is broadened and shows an inhomogeneous shape. While its increase compared to Cu$_2$Se from 370 K to 380 K is correlated with the faster decrease in electrical conductivity, the increase and broadening above that temperature are likely due to the complicated interaction of the dissolved Ag with the Cu$_2$Se main phase. Above the phase transition, the Seebeck coefficient of Cu$_2$Se is slightly higher than of Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se, but the electrical conductivity is correspondingly lower.

Comparison of the thermal properties of Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se and Cu$_2$Se are particularly illustrative. Just as in Cu$_2$Se the region of decreasing slope in $\sigma$ matches a corresponding region in the thermal diffusivity, see Figure 7.11(a). The diffusivity decrease in Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se from 320 K to 360 K is much less than that in the same temperature range for Cu$_2$Se. Most notably there are two distinct minima in the diffusivity. The minima at 385 K resembles a critical power law decrease, as seen at the 410 K phase transition of Cu$_2$Se. Between 390 K and 410 K there is a steady decrease in the diffusivity, suggesting that the dissolution of the secondary phases is broadening out the phase transition region. As expected the phase transition temperature in thermal diffusivity occurs at a lower temperature for Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se than for Cu$_2$Se. In the high temperature phase $D_T$ for Cu$_2$Se is slightly higher than that
of Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se. As this difference is similar to that of Cu$_2$Se, it is probably driven by a corresponding decrease in electronic thermal conductivity.

The double minima in $D_T$ corresponds to a doubled peak in $c_p$, see Figure 7.11(b). The heat capacity baseline of Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se is slightly higher than that of Cu$_2$Se — 0.42 J/gK as compared to 0.37 J/gK. As the compositions are nearly identical, the Dulong-Petit heat capacity should be nearly the same, so this difference is due to systematic measurement error or from a higher coefficient of thermal expansion. The heat capacity from 320 K to 360 K is greater than the high temperature baseline, and it shows a linear increasing trend. At 360 K there is a kink in the heat capacity above which the data is non-linear. This kink exactly mirrors that seen in Cu$_2$Se, suggesting that though the middle temperature second order transition is more difficult to observe in Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se than Cu$_2$Se, it is a feature of both systems. The 403 K peak, representing in part a first order transition, must include a discrete enthalpy of formation. As I cannot determine which portion of the DSC curve is due to the enthalpy release of a first order phase transition, I treat all of it as a portion of the specific heat capacity. This will result in an unknown underestimate of the $zT$ between 400 K and 420 K.

The $zT$ of Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se dwarfs that of Cu$_2$Se, reaching a maximum of 0.95 at
402 K, see Figure 7.12. The maximum $zT$ is reached just prior to the 1st order phase transition temperature. The $zT$ shows a kink at 385 K, corresponding to the temperature of the secondary diffusivity minima and heat capacity peak as well as the dissolution of the CuAgSe phase. This is the same temperature at which the measured Seebeck for Cu$_2$Se begins to exceed the value predicted by the single parabolic band. This correlation may be causal. The disordering of the main phase may decrease the chemical potential for additional Ag or Cu to be added to it. By doing so it may instigate the dissolution.

Band structure analysis could not be performed on Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se due to bipolar affects from the secondary phase of CuAgSe. Measurements of Hall coefficient in the low temperature phase (Figure 7.13(a)) show it to be negative. For a single band thermoelectric the Hall coefficient and the Seebeck should have the same sign — that of the majority carrier. As discussed in detail in chapter 2, the effect of a minority carrier band is linear with its mobility in Seebeck but quadratic in the Hall coefficient. The CuAgSe secondary phase high mobility n-type bands with mobility of order $10^4$ cm$^2$/V·S [88]. As a band’s Hall coefficient characteristic field is the inverse of its field, this indicates a transformation from electron to hole dominated behavior should occur in the 1 to 10 T range.
Figure 7.13: Hall coefficient for Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se at 2 T and varying temperature (a) and at 293 K with varying magnetic field.

The Hall coefficient was measured under magnetic fields varying from 0.1 T to 2.2 T in steps of 0.1 T below 1 T and in steps of 0.2 T above it. Though low field measurements were below the noise floor, data above 0.3 T showed a clear increasing trend, see Figure 7.13(b). This trend is consistent with two single carrier bands with $n = 1 \times 10^{17} \text{cm}^{-3}$, $\mu_n = 1440 \text{cm}^2\text{V}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}$, $p = 4 \times 10^{20} \text{cm}^{-3}$, and $\mu_p = 11\text{cm}^2\text{V}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}$. The p-type characteristics were chosen to be similar to that of Cu$_2$Se and the n-type parameters adjusted until a visual fit could be made. This fit is shown as a black line in Figure 7.13(b).

When examining the transport properties near a phase transition, it is of utmost importance to verify that they are stable. When measuring the Seebeck coefficient via the ramp method, half of the data used was measured while the average sample temperature was increasing (on heating), and half the data was measured while the average sample temperature was decreasing (on cooling). From all of the voltage $\Delta T$ points measured at a given temperature, the Seebeck data shown in Figure 7.10 were determined. If the phase transitions are interfering with the transport properties, this should be visible in a difference between the Seebeck of the data from heating and cooling.
The ramp method Seebeck determined for both the heating and cooling data is show in Figure 7.14(a) for Cu$_2$Se and in Figure 7.14(b) for Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se. The data for Cu$_2$Se shows an offset of less than 5% between heating and cooling across the temperature range. The value at the 406 L $\text{zT}$ peak is identical on both heating and cooling. The average value is midway between the heating and cooling curves. The differences between the curves are within systematic measurement uncertainty; they are probably due to a slight alteration in thermal contact resistance on heating and on cooling.

The data for Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se shows values that are within 10% on heating and cooling, other than in the small temperature range above the 403 K phase transition. A small hysteresis in the data is observed. The line shapes of the curve are slightly different. The average Seebeck shown in Figure 7.14(b) is much closer to the data measured on heating than that measured on cooling. This suggests that the visually notable 5% discrepancy in the data at 400 K is driven by greater noise in the data on cooling than on heating. Another possibility is that there is a longer time-scale required for precipitation of an impurity phase than there is for its dissolution at the 403 K phase transition. The discrepant range corresponds to the temperatures between the first order phase transition and the dissolution of the CuAgSe secondary
phase. The precipitation and dissolution of the CuAgSe phase may increase the kinetics of secondary phase restructuring.

![Graph showing measured Seebeck voltage](image)

Figure 7.15: Measured Seebeck voltage of Cu$_2$Se at $\bar{T} = 390$ K and $\Delta T = 16$ K. There was a variation of less than 1% in the measured values. After the temperature gradient stabilized there was no variation.

The Seebeck coefficient of Cu$_2$Se just below its phase transition temperature is very stable, indicating it is a steady state property of the material, see Figure 7.15. The sample was held at an average temperature of 390 K and a temperature difference of 16 K for 13 hours. The measured thermopower, 152 $\mu$V/K, varied by less than 1% during this time period. The predicted average thermopower for this range was calculated by integration of the data shown in Figure 7.2(a) as 143 $\mu$V/K. This 6% discrepancy between the predicted and measured value is consistent with the repetition error of Seebeck measurements. As the discrepancy would suggest that Seebeck and $zT$ are underestimated, it does not undermine the conclusion of phase transition enhanced thermopower.

In the next and concluding chapter I will summarize the experimental results in the context of super-ionic phase transitions. I will present a suggestion for how the
data for Ag$_2$Se and Cu$_2$Se may be explained based on the irreversible thermodynamics of phase transitions.
Chapter 8

Order and Ion Enhanced Thermoelectrics

In Chapter 6 I presented data showing that the ordered phase of Ag$_2$Se has a larger $zT$ in its ordered phase than its disordered phase, see Figure 8.1(a). This $zT$ enhancement was predicted to within 5% by a corresponding enhancement of Seebeck, see Figure 8.1(b). The Seebeck change was shown to be neither predicted by the effective mass determined by Day et al. [46] or the measured Hall carrier concentration through the phase transition.

In Chapter 7 I presented data showing that just below Cu$_2$Se and Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se’s phase transition an enhancement in their $zTs$ of 100% or more was observed, see Figure 8.1(c). This enhancement seemed driven by an 80% increase in their Seebecks over a 60 K temperature range, see Figure 8.1(d). In Cu$_2$Se $n_H$ and $\mu_H$ could be measured through the phase transition in temperature. It was shown that the variation in $n_H$ explained half of the peak in Seebeck, and that the temperature profile of the remaining part of the Seebeck peak explained the peak in $zT$. Bipolar conduction made a similar analysis of Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se impractical.

In this chapter I will provide an explanation for this enhancement in thermoelectric performance. First, I will explain based on the Onsager equations how there might be additional Seebeck and $zT$ beyond that predicted by band structure modeling. Second, I will show that the differing behaviors of Ag$_2$Se and Cu$_2$Se can be explained by the Landau theory of order-disorder phase transitions. Finally, I will present
Figure 8.1: Key results of this thesis. Concurrent with its first order transition there is a step change in Ag$_2$Se $zT$ (a) and Seebeck (c). The second order transition of Cu$_2$Se results in a sharply peaked $zT$ (a) and Seebeck (d). The $zT$ and Seebeck of the mixed phase transition of Cu$_{1.97}$Ag$_{0.03}$Se resembles that of its Cu$_2$Se main phase. Dotted lines are guides for the eye.
in detail a similar analysis on the basis of the ionic nature of the particular order-
order phase transitions. This will allow me to present particular literature results
supportive of my hypothesis and provide an experimentally tractable basis for testing
these theories.

8.1 Ordering Entropy Enhancement

In Chapter 7 I presented the Onsager coefficients typically presented [69] for a ther-
molectric system. It was on the basis of a two term entropy production equation of
form:

$$T \dot{S} = -J_s \cdot \nabla T - J_e \cdot \nabla \mu_e$$

(8.1)

In which $V \equiv \frac{\mu_e}{e}$ and $J_e$ is a quantity flux rather than a charge flux, i.e. defined by
$J = qJ_e$. This leads an Onsager matrix of form:

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
J_e \\
J_s
\end{bmatrix}
= -
\begin{bmatrix}
2L_{ee} & 2L_{es} \\
2L_{se} & 2L_{ss}
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\nabla \bar{\mu}_e \\
\nabla T
\end{bmatrix}
$$

(8.2)

In which the subscript 2 is used for didactic purposes. But imagine if there is
a second thermodynamic quantity that transports. Without loss of generality, lets
call it $m$ and lets call its conjugate flux $h$. Then the corresponding internal energy
differential to that used for Equation 8.2 is:

$$du = Tds + \bar{\mu}_edn_e + hdm$$

(8.3)

The corresponding entropy production is:

$$T \dot{S} = -J_s \cdot \nabla T - J_e \cdot \nabla \mu_e - J_m \nabla h$$

(8.4)

As a sidenote, if $J_m > 0$ than Equation 8.4 will apparently not capture the entirety
of the entropy transported, though this problem can be overcome if $J_s$ is replaced
with some other entropy-like flux [132]. In this case there would be dissipation from
a non-electronic transport quantity that must affect the maximal $zT$ and $\eta$ of the system. In the analysis below I principally consider the condition of $J_m = 0$, and so this complication does not enter in.

The Onsager matrix that corresponds to Equation 8.4 is:

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
J_e \\
J_m \\
J_s
\end{bmatrix} = -
\begin{bmatrix}
3L_{ee} & 3L_{ms} & 3L_{es} \\
3L_{me} & 3L_{mm} & 3L_{ms} \\
3L_{se} & 3L_{sm} & 3L_{ss}
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\nabla \tilde{\mu}_e \\
\nabla h \\
\nabla T
\end{bmatrix}
$$  \hspace{0.5cm} (8.5)

The essential complication arises from this: $2L_{se} \neq 3L_{se}$ for all conditions, but $3L_{se}$ is that which is calculated by the band structure models presented earlier and generally calculated from density functional theory. The discrepancy between them gives the contribution of entropy co-transport to thermoelectric performance. This is not to say that the kinetic theory that underlies such calculations is incorrect, but rather that if incomplete information is given to them they cannot provide the correct results. The measure Seebeck coefficient is always given by:

$$
\alpha = \frac{\nabla V}{\nabla T} \Big|_{J_e=0} = \frac{1}{q} \frac{-2L_{se}}{2L_{ee}}
$$  \hspace{0.5cm} (8.6)

With $J_e = 0$ indicating the material is measured with an open electrical circuit. The relation between the Onsager L coefficients from Equation (8.1) and those from Equation (8.4) will depend on the boundary conditions, i.e. $\nabla h = 0$ or $\nabla m = 0$. The cases of both $\nabla h$, $\nabla \tilde{\mu}_e = 0$ and $J_m = 0$, $J_e = 0$ were both considered by DeGroot in the context of thermodiffusion [132], while the case of $J_e = 0$, $\nabla m = 0$ was recently consider by Sandbakk et al. [171] in the context of coupled ion and volume transport in ion-membrane thermoelectrics.

In the case of $\nabla h = 0$, the Seebeck expressed in terms of Equation 8.5 is:

$$
\alpha = \frac{\nabla V}{\nabla T} \Big|_{J_e=0, \nabla h=0} = \frac{-1}{q} \frac{3L_{se}}{3L_{ee}}
$$  \hspace{0.5cm} (8.7)

This gives the same form as that of Equation 8.6, except that there may be some
external dissipation due to $J_m \neq 0$ that limits the heat to electron conversion efficiency possible. The conditions of a normal thermoelectric may be thought of as having $L_{mm} = 0$, so that $J_m = 0$ implies $\nabla h = 0$ — and there is therefore neither co-transport or dissipation. The other transport coefficients ($\sigma$, $\kappa$) will behave similarly [171].

In the case of $J_m = 0$, the Seebeck expressed in terms of Equation 8.5 is:

$$\alpha = \frac{\nabla V}{\nabla T_{J_e=0, J_m=0}} = -\frac{1}{q} \frac{3}{3L_{ee}} \left( 1 - \frac{3L_{ms}}{3L_{mm}} \frac{3L_{me}}{3L_{ee}} \right) \tag{8.8}$$

The expression $\frac{3L_{ms}}{3L_{mm}}$ is the equivalent to the Seebeck coefficient but associated with transport of $m$ instead of electron transport. That is:

$$\alpha_m \equiv \left( \frac{\nabla h}{\nabla T} \right)_{\nabla \vec{\mu}_e, J_m=0} = \frac{3L_{ms}}{3L_{mm}} \quad \tag{8.9}$$

Like $\alpha$, $\alpha_m$ has its own presence contribution and that may be defined as:

$$\alpha_{m, presence} = -\left( \frac{\partial s}{\partial m} \right)_{u,n} \quad \tag{8.10}$$

The expression $\frac{3L_{em}}{3L_{ee}}$ is the co-transport of $J_m$ with $J_e$ when there is no driving force for direct transport of $m$. It will have its own presence contribution:

$$\left( \frac{J_m}{J_e} \right)_{\nabla T=0, \nabla h=0} \approx \left( \frac{\partial m}{\partial n} \right)_{u,s} \quad \tag{8.11}$$

This expression will be most accurate if all transport of $m$ is mediated by transport of the electrons. This is certainly the case in the spin-state enhancement of Seebeck observed in oxide thermoelectrics [109, 196]. Due to the independent mobility of ions in Ag$_2$Se and Cu$_2$Se, Equation 8.11 is here only an approximation.

By combining Equation 8.10 and Equation 8.11 into a single expression, a quasi-thermodynamics expression for the entropy co-transport Seebeck may be obtained. Lets call this term $\alpha_{\text{order-entropy}}$. It can be formulated in terms of the free energy
density \( (f) \) and \( T \) as:

\[
\alpha_{\text{order-entropy}} = -\frac{1}{q} \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial m} \right)_{T,n} \left( \frac{\partial m}{\partial n} \right)_{T,s}
\]  

(8.12)

The behavior of the order-entropy contribution to Seebeck near the phase transition will depend on the behavior of the order parameter \( (m) \) near the phase transition. This is expressed as a polynomial expansion in \( m \) with phenomenological thermodynamic coefficients. For a first order transition the form is [32]:

\[
f_{1st} = am^2 + cm^3 + bm^4 + hm
\]  

(8.13)

With \( a, b, \) and \( c \) thermodynamic coefficients The cubic term causes the first order transition. Equation 8.13 can be solved for \( m \) such that \( f_{1st}(m, h = 0) = 0 \). For example, under the condition \( c \gg b, a \):

\[
m = \begin{cases} \frac{-c}{b} & T < T_c \\ 0 & T > T_c \end{cases}
\]  

(8.14)

From Equation 8.14 \( \frac{\partial m}{\partial n} \) will be a value that is dependent on the systems microscopics below \( T_c \) as expressed in the quantities \( b \) and \( c \). Above the phase transition \( \frac{\partial m}{\partial n} \) must be zero, because \( m \) is zero. By substituting Equation 8.14 in Equation 8.13 the relation \( \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial m} \right)_{T,n} = h \) is determined. Though there is no externally applied \( h \), there is an internally induced \( h \). The temperature gradient will induce a gradient in the order parameter. That order parameter gradient must induce a restoring force through a non-zero \( h \). Using the functional forms of \( \frac{\partial m}{\partial n} \) and \( \frac{\partial f}{\partial m} \) described above, Equation 8.12 indicates that a first order transition may have a step change in \( \alpha_{\text{order-entropy}} \) at \( T_c \). An order entropy induced step change in Seebeck would explain the increase in the Seebeck and \( zT \) of \( \text{Ag}_2\text{Se} \) in its ordered phase.

Below a second order transition, the order parameter follows a critical power law. As discussed in Chapter 5 it is characterized by a critical exponent, \( m = m_0 \tau_r^\beta \), with reduced temperature \( \tau_r \equiv (T_c T)/T_c \) and \( \beta > 0 \). The Seebeck coefficient should also
include a critical exponent contribution and be of form:

$$\alpha = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \tau_r^r,$$  \hspace{1cm} (8.15)

in which \(\alpha_0\) and \(\alpha_1\) may have a separate temperature dependence.

Laguesse et al [115] suggested that Seebeck should have a critical exponent of \(r = 1 - \lambda\), where \(\lambda\) is the critical exponent for heat capacity. As \(\lambda\) is less than unity, Laguesse et al. predicted \(r\) to be greater than 0. This would imply no Seebeck peak and thereby contradict both our observations in Cu$_2$Se [23] and also the critical exponent of \(r = -1\) that Laguesse et al. measured in YBa$_2$Ca$_3$O$_{7-y}$ [115]. If \(h\) is large (relative to \(\tau_r^\Delta\), where \(\Delta\) is the gap exponent) [95], then the critical exponent for Seebeck will be larger than \(1 - \lambda\). The free energy can be expressed as [95]:

$$f_{2nd} = \begin{cases} f_0 \tau_r^{2-\lambda} & \text{h small} \\ f_1 \tau_r^\beta & \text{h large} \end{cases}$$  \hspace{1cm} (8.16)

A form for \(\frac{\partial f}{\partial m}\) can be obtained from Equation 8.16:

$$\alpha_{order-entropy} = -\frac{\partial f_{2nd}}{q \partial n} = \begin{cases} \alpha_1 \tau_r^{1-\lambda} \frac{\partial T_c}{\partial n} & \text{h small} \\ \alpha_2 \tau_r^{\beta-1} \frac{\partial T_c}{\partial n} & \text{h large} \end{cases}$$  \hspace{1cm} (8.17)

From Equation 8.17b if \(h\) is large enough, the critical exponent for Seebeck is \(r = \beta - 1\). As \(\beta\) is typically a small fraction of unity, \(r\) should be slightly more than -1. That critical exponent is consistent with that measured in both our work on Cu$_2$Se and the work by Laguesse et al. on YBa$_2$Ca$_3$O$_{7-y}$ [115]. The form in of Equation 8.17b can also be determined from our Equation 8.13 and the definition of \(m(T)\):

$$\frac{\partial m}{\partial n} = m_0 \tau_r^{\beta-1} \frac{T}{T_c^2} \frac{\partial T_c}{\partial n}$$  \hspace{1cm} (8.18)

As per our discussion of the first order transition, the temperature gradient will induce \(h \neq 0\). Therefore \(\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial m}\right)_{T,n} = h\) is non-zero. If this is applied with Equation 8.18 to
Figure 8.2: Ion conductivity of Cu$_2$Se [84] and Ag$_2$Se [136] through their phase transitions. Ag$_2$Se shows a step increase in ion conductivity at its phase transition, while Cu$_2$Se shows a super-exponential increase in ion conductivity to the phase transition temperature. The dotted line corresponds to 374 K, at which temperature the super-exponential increase begins.

Equation 8.12, the form and critical exponent of Equation 8.17b are obtained.

### 8.2 Ion-mediated Enhancement

When considering the specific case of super-ionic transitions, ionic transport properties may function as a convenient and metrologically tractable proxy for measurements of the order parameter. A super-ionic transition is a disordering of mobile ions that results in a substantial change in ionic transport properties. The enhancements in ionic transport may be much more significant than those of electronic transport, and
the phase transition may act on the electrons indirectly through the ions. In this case we have:

$$\frac{\partial T_c}{\partial n} = \frac{\partial T_c}{\partial n_i} \frac{\partial n_i}{\partial n}$$

(8.19)

Where $n_i$ is the concentration of mobile ions. If ionic transport is directly enhanced by the phase transition, $\frac{\partial T_c}{\partial n_i}$ will be non-zero. Such a variation has been observed in both Cu$_2$Se [194] and Ag$_2$Se [15] as well as other super-ionics [111, 114]. Electrons and ions may interact through both chemical and electrostatic processes; their co-transport interaction would indicate a significant value for $\frac{\partial n_i}{\partial n}$. Polarization measurements of some oxygen conductors have revealed such coupled transport [205, 119, 36], which has been explained as being due to a long range electrostatic interaction changing the effective charge of the transported ions [99]. As $\frac{\partial T_c}{\partial n}$ and $\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial n}$ may be obtainable via gated transport measurements [172], future studies may be able to precisely test Equation 8.17b.

Super-ionic materials are defined phenomenologically as those with ion conductivity greater than 1 S/cm at elevated temperatures [21, 87, 163]. They are divided into three classes by the manner in which they achieve high ion conductivity. Type III super-ionics are those without a phase transition (e.g. $\beta$-Alumina) [21] and therefore are not of interest here. This study is of the ordered or non-superionic phase of both Ag$_2$Se and Cu$_2$Se and therefore their classification within the broader contexts will be helpful in finding similar materials.

Type I and type II super-ionic conductors are characterized by a structural phase transition with an entropy change close to that of melting (i.e. order 10 J K$^{-1}$ mol$^{-1}$ and a concurrent increase in ion conductivity [151]. For type I super-ionic conductors there is a sudden enthalpy release at the phase transition temperature (i.e. a first order phase transition) and a concurrent discontinuous increase in ionic conductivity [21]. For type II super-ionic conductors the ionic conductivity increases super-exponentially up to the phase transition temperature, the structure changes continuously, and there is a lambda-shaped peak in heat capacity like that characteristic of a second order phase transitions [87].
Figure 8.3: Calorimetry data (a) for Ag$_2$Se (solid line) and Cu$_2$Se (dotted line) on heating. Ag$_2$Se shows a characteristic symmetric peak in its DSC curve due to the enthalpy release of its first order phase transition. Cu$_2$Se shows an extended asymmetric elevation in its heat capacity due to its second order phase transition. Temperature resolved powder X-ray diffractograms of Ag$_2$Se (b) and Cu$_2$Se (c). The structural transformation of Ag$_2$Se is first order, while that of Cu$_2$Se is second order.

To determine whether a material in this study has a type I or type II super-ionic phase transition, three physical properties are examined through the phase transition: ionic conductivity, calorimetry, and crystallographic structure. A type I super-ionic transition (typically first order) is characterized by a sudden disordering of the ions [21, 87, 151]. As the number of mobile ions and their diffusivity increase suddenly, they show a concurrent step increase in ion conductivity. Literature results show that Ag$_2$Se ion conductivity increases by four orders of magnitude at 412 K, see Figure 8.2 [136]. The disordering of the ions requires the absorption of enthalpy. DSC data for Ag$_2$Se shows a sharp symmetric peak centered at 414 K, see Figure 8.3(b). As the ordering of the ions is lost suddenly, there should be a corresponding change in the crystal symmetries represented by disappearance of peaks in the diffractogram. Temperature resolved PXRD shows numerous strong crystallographic peaks disappearing at the phase transition temperature, see Figure 8.3(b), indicative of a sudden disordering of the Ag ions.

In a type II super-ionic phase transition the ions disorder continuously (as in a second order transition) until the phase transition temperature is reached. The ionic conductivity increases super-exponentially below the phase transition temperature [21, 87, 151]. Horvatic et al. measured such a super-exponential increase in
the ionic conductivity of Cu$_2$Se, see Figure 8.2 \[84\] As the ionic disordering occurs continuously over a significant temperature range, the heat capacity is elevated over that range \[151\]. The DSC data for Cu$_2$Se shows a broad asymmetric lambda peak, see Figure 8.3(a). Its crystal structure indicates gradual disordering and a second order phase transition, see Figure 8.3(c). From the behavior of its ionic conductivity, heat capacity and crystallography through its phase transition temperature, we conclude that Cu$_2$Se has a type II super-ionic phase transition.

Experimentally, we have seen an example of the contrast between a type II and type I super-ionic thermoelectric material in Ag$_2$Se and Cu$_2$Se. Consider transport of heat, ions, and electrons:

\[
du = Tds - \tilde{\mu}_e dn_e - \tilde{\mu}_i dn_i
\]  

(8.20)

The corresponding entropy production is:

\[
T \dot{S} = -J_s \cdot \nabla T J_e \cdot \nabla \tilde{\mu}_e J_i \cdot \nabla \tilde{\mu}_i
\]  

(8.21)

The corresponding Onsager relationships are \[132\]:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
  J_e \\
  J_i \\
  J_s
\end{bmatrix} = -\begin{bmatrix}
  3L_{ee} & 3L_{is} & 3L_{es} \\
  3L_{ie} & 3L_{ii} & 3L_{is} \\
  3L_{se} & 3L_{si} & 3L_{ss}
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
  \nabla \tilde{\mu}_e \\
  \nabla \tilde{\mu}_e \\
  \nabla T
\end{bmatrix}
\]  

(8.22)

If the Seebeck coefficient is measured in an open circuit system with ion blocking electrodes (i.e. $J_i = 0$, $J_e = 0$):

\[
\alpha = \frac{\nabla V}{\nabla T J_e=0, J_i=0} = - \frac{1}{q} \frac{3L_{se}}{3L_{ee}} \left(1 - \frac{3L_{is}}{3L_{ii} 3L_{ee}} \right)
\]  

(8.23)

The first term in the numerator is the band structure electronic Seebeck. The second term in the numerator is the Seebeck enhancement due to the ions. The term in the denominator is an ionic drag term. The ionic drag term will be small because
$L_{ii} \ll L_{ee}$ and $L_{ie}$ is even in the largest measured case only on the order of $L_{ii}$. If $L_{is}$ and $L_{ie}$ are significant compared to $L_{es}$ and $L_{ee}$, analysis of only electronic properties will lead to an incomplete description of the thermoelectric properties.

The first condition for the ion transport enhancing Seebeck is that $\frac{L_{ie}}{L_{ee}} = \frac{\sigma_{ie}}{\sigma_{ee}}$ be large. $\frac{L_{ie}}{L_{ee}} = \frac{\sigma_{ie}}{\sigma_{ee}}$ is the ratio between ions transported and electrons transported under a gradient in $\mu_e$ but no gradient in $\mu_i$. Mixed ion-electron conductors can show electron-ion transport coupling. Electrons and ions may interact through both chemical and electrostatic processes. Polarization measurements of some oxygen conductors have revealed such a coupling [205, 119], which has been explained as due to a long range electrostatic interaction changing the effective charge of the transported ions [99]. Thus in both low temperature type I Ag$_2$Se and type II Cu$_2$Se $\frac{L_{ie}}{L_{ee}}$ may be significant. In the high temperature phase of Ag$_2$Se $\frac{L_{ie}}{L_{ee}}$ has been measured to be less than $10^{-2}$ [137]. This has been explained by Ogawa and Kobayashi [141, 142] to be due to the high concentration of ionic carriers. In the super-ionic limit they found that $\frac{L_{ie}}{L_{ii}} < \frac{n_e}{n_i}$. $n_i$ is much larger in the superionic phase than the ordered phase [142].

The second condition is that ionic Seebeck, $\alpha_i = -\frac{L_{is}}{L_{ii}}$ be significant. The coupling of concentration of Ag and Cu to the thermodynamics of disordering has been observed via the dependence of $T_c$ on composition in Cu$_2$Se [194] and Ag$_2$Se [15]. Mechanistically this may function through a dependence of occupation of soft modes (e.g. the Zn$_4$Sb$_3$ rattler) [173] on the concentration of Ag$^+$ and Cu$^+$. An observation of not only structural entropy change at the phase transition but also of structural entropy transport is given by Korzhuev and Laptev [107]; they measured a sharp peak in the thermodiffusion of Cu$^0$ in Cu$_2$Se at the 410 K phase transition. From this they calculated a heat of transport of $Q_{Cu^0}^*$ of Cu atoms of 1 eV. Conservation of particles and charge requires that:

$$Q_{Cu^0}^* = Q_{Cu^+}^* + Q_p^* = qT(\alpha_{Cu^+} - \alpha) \quad (8.24)$$

Therefore $Q_{Cu^0}^* = 1$ eV corresponds to $\alpha_{Cu^+} \approx 2500 \mu V/K$ at the phase transition. If even 2% small fraction of this copper entropy were co-transported with Cu$_2$Se, than
the Seebeck and $\varepsilon T$ enhancement observed would be completely explained.

8.3 Future work

Other super-ionic materials should be evaluated for their phase transition thermoelectric properties. The thermoelectric materials $\text{Ag}_2\text{S}$, $\text{Ag}_2\text{Te}$, $\text{Cu}_2\text{S}$, and $\text{Cu}_2\text{Te}$ are all type I super-ions [87]; like $\text{Ag}_2\text{Se}$, they are not expected to show phase transition enhanced Seebeck. There are many other known type II super-ionic conductors [21] such as $\text{PbF}_2$ [9, 34] and $\text{K}_2\text{S}$ [51]. Like $\text{Cu}_2\text{Se}$ they have a modified fluorite (or anti-fluorite) structure. Because of their large band gaps, their thermoelectrics properties are unexamined. It may be possible to change $\text{Ag}_2\text{Se}$ from a type I to a type II superionic material. The order of the phase transition has been changed in certain super-ionic materials by alloying. $\text{PbF}_2$ is type II super-ionic. Alloying it with KF changes the temperature dependence of its ionic conductivity. At 10% KF and above it becomes a type I super-ionic [86]. Though $\text{AgI}$ is type I, $\text{RbAg}_4\text{I}_5$ has both a type I and type II super-ionic transition [93]. Additionally, when a pressure of 2.6 GPa is applied to $\text{AgI}$, it becomes a type II super-ionic conductor [97].

Critically increased entropy may be present in other materials systems. $\text{AgCrSe}_2$ [66] which is also an ion transporting materials shows a small Seebeck enhancement near a phase transition, though there is no evidence that this is associated with critical phenomena. The temperature of the continuous transition in the CuI-AgI system shows a composition dependence [114]. The effect on Seebeck from order entropy is likely not limited to mixed ion-electron conductors. Any material in which the entropy associated with a phase transition might be coupled to transport is a candidate. For example, the magnetic ordering phase transition associated with giant magnetoresistance is often accompanied by a corresponding significant Seebeck change [91, 120]. Applying a magnetic field to these materials induces ordering and results in a corresponding reduction in Seebeck.

In order to understand and engineer this phenomenon, substantial future work needs to be done. The ionic properties, both the conductivity [107] and the See-
beck, [12] may need to be measured and considered when engineering these materials. Further synchotron and neutron crystallographic work may be able to uncover the structure and order parameter. The Onsager coefficient analysis above may be used to relate separate measurements of ion and electronic properties, in order to directly test the hypothesis of ion-mediated or perhaps even order-mediated Seebeck enhancement.

The best thermoelectric performing materials in this class of compound are yet to be synthesized. Through such future work a greater understanding of the excellent thermoelectric properties of the ordered phases of super-ionic materials may be understood and engineered.
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