A nom alous spin-splitting of two-dimensional electrons in an A IA s Q uantum Well

S.J.Papadakis, E.P.De Poortere, and M. Shayegan

Department of Electrical Engineering, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544

(August 1998)

We measure the electrive Landle g-factor of high-mobility two-dimensional electrons in a modulation-doped A A squantum wellby tilting the sample in a magnetic eld and monitoring the evolution of the magnetoresistance oscillations. The data reveal that igj = 9.0, which is much enhanced with respect to the reported bulk value of 1.9. Surprisingly, in a large range of magnetic eld and Landau level llings, the value of the enhanced g-factor appears to be constant.

73.40 Kp, 73.40.-c, 72.15 Gd, 73.40 Hm

The electrive Landle g-factor and electrive mass mare two fundamental parameters that characterize the energy levels of two-dimensional electron systems (2D ESs) in semiconductors in the presence of a magnetic eld (B). In a simple, non-interacting picture, the cyclotron energy ($h!_c$ $heB_2 = m$) associated with the electron's orbital motion determines the separation between the quantized energy levels (Landau levels), while the Zeem an energy (g _ B B) gives the "spin-splitting" of the Landau levels (B₂ is the component of B perpendicular to the 2D ES plane).

For 2D ESs in a high $B_{?}$ it is well known that when there are unequal populations of electrons with opposite spin, electron-electron interaction can lead to a substantial enhancem ent of the spin-splitting energy which can in turn be expressed as an enhancem ent of the elective gfactor [1{3]. In G aAs 2D ESs, for example, the exchange enhancem ent of the g-factor leads to the energy gaps for the quantum Hall elect states at odd Landau level llings () being much larger than the bare Zeem an energy [4]. Moreover, the magnitude of the g-factor enhancement oscillates with as the spin population di erence does [3{8].

We report here an experimental determination of the spin-splitting energy for electrons conned to a modulation-doped A lAs quantum well (QW). In contrast to GaAs, where electrons occupy the conduction band minimum at the Brillouin zone center (-point) and form a spherical Fermi surface, in A lAs they occupy conduction band ellipsoids near the zone edge (X-point). This is somewhat similar to the case of 2D electrons at the Si/SiO₂ (100) interface except that in the A lAs QW that we have studied, an ellipsoid with its major axis parallel (as opposed to perpendicular) to the 2D plane is occupied [9]. In our measurements we utilize the "coincidence" method, a technique which has been used to study the g-factor enhancement in other 2D E Ss such as those in Si/SiO_2 [1], SiGe [7], and G aAs [4]. The results are surprisingly simple yet puzzling: in a large range of

, we nd a signi cant enhancement of the g-factor with respect to the reported bulk value but, remarkably, the enhancement appears to be independent of . The 2DES behaves like a non-interacting system of electrons but with a much-enhanced g-factor.

The experiment was done on samples from two wafers that were grown by molecular beam epitaxy on undoped GaAs (100) substrates. In both wafers the 2DES is con ned to a 150 A -wide A lAs QW which is separated from the Sidopants by ALG aAs barriers. Three sam ples (A, B, and C) from wafer 1 and one sample (D) from wafer 2 were used in the tilt experiment. Sam ple A was photolithographically patterned with an Lshaped Hall bar whose two perpendicular arms lay on the [100] and [010] directions. Samples B, C, and D had a van der Pauw geom etry. Sam ples A and B had evaporated m etal front gates to control the density. The experiments were performed in a pumped ³He system at a tem perature of 0.3 K, in magnetic elds up to 16 T. The samples were mounted on a platform which could be rotated in situ. The ungated carrier density of sample A was $n = 2.08 \quad 10^{11} \text{ cm}^2$ and the mobilities along the two arms of the L-shaped hall bar were 6.1 m²/Vs for the high-m obility direction and $4.2 \text{ m}^2/\text{V} \text{ s}$ for the lowmobility direction [9].

The elective m assess for the conduction band ellipsoids in bulk A As are $m_1 = 1: lm_e$ for the longitudinal m ass and $m_t = 0:19m_e$ for the transverse m ass [10]. For QW s of width greater than 60 A, the 2D electrons will be forced to occupy the two ellipsoids whose m a jor axes lie in the plane of the 2D ES [11{13}]. In our sam ples, m easurements have shown that only one of the two in-plane ellipsoids is occupied [9,14]. In particular, cyclotron resonance m easurements reveal a cyclotron resonance e ective m ass of $m_{CR} = 0.46m_e$, in excellent agreement with the m ass, $P m_{1m_t}$, expected for in-plane ellipsoids [14]. This observation is consistent with the work of Sm ith et al., who also conclude that in multiple A IA sQW sam ples with a QW width of 150 A only a single in-plane ellipsoid with sim ilarm_{CR} is occupied [15].

We used the coincidence method [1] to determ ine the product of the Lande g-factor and the electrice mass (jgm j) of the electrons in the A IA s QW. Note that this method cannot determ ine the sign of g. When a 2D E S is tilted in a magnetic eld, the Zeem an energy $g_B B$ changes relative to the cyclotron energy $h!_c$ because the Zeem an energy is proportional to the total B while the

Landau level separation depends on B₂. At the coincidence angles, spin-up and spin-down levels of di erent Landau levels become degenerate. This degeneracy can be seen in magnetoresistance data. At a coincidence angle, in an ideal non-interacting system, half of the longitudinal resistance (R_{xx}) m inim a, corresponding to half of the integer (either the even or the odd), disappear. The other half reach a maximum strength. Once the angle at which a coincidence occurs is found, jgm j can be determ ined from the equation

$$lh!_c = jgj_BB;$$
 (1)

where l is an index determ ined by both the relative values of jjj_BB and $h!_c$ at = 0 and the order of the coincidence observed. For example, if $jjj_BB = 0.3 h!_c$ at = 0, then at the rst coincidence angle $(_1)$ l = 1, at the second coincidence angle $(_2)$ l = 2, etc. How ever, if $jjj_BB = 1:3 h!_c$ at = 0, then for $_1$, l = 2; for $_2$, l = 3; and so on. For all of the coincidence measurements in other materials that we cite, l = 1 for $_1$; i.e. the Zeem an energy is smaller than the cyclotron energy at = 0 β {8]. Our data reveals that we have studied.

Experimentally, we rstm ade sure that the sample was at zero angle (= 0) by maxim izing the Hall resistance in a sm allB. Then we made magnetoresistance measurements at various, determining by comparing the Hall resistances and the positions of the R_{xx} m in in a to those of the = 0 trace. Data from sample A, at a density of 1:4 10^{11} cm², are shown in Fig. 1. R_{xx} traces for various angles, o set vertically for clarity, are plotted vs. $B_{\, ?}$. Concentrating on $\quad \mbox{from 3 to 8, we see that in the}$ = 0 trace, there are no R_{xx} m inim a corresponding to the odd , while there are strong even- minima. As the sample is tilted, the situation slowly reverses itself, so that at $= 48.2^{\circ}$, there are no m in in a corresponding to the even , but strong m in im a exist for the odd . This indicates that $_1$ is near 48°. This observation agrees with the data of Sm ith et al., which show the rst coincidence to be roughly at the sam e angle [15]. However, Sm ith et al. reached the conclusion that jgm j = 1.52using Eq. 1 with l = 1 [15]. This conclusion is inconsistent with the remainder of our data. If l is taken to be 1 for the rst coincidence, then at = 0

$$\frac{jgj_BB}{h!_c} = 1\cos_1 = 0.7:$$
 (2)

W ith this ratio, one would expect that at = 0 the odd-

 R_{xx} m inim a would be stronger than the even- m inim a. Figure 1 shows that the opposite is true. A lso, the angles of subsequent coincidences are inconsistent with l=1.0 n the other hand, all of the coincidences that we observe are consistent with l=3 for $_1$, l=4 for $_2$, etc. This yields jgm j=4:1. Using m = 0:46m $_e$ [14], we calculate that the Land eq-factor of electrons conned to this A LA s Q W is 9:0. This g-factor is consistent with the data of Sm ith et al. [15], because observation of the rst coincidence alone cannot determ ine jgm jto better than the integer multiple 1.

Other features of Fig. 1 are also consistent with $ig_j = 9.0$. Figure 2a is a plot of the energies of the Landau levels (LLs) for a tilt experiment of an ideal, non-interacting 2DES with jgm j= 4:1 [16]. The spindown (-up) levels are shown as solid (dotted) lines. The coincidences are marked with vertical lines and labelled in order. W hen the Ferm i energy lies halfway between two of the LLs on the plot, the system is at an integer and an R_{xx} m in im um is observed. At a given angle, the energy gap () between the LLs is the vertical distance between the LLs on the plot. Larger are m an ifested as stronger R_{xx} m in in a at that . Qualitatively, all of the R_{xx} m in im a in Fig. 1 have the behavior described in Fig. 2a. For example, Fig. 2a predicts that 4 (shaded for clarity) will be large at = 0, disappear com pletely at 1, reach a maximum again at 2, and remain constant through all higher angles. The = $4 R_{xx}$ m in imum reects this behavior.

W e also have sim ilar tilt measurem ents of sam ple B gated to a density of 3.9 10^{11} cm 2 , sample C at a density of 2:4 10^{11} cm², and sample D at a density of 3:6 10^{11} cm². The data from all of the samples look similar, with all of the coincidences happening at the same angles. Since the quality is better at the higher densities, more minima are observed at higher , and they, too, follow the behavior predicted by Fig. 2a in the manner described above. The quality of the highest density data (from sample B) allow susmake a more precise m easurem ent of the coincidence angles and therefore igm j than would be possible with the data of Fig. 1 alone. Data from sample B are shown in Fig. 2b: the strengths of various R_{xx} m in im a as they evolve with are plotted. This plot was made by subtracting a linear background from the R_{xx} vs. $B_{?}$ data, and plotting the new R_{xx} value for each integer . Since a particular R_{xx} m in im um is strongest when its corresponding is largest, it is the minima in Fig. 2b that correspond to . At $_1$ and $_3$, the odd- curves in Fig. maxima in 2b show minima, and at 2 the even-curves show minim a [17]. It is the positions of the minima in Fig. 2b that we used to calculate accurately the angles of the coincidences, and therefore jgm j = 4:1, to within 4%.

The coincidence data provide a value for the ratio of the Zeem an and cyclotron energies, i.e. jgm j but not for the m agnitude of these energies individually. The m agnitude of these energies individually. The m agnitude of can be determ ined from m easurem ents of the activated behavior of the various R_{xx} m in in a according to R_{xx} / exp(= $2k_B T$)). We have done such m easurem ents on sample B for the smaller llings (= 1 3) at various densities and angles. These m easurem ents are consistent with the Landau level diagram in Fig. 2a, which indicates that 1 and 2 should be h!c at any

, and that $_3$ should be $h!_c$ for angles $_1$ and above. Shown in Fig. 3a are the measured at various densities for = 1 and = 2 at = 0 and for = 3 at $_1$. The slope of the line tted to the points in Fig. 3a is 3.4 K/T, in reasonable agreement with $h!_c$ which is expected to be 2.9 K/T. The ' 15% discrepancy could come from the uncertainty in the mass measurement and also from the fact that the measured are reduced from the true

by the disorder in the sample, which is expected to have a smaller e ect as the sample density is increased. Therefore it is reasonable that the slope of the line should be som ewhat greater than the expected slope for a system with no disorder. The negative y-intercept of the line in Fig. 3a gives one estim ate of the disorder in the sam ple: 14 K .W e get another estim ate of roughly 9 K by exam ining the B? -dependence of the Shubnikov-de H aas oscillations [18]. The observation that the magnitude of the y-intercept (14 K) is larger than 9K is also consistent with the disorder becoming less in portant as the density is increased. Finally, Fig. 3b shows how some of the change as the sample is tilted. The fact that 1 and 2do not rapidly increase as the sample is tilted is strong evidence that neither $_1$ nor $_2$ are gaps of g $_B$ B. Together, all of these observations form a consistent picture that shows reasonable agreem ent with the predictions of Fig. 2a.

The data we have presented so far all support the idea that this A IA s 2D E S behaves like the non-interacting Landau level diagram in Fig. 2a. There are som e details, however, that are not explained by this picture. One is that at high densities, the R_{xx} m in in a for up to 6 are visible, although very weak, at angles at which they are expected to disappear com pletely. A s F ig. 2b show s, how ever, they are at their weakest at the expected angles. W e do not understand this unexpected anticrossing-like behavior. The other is that, as the sample is tilted, 1 and 2 fall with increasing (Fig. 3b) while Fig. 2a indicates that they are expected to stay constant at h!... However, the fact that both $_1$ and $_2$ have the same behavior with 1=cos suggests that the same e ect is causing this deviation from the ideal behavior predicted by the Landau level diagram .

The most interesting features of this 2DES are its apparent non-interacting behavior and its unexpectedly large g-factor. A constant g-factor in this system is surprising given the results of previous experiments which all show variations in g that are well explained by electron-electron interaction. Ando and U emura proposed that this enhancement depends on the spin-population di erence in the 2DES. They conclude that the enhancement in g for a given Landau level N goes as $_{N \circ} J_{N N}^2 \circ (g) (n_N \circ n_N \circ), where n_N \circ (n_N \circ)$ is the number of spin-up (down) electrons in the N 0 Landau level β]. In the case of the Sim etal-oxide semiconductor structure, $J_{N N} \circ$ became negligible for N $^0 \in N$. Qualitatively, this is true for all of the previously studied sys-

tems [4{8], because of the common feature they share: for angles less than the st coincidence angle there is only a spin-population di erence when the Ferm i energy lies within one Landau level (between the two spin-split levels). This is due to the fact that $\frac{1}{2}$ B is smaller than $h!_{c}$ at = 0. These experiments were all perform ed at angles near the st coincidence angle because with a smaller g, the coincidences are at much higher angles, and features at the second coincidence angle and beyond are not resolved. In our A IA s QW sample, we have a system in which $g_B B$ (with jgj = 9:0), is signi cantly larger than h! even at = 0. This not only leads to larger spin-population di erences, but also to a situation in which the Ferm i energy can never lie within one single Landau level. Therefore it is some di erent, and unknown, values of $J_{N N} \circ$ that are relevant to this system . Under this picture, one hypothesis is that the enhancem ents due to spin-population di erence are not signi cant. This would lead to the data matching what would be expected of a non-interacting system of electrons. However, this would not explain the magnitude of the g-factor. The expected bulk value from theoretical calculations is 1.9 [19], and the g-factor of electrons in bulk A lo:8G a0:2As has been measured by electron-param agnetic-resonance to be 1.96 [20]. Also, van Kesteren et al. have reported a value of ' 1:9 for electrons in A IA s Q W s based on optically detected m agnetic resonance experim ents on A IA s-G aA s superlattices [12]. It could be that there is som e other, still unknown, electron interaction-driven mechanism that is causing the enhancem ent seen here. It is also possible that the QW structure or som e band structure e ect is som ehow causing the enhancem ent over the bare value of 1.9. If this is the case, it is a very interesting developm ent that warrants further study, because a better understanding of the mechanism might allow one to use it to control the g-factor independently of the other system parameters.

In sum m ary, we have m agnetoresistance and tem perature dependence data revealing that 2D electrons in a 150A QW behave as a non-interacting 2DES with a gfactor of 9.0. The coincidences observed in the m agnetoresistance data accurately determ ine jgm j=4.1, and the activation energies agree with this jgm j. The m agnitude of the g-factor is surprising because it rem ains constant with , and therefore appears to be enhanced by som e unknown m echanism other than the one that is observed in other 2DESs.

W e would like to thank J.P.Lu, S.A.Lyon, and D. C.T suifor useful discussion and insight. This work was funded by the NSF.

- [1] F.F.Fang and P.J.Stiles, Phys. Rev. 174, 823 (1968).
- [2] J.F.Janak, Phys. Rev. 178, 1416 (1969).
- [3] T. Ando and Y. Uemura, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 37, 1044 (1974).
- [4] R. J. Nicholas, R. J. Haug, K. v. Klitzing, and G. Weimann, Phys. Rev. B 37, 1294 (1988).
- [5] T. Englert, D. C. Tsui, A. C. Gossard, and C. U ihlein, Surf. Sci. 113, 295 (1982).
- [6] R.J. Nicholas, M.A. Brummell, J.C. Portal, K.Y. Cheng, A.Y. Cho, and T.P.Pearsall, Solid State Commun. 45, 911 (1983).
- [7] P.W eitz, R.J.Haug, K. von K litzing, and F.Scha er, Surf.Sci. 361/362, 542 (1996).
- [B] J. X. Shen, W. Ossau, F. Fischer, A. Waag, and G. Landwehr, Surf. Sci. 361/362, 460 (1996).
- [9] S. J. Papadakis and M. Shayegan, Phys. Rev. B 57, R15068 (1998).
- [10] S.Adachi, J.Appl. Phys. 58, R1 (1985).
- [11] A.F.W. van de Stadt, P.M. Koenraad, J.A.A.J. Perenboom, and J.H.W olter, Surf. Sci. 361/362, 521 (1995).
- [12] H.W. van Kesteren, E.C.Cosman, P.Dawson, K.J. Moore, and C.T.Foxon, Phys. Rev. B 39, 13426 (1989).
- [13] K.M aezawa, T.M izutani, and S.Yam ada, J.Appl.Phys. 71, 296 (1991).
- [14] T. S. Lay, J. J. H erem ans, Y. W. Suen, M. B. Santos, K. H irakawa, M. Shayegan, and A. Zrenner, Appl. Phys. Lett. 62, 3120 (1993).
- [15] T.P.Sm ith III, W .I.W ang, F.F.Fang, and L.L.Chang, Phys. Rev. B 35, 9349 (1987).
- [16] It should be noted that only the product gm has signi cance in this diagram . A ny system with a given gm will have the same Landau level vs. tilt diagram for the ideal, non-interacting case, regardless of what the individual values of g and m happen to be.
- [17] Note that from the Landau level diagram , $_5$ is expected to remain strong after the third coincidence and Fig. 2b shows this.
- [18] Ando, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 37, 1233 (1974).
- [19] L.M. Roth, B.Lax, and S.Zwerdling, Phys. Rev. 114, 90 (1959).
- [20] R.Bottcher, S.W artewig, R.M indem ann, G.Kuhn, and P.Fischer, Phys. Status Solidi (b) 58, K 23 (1973).

FIG.1. M agnetoresistance traces from a 2DES (density = 1:4 10^{11} cm²) in a 150 A-wide QW (sample A) at various angles of tilt.

FIG.2. a: D iagram of the Landau level energies for a tilt experim ent in a non-interacting 2DES with jgm j=4:1. The solid (dashed) lines correspond to spin-up (-down) Landau levels. b: R_{xx} points as a measure of the relative strengths of the R_{xx} m inim a. The R_{xx} were calculated by subracting a linear background from the R_{xx} vs. B₂ data.

FIG.3. a: A ctivation energies from sample B. The activation energy for = 2 was measured at various densities. b: A ctivation energies at various measured in sample B.





