Analysis of Stress Gradient in Ceramic Film by X-ray Method*

Kenji SUZUKI**, Keisuke TANAKA***
and Yoshihisa SAKAIDA***

The $\sin^2 \psi$ diagram taken from a specimen with steep stress gradients beneath the surface shows nonlinearity, because the X-ray penetration depth changes depending on the tilt angle. Stress gradients can be determined from this nonlinearity. Since ceramic materials have deep X-ray penetration depth, the thickness of a ceramic thin film should have a significant effect on the nonlinearity of the $\sin^2 \psi$ method. In this paper, we propose a method of X-ray measurement of the stress gradient, which takes into account film thickness under the assumption of linear stress distributions. A 58- μm -thick silicon nitride film was prepared. The film specimen was polished carefully with diamond slurry to obtain sharp profiles of the X-ray diffraction. To obtain a steep stress gradient, the specimen was bent on a cylinder. The stress distribution estimated by the present method agreed well with the applied bending stress. In conclusion, the stress gradient should be analyzed by the weighted average stress on the basis of the intensity of the diffracted X-rays from the entire thin film, when the thickness is six times larger than the effective X-ray penetration depth.

Key Words: Residual Stress, Experimental Stress Analysis, Ceramics, X-ray Stress Measurement, Thin Film, Coating Film

1. Introduction

Various coating methods have been developed to improve surface characteristics. In the coating process, residual stress is inevitably introduced into the film due to a mismatch of coefficients of thermal expansions between the coating film and the substrate, and to other mechanisms. Among the various methods used for the measurement of residual stresses, the method based on X-ray diffraction is the most useful. Many X-ray measurements⁽¹⁾⁻⁽⁷⁾ on thin films and coated films have been reported.

The X-rays penetrate some distance into the specimen. The $\sin^2 \psi$ diagram taken from a material that has a steep stress gradient shows nonlinearity,

because the X-ray penetration depth changes with the tilt angle ψ . Yoshioka et al.⁽⁸⁾ proposed the $\cos \psi$ method by which the stress gradient was determined from the nonlinearity in the $\sin^2 \psi$ diagram.

In the X-ray stress analysis of the nonlinearity in the diagram, we need the true X-ray penetration depth. We have shown experimentally that the X-ray penetration depth should be equal to the thickness of the specimen⁽⁹⁾. A film whose thickness is six times larger than the effective X-ray penetration depth can be regarded as being thick enough, and the penetration depth can be considered infinite.

If a ceramic film is not thick enough, the film thickness should be taken into account. Sasaki et al.⁽¹⁰⁾⁻⁽¹²⁾ calculated the stress gradient by using the weighted average stress from the surface to the depth where the ratio of X-ray diffraction intensity to the entire diffraction intensity became $1-1/e$. On the basis of our previous experience, we conclude that the diffraction intensity from the entire film enable an accurate determination of the stress gradient. It is necessary to discuss the definition of penetration depth for obtaining the weighted average stress.

In this paper, we propose the theory and the

* Received 26th September, 1997. Japanese original: Trans. Jpn. Soc. Mech. Eng., Vol. 63, No. 610, A (1997), p. 1243-1248 (Received 21st August, 1996)

** Faculty of Education, Niigata University, 8050 Igarashi-2-no-cho, Niigata 950-2181, Japan

*** Faculty of Engineering, Nagoya University, Furoh-cho, Chikusa-ku, Nagoya 464-8601, Japan

**** Japan Fine Ceramics Center, 2-4-1 Rokuno, Atsuta-ku, Nagoya 456-0023, Japan

analytical method for determining the stress gradient of thin films. We solve the problem of penetration depth experimentally, and discuss the effect of film thickness on the nonlinearity of the $\sin^2 \psi$ diagram.

2. Analysis Method

2.1 X-ray stress analysis of thin film

The coordinate system is defined as shown in Fig.

1. The stress state is assumed to be plane stress. The relationship between diffraction angle $2\theta_{\phi\psi}$ and stresses is given by

$$2\theta_{\phi\psi} = -\frac{2(1+\nu)}{E} \tan \theta_0 (\sigma_1 \cos^2 \phi + \sigma_2 \sin^2 \phi) \sin^2 \psi + \frac{2\nu}{E} \tan \theta_0 (\sigma_1 + \sigma_2) + 2\theta_0, \quad (1)$$

where σ_1 and σ_2 are in-plane principal stresses and $2\theta_0$ is the diffraction angle of the stress-free material.

The intensity $I(x)$ of the incident X-ray decreases with path length x , and is written as

$$-\frac{dI}{I} = \mu dx. \quad (2)$$

The integration of Eq. (2) gives

$$I = I_0 \exp(-\mu x), \quad (3)$$

where I_0 is the intensity of the incident X-ray, and μ is the linear absorption coefficient of the ceramic film. The effective X-ray penetration depth T is defined⁽¹³⁾ as the depth where the ratio I/I_0 becomes $1/e$. In the iso-inclination method, T is given by

$$T = \frac{\sin^2 \theta - \sin^2 \psi}{2\mu \sin \theta \cos \psi}. \quad (4)$$

Since the diffraction intensity decreases with increasing the penetration distance of the X-ray, the measured diffraction angle, $\langle 2\theta_{\phi\psi} \rangle$, is represented by the weighted average from the surface to the film thickness t . Thus, $\langle 2\theta_{\phi\psi} \rangle$ becomes

$$\langle 2\theta_{\phi\psi} \rangle = \frac{\int_0^t 2\theta_{\phi\psi} I(z) dz}{\int_0^t I(z) dz} = \frac{\int_0^t 2\theta_{\phi\psi} \exp(-z/T) dz}{\int_0^t \exp(-z/T) dz}. \quad (5)$$

Equation (1) is rewritten as

$$\langle 2\theta_{\phi\psi} \rangle = -\frac{2(1+\nu)}{E} \tan \theta_0 (\langle \sigma_1 \rangle \cos^2 \phi + \langle \sigma_2 \rangle \sin^2 \phi) \sin^2 \psi + \frac{2\nu}{E} \tan \theta_0 (\langle \sigma_1 \rangle + \langle \sigma_2 \rangle) + 2\theta_0. \quad (6)$$

Now, we assume that the stress distribution is linear along the z -coordinate through the depth of the film

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_1 &= \sigma_{10} + A_1 z, \\ \sigma_2 &= \sigma_{20} + A_2 z, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where σ_{10} and σ_{20} are the stresses on the surface, and A_1 and A_2 are their gradients. By substituting Eq. (7) into Eq. (6), we have

Fig. 1 Coordinate system

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \sigma_1 \rangle &= \frac{\int_0^t \sigma_1 I(z) dz}{\int_0^t I(z) dz} = \frac{\int_0^t (\sigma_{10} + A_1 z) \exp(-z/T) dz}{\int_0^t \exp(-z/T) dz} \\ &= \sigma_{10} + A_1 \left(T - \frac{t}{e^{t/T} - 1} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

and we obtain a similar equation for the weighted average stress $\langle \sigma_2 \rangle$. The weighted average stresses for the thin film are written as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \sigma_1 \rangle &= \sigma_{10} + A_1 W_t, \\ \langle \sigma_2 \rangle &= \sigma_{20} + A_2 W_t, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where

$$W_t = T - \frac{t}{e^{t/T} - 1}. \quad (10)$$

The W_t value includes the film thickness t explicitly, and is the weighted coefficient for the thin film. For case of thickness t much larger than T , W_t is equal to the effective X-ray penetration depth T . In the case of thin films, the weighted coefficient W_t necessary for the calculation of the stress gradient. The stress gradient should be calculated using the diffraction intensity from the entire film.

Substituting Eq. (9) into Eq. (6) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \langle 2\theta_{\phi\psi} \rangle &= -\frac{2(1+\nu)}{E} \tan \theta_0 [(\sigma_{10} + A_1 W_t) \cos^2 \phi \\ &\quad + (\sigma_{20} + A_2 W_t) \sin^2 \phi] \sin^2 \psi \\ &\quad + \frac{2\nu}{E} \tan \theta_0 [\sigma_{10} + \sigma_{20} + (A_1 + A_2) W_t] + 2\theta_0. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

By denoting the diffraction angles measured in the directions of $\phi=0^\circ$ and $\phi=90^\circ$ as $\langle 2\theta_{\phi=0\psi} \rangle$ and $\langle 2\theta_{\phi=90\psi} \rangle$, the following equations are obtained from the sum of and the difference between $\langle 2\theta_{\phi=0\psi} \rangle$ and $\langle 2\theta_{\phi=90\psi} \rangle$:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle 2\theta_{\phi=0\psi} \rangle + \langle 2\theta_{\phi=90\psi} \rangle &= \alpha [\sigma_{10} + \sigma_{20} + (A_1 + A_2) W_t] \\ &\quad + \beta [\sigma_{10} + \sigma_{20} + (A_1 + A_2) W_t] + 4\theta_0 \\ \langle 2\theta_{\phi=0\psi} \rangle - \langle 2\theta_{\phi=90\psi} \rangle &= \alpha [\sigma_{10} - \sigma_{20} + (A_1 - A_2) W_t], \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where α and β are

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= -\frac{2(1+\nu)}{E} \tan \theta_0 \sin^2 \psi \\ \beta &= \frac{4\nu}{E} \tan \theta_0. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

To analyze the stress distributions, we must obtain the $\sin^2 \psi$ diagrams in two directions, $\phi=0^\circ$ and $\phi=90^\circ$, and from the $\sin^2 \psi$ diagrams we determine optimum values of parameters σ_{10} , σ_{20} , A_1 and A_2 .

2.2 Determination method of stress gradients

In this section, we derive the determination method of stress distributions, σ_{10} , σ_{20} , A_1 , A_2 and θ_0 , using the $\sin^2\psi$ diagrams measured in two directions, $\phi=0^\circ$ and $\phi=90^\circ$. To simplify the equations, we replace the parameters with c_i as

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 &= \sigma_{10} + \sigma_{20} \\ c_2 &= A_1 + A_2 \\ c_3 &= \theta_0 \\ c_4 &= \sigma_{10} - \sigma_{20} \\ c_5 &= A_1 - A_2, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

and denote the left-hand terms of Eq.(12) using Y and Z :

$$\begin{aligned} Y &= \langle 2 \theta_{\phi=0\psi} \rangle + \langle 2 \theta_{\phi=90\psi} \rangle \\ Z &= \langle 2 \theta_{\phi=0\psi} \rangle - \langle 2 \theta_{\phi=90\psi} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Using Eqs.(14) and (15), Eq.(12) is rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} Y_j &= (\alpha_j + \beta) c_1 + (\alpha_j + \beta) W_t c_2 + 4 c_3 \\ Z_j &= \alpha_j c_4 + \alpha_j W_t c_5, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where the suffix j means the tilt angle ψ . We use $y_{\phi=0j}$ and $y_{\phi=90j}$ for measured data, R_j for the error of measured y_j and calculated Y_j , and Q_j for the error of measured y_j and calculated Z_j . The errors R_j and Q_j are

$$\begin{aligned} R_j &= (\alpha_j + \beta) c_1 + (\alpha_j + \beta) W_t c_2 + 4 c_3 \\ &\quad - (y_{\phi=0j} + y_{\phi=90j}) \\ Q_j &= \alpha_j c_4 + \alpha_j W_t c_5 - (y_{\phi=0j} - y_{\phi=90j}). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

In this study, the parameters were determined so as to minimize errors R and Q by the method of least-squares estimation of nonlinear parameters⁽¹⁴⁾. The relation between errors R and parameters c_i is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{j=1}^n (\alpha_j + \beta)^2 & \sum_{j=1}^n (\alpha_j + \beta)^2 W_t & \sum_{j=1}^n 4(\alpha_j + \beta) \\ \sum_{j=1}^n (\alpha_j + \beta)^2 W_t & \sum_{j=1}^n (\alpha_j + \beta)^2 W_t^2 & \sum_{j=1}^n 4(\alpha_j + \beta) W_t \\ \sum_{j=1}^n 4(\alpha_j + \beta) & \sum_{j=1}^n 4(\alpha_j + \beta) W_t & \sum_{j=1}^n 4^2 \end{bmatrix} \\ \times \begin{bmatrix} \delta c_1 \\ \delta c_2 \\ \delta c_3 \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} -\sum_{j=1}^n (\alpha_j + \beta) R_j \\ -\sum_{j=1}^n (\alpha_j + \beta) W_t R_j \\ -\sum_{j=1}^n 4 R_j \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

and the relation for errors Q becomes

$$\begin{bmatrix} \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j^2 & \sum_{j=1}^n W_t \alpha_j^2 \\ \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j^2 W_t & \sum_{j=1}^n W_t^2 \alpha_j^2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \delta c_4 \\ \delta c_5 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -\sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j Q_j \\ -\sum_{j=1}^n W_t \alpha_j Q_j \end{bmatrix}. \quad (19)$$

Solving these equations for $\delta c_1, \delta c_2, \dots, \delta c_5$, further optimized parameters c'_i are calculated from δc_i as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} c'_0 &= c_0 + \delta c_0 \\ c'_1 &= c_1 + \delta c_1 \\ &\vdots \\ c'_5 &= c_5 + \delta c_5 \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Table 1 Mechanical properties and thickness of the test specimen

Young's modulus E (GPa)	Poisson's ratio ν	Bulk density (g/cm ³)	Bending strength σ_B (MPa)	Thickness t (μm)
320	0.27	3.23	1035	58

Fig. 2 Bending jig for thin film

Substituting c'_i as new parameters in c_i and repeating the calculation, we finally obtain the optimum parameters.

3. Experimental Method

3.1 Specimen and bending test

The stress gradient experiment requires a very thin film having high strength for the bending test, as well as a large X-ray penetration depth. In the present experiment, gas-pressure-sintered silicon nitride was used as the test specimen. The mechanical properties and the thickness of the specimen are shown in Table 1. The ceramic thin film was polished carefully to narrow the line broadening; thus we could obtain accurate data at large ψ . We removed a 30- μm -thick layer from both surfaces of the specimen by polishing with diamond slurry of 6 μm in diameter, and then removed a 20- μm -thick layer by lapping with diamond slurry of 2 μm diameter. The final thickness of the specimen was 58 μm . The effective X-ray penetration depth of Cu-K α radiation for silicon nitride was 34.7 μm at $\psi=0^\circ$. The thickness of the specimen was 1.7 times larger than the penetration depth. The thickness of the specimen was appropriate for our experiment.

By bending the specimen on the cylinder, we were able to apply a linear stress distribution to the specimen. The bending jig used is shown in Fig. 2. Both ends of the specimen were fixed on the cylinder with strap plates, and so the known radius of curvature was applied to the specimen. The material of the bending jig was vinyl chloride, which does not diffract X-rays. The specimen with the jig can be held accurately by the holder on the goniometer stage in the directions of $\phi=0^\circ$ and 90° .

The stress-strain relationship for a pure bending plate is given by

$$\varepsilon_1 = \frac{y}{r}, \quad (21)$$

where y is the distance from the neutral axis in the thickness direction, and r is the curvature of the neutral plane. During pure bending of a plate, we can assume $\varepsilon_2=0$ and $\sigma_3=0$. Thus, the stress-strain relationships become

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_1 &= \frac{1}{E}(\sigma_1 - \nu\sigma_2) \\ \varepsilon_2 &= \frac{1}{E}(\sigma_2 - \nu\sigma_1) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

and the stress distributions in the depth direction are given by

$$\sigma_1 = \frac{E}{1-\nu^2} \varepsilon_1 \quad (23)$$

$$\sigma_2 = \nu\sigma_1. \quad (24)$$

These equations correspond to Eq.(7), and the known values of stress gradients are applied to the thin film specimen. The applied gradients were as follows: $\sigma_{10}=333$ MPa, $\sigma_{20}=90$ MPa, $A_1=-11.5$ MPa/ μ m, and $A_2=-3.10$ MPa/ μ m.

3.2 X-ray stress measurements

The X-ray stress was measured by the fixed plane normal method with the iso-inclination arrangement and the X-ray optics was the parallel beam method. The X-ray conditions are summarized in Table 2. We used the Cu-K α characteristic X-ray, since it has deep X-ray penetration depth. It is preferable that the range of $\sin^2\psi$ be wide, although the measurements at large ψ become inaccurate. The values of $\sin^2\psi$ ranged from 0 to 0.8 within measurement limits, and the increment of $\sin^2\psi$ was 0.05. The diffraction angle was determined from the average of three measurements. The X-ray elastic constants used were the experimental values reported previously⁽¹⁵⁾.

In this experiment, the accuracy of ψ directly influences the accuracy of the stress gradient analysis, so we had to prevent the backlash of the ψ -goniometer.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Comparison of experimental results and applied stress

Figure 3 shows the $\sin^2\psi$ diagram of the thin film bent in the jig. The curve in the figure indicates the results of stress gradient analysis in which the effect of film thickness is taken into account. The relationship in the $\sin^2\psi$ diagram shows nonlinearity due to a steep stress gradient of the bent specimen. The analysis agrees well with measured data. The optimized parameters for stress distributions are summarized in Table 3. The analyzed values of the surface stress and the stress gradient correspond very well to the applied values. However, the analyzed value of

Table 2 X-ray conditions for stress measurement

Characteristic X-ray	Cu-K α_1
Diffraction	3 2 3
Diffraction angle 2θ	141.260 deg
$\sin^2\psi$	0.00 ~ 0.80
Tube voltage	40 kV
Tube current	30 mA
Filter	Ni
Divergent angle	0.64 deg
Preset time	2 sec
Scanning speed	1 deg/min
Irradiated area	$4 \times 10 \text{ mm}^2$
Stress constant S	-811 MPa/deg
X-ray elastic constant E	339 GPa
X-ray Poisson's ratio ν	0.285
Linear absorption factor μ	136/cm

Table 3 Analytical results of bent thin plate

Stress distribution	Applied value	Analyzed value
σ_{10} (MPa)	333	392
σ_{20} (MPa)	90.0	201
A_1 MPa/ μ m	-11.5	-14.2
A_2 MPa/ μ m	-3.10	-3.91

Fig. 3 2θ vs. $\sin^2\psi$ diagram of bent thin film

the surface stress σ_{20} does not agree with the applied value. This may be due to the effect of the specimen edge.

From the good agreement between measured and applied values, the weighted coefficient W_t proposed in this study is concluded to be appropriate for the analysis of stress gradient of a thin film. The X-ray stress gradient for a thin film can be calculated by using the X-ray intensity diffracted from the entire thin film. This conclusion is consistent with the case of a bulk plate reported previously⁽⁹⁾. Thus, stress gradient analysis using the weighted coefficient W_t is applicable to both thin films and bulk plates. In the

analysis of the $\sin^2\psi$ diagram of a ceramic coating film showing nonlinearity, analysis using W_t is necessary.

4.2 Effect of film thickness

By changing the values of $\sin^2\psi$ from 0 to 0.8, the value of t/T changes from 1.67 to 7.39. The weighted coefficient W_t and the effective penetration depth T change with the $\sin^2\psi$ value. These changes calculated using Eq.(10) for various film thicknesses are shown in Fig. 4. The X-ray penetration depth T decreases with increasing $\sin^2\psi$ value, and then becomes equal to W_t . For the case of 58- μm -thick specimen used in the present experiment, W_t is smaller than T for small values of $\sin^2\psi$ and becomes equal to T at $\sin^2\psi=0.8$. This means that the film thickness affects the analysis of the stress gradient over the range of $\sin^2\psi=0\sim 0.8$. For film thickness $t=200\ \mu\text{m}$, W_t is equal to T ; thus, the effect of film thickness disappears. In a previous study⁽⁹⁾, we reported that the thickness effect could be disregarded when the thickness is about six times larger than the effective X-ray penetration depth. This agrees with the calculated results shown in Fig. 4.

For the X-ray stress analysis of thin films, it is important to clarify the effect of film thickness on the $\sin^2\psi$ diagram. Firstly, we simulate the effect of the thickness of the films with the same stress distribution from the surface. The simulation results for several film thicknesses are shown in Fig. 5. The films have the same stress distribution, but the $\sin^2\psi$ diagram is different as shown in the figure. $\sin^2\psi$ of the thin film is affected by film thickness; therefore, we must use the analytical method where film thickness is taken into account. Since the stress difference in a 10- μm -thick film is small, nonlinearity of the $\sin^2\psi$ diagram becomes small. The difference in stress values of thicker films is large, and hence nonlinearity of the

Fig. 4 Change in coefficient of weight with $\sin^2\psi$

$\sin^2\psi$ diagram becomes considerable.

Figure 6 shows the results of the simulation of the $\sin^2\psi$ diagram for a film specimen with 50 μm thickness bent to various curvatures. From Eq.(24) and $A_2 = \nu A_1$, Eq.(11) is rewritten as follows:

$$\langle 2\theta_{\phi=0\psi} \rangle = -\frac{2(1+\nu)}{E} \tan \theta_0 (\sigma_{10} + A_1 W_t) \sin^2\psi + \frac{2(1+\nu)\nu}{E} \tan \theta_0 (\sigma_{10} + A_1 W_t) + 2\theta_0. \quad (25)$$

The $\langle 2\theta_{\phi=0\psi} \rangle$ value is equal to the stress-free diffraction angle $2\theta_0$ at $\sin^2\psi = \nu$, so the curves merge at $\sin^2\psi = \nu$. When we apply several values of the bending stress to the thin film, we have

$$\sin^2\psi = \nu, \quad \langle 2\theta_{\phi=0\psi} \rangle = 2\theta_0 \quad (26)$$

$$\sin^2\psi = 0,$$

$$\langle 2\theta_{\phi=0\psi} \rangle = \frac{2(1+\nu)\nu}{E} \tan \theta_0 (\sigma_{10} + A_1 W_t) + 2\theta_0. \quad (27)$$

If the mechanical elastic constants are known, σ_{10} and $A_1 W_t$ can be calculated and then the X-ray elastic constants can be determined using Eqs.(26) and (27).

Our method of X-ray stress gradient analysis can be applied to ceramic film and other thin films. Since thin films are usually multi-layered rather than single-layered, the stress gradient analysis is important, in

Fig. 5 Effect of film thickness on $2\theta - \sin^2\psi$ diagram

Fig. 6 Thin film with applied bending stresses

addition to the stress on the surface.

5. Conclusion

In the present study, we analyzed the stress gradients in ceramic thin film by taking into account the effect of film thickness. We assumed that the diffraction intensity from the entire thickness influences the stress analysis, and proposed the method of stress gradient analysis using the weighted coefficient including the film thickness. We also derived a method for determining the parameters for stress distributions.

We applied our method to analysis of the stress gradient in the case of bending of a 58- μm -thick silicon nitride film. The analytical results agreed very well with applied stress distributions. It is concluded that the stress gradients should be determined from the weighted average stress over the entire thin film.

Under a given stress distribution, the nonlinearity of the $\sin^2\psi$ diagram becomes pronounced with an increase in film thickness, since the stress difference within the film is large. If the film thickness is six times larger than the effective X-ray penetration depth, the $\sin^2\psi$ diagram of the film corresponds to that of the bulk specimen. We also proposed a measurement method of X-ray elastic constants of the thin film by applying bending stresses.

Acknowledgement

This work was financially supported by a Grant-in-Aid for Science Research from the Ministry of Education, Sports, Science and Culture of Japan.

References

- (1) Chen, P. C. and Oshida, Y., Residual Stress Analysis of a Multi-Layer Thin Film Structure by Destructive (Curvature) and Non-Destructive (X-ray) Method, *Mat. Res. Soc. Symp. Proc.*, Vol. 153 (1989), p. 363.
- (2) Oshida, Y. and Chen, P. C., Nondestructive Low-Cycle Fatigue Characterization of Multi-Layer Thin Film Structure, *J. Nondestr. Eval.*, Vol. 8, No. 4 (1989), p. 235.
- (3) Eigenmann, B., Scholtes, B. and Macherauch, E., X-ray Residual Stress Determination in Thin Chromium Coatings on Steel, *Surface Eng.*, Vol. 7, No. 3 (1991), p. 221.
- (4) Idemitsu, K., Endoh, T. and Kawakami, M., X-ray Measurement of Residual Stress Distribution in Later Heat Treated TiN Coated Caron Steels, *Nondestr. Test Eval.*, Vol. 8, No. 9 (1992), p. 919.
- (5) Durand, N., Badawi, K. F., Declémy, A. and Goudeau, Ph., Origin of Residual Stress in a Textured Au Thin Film on a LiF Substrate, *Appl. Surface Sci.*, Vol. 81 (1994), p. 191.
- (6) Shibano, J., Ukai, T., Tadano, S. and Todoh, M., Residual Stress Evaluation in the Vicinity of Ceramic Coating Interface Using Polychromatic X-ray Method, *Trans. Jpn. Soc. Mech. Eng.* (in Japanese), Vol. 61, No. 586, A (1995), p. 1356.
- (7) Noyan, I. C., Huang, T. C. and York, B. R., Residual Stress/Strain Analysis in Thin Films by X-ray Diffraction, *Critical Reviews in Solid State and Materials Sciences*, Vol. 20, No. 2 (1995), p. 125.
- (8) Yoshioka, Y., Sasaki, T. and Kuramoto, M., Multiaxial Stress Analysis Taking Account of Penetration Depth of X-rays, *J. Soc. for Non-destructive Inspection, Jpn* (in Japanese), Vol. 34 (1985), p. 52.
- (9) Suzuki, K., Tanaka, K. and Sakaida, Y., Penetration Depth in X-ray Analysis of Steep Stress Gradient Near Surface, *J. Soc. Mater. Sci., Jpn*, (in Japanese), Vol. 45 (1996), p. 759.
- (10) Sasaki, T., Kuramoto, M. and Yoshioka, Y., X-ray Stress Measurement in Zn-Ni Alloy Electroplating, *The 26th Symp. on X-ray Studies and Mech. Behavior of Mater., Soc. Mater. Sci., Jpn*, (in Japanese), (1989), p. 134.
- (11) Sasaki, T., Kuramoto, M. and Yoshioka, Y., A Method of X-ray Tri-axial Stress Analysis for Thin Films and Example of its Application, *J. Soc. for Non-destructive Inspection, Jpn* (in Japanese), Vol. 42 (1993), p. 237.
- (12) Sasaki, T. and Hirose, Y., A Method of X-ray Stress Measurement for Composite Materials Considering Macro- and Microstresses with Steep Stress Gradient, *Trans. Jpn. Soc. Mech. Eng.* (in Japanese), Vol. 61, No. 585, A (1995), p. 1031.
- (13) Wolfstieg, U., ψ -Goniometer, *HTM*, Vol. 31 (1976), p. 19.
- (14) Marquardt, D. W., An Algorithm for Least-Squares Estimation of Non-linear Parameters, *J. SIAM*, Vol. 11, No. 2 (1963), p. 431.
- (15) Tanaka, K., Hattori, Y. and Tanaka, H., Diffraction-Plane Dependence of Elastic Constants of Silicon Nitride for X-ray Stress Measurement, *J. Soc. Mater. Sci., Jpn* (in Japanese), Vol. 44 (1995), p. 1110.