University of Groningen

Order and Domain Strengthening in Highly Pure and Commercial Cu₂NiZn

Wegen, G.J.L. van der; Bronsveld, P.M.; Hosson, J.Th.M. De

Published in:

Metallurgical transactions a-Physical metallurgy and materials science

DOI:

[10.1007/bf02644182](https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02644182)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:

1981

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Wegen, G. J. L. V. D., Bronsveld, P. M., & Hosson, J. T. M. D. (1981). Order and Domain Strengthening in Highly Pure and Commercial Cu₂NiZn. *Metallurgical transactions a-Physical metallurgy and materials science*, 12(12), 2125-2129. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02644182>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Order and Domain Strengthening in Highly Pure and Commercial Cu₂NiZn

G. J. L. VAN DER WEGEN, P. M. BRONSVELD, AND J. TH. M. DE HOSSON

Vickers microhardness measurements are performed on the ordering alloy Cu₂NiZn to determine the dependence of the strength upon the quench temperature and the antiphase domain size. The influence of impurities on the strength is investigated by performing the measurements on a highly pure and on a commercial alloy. A maximum in strength as a function of the quench temperature has been found, which is similar of shape and position as reported for Ni₃Mn. The extent of domain hardening in Cu₂NiZn is rather small, like in Ni₃Mn and Ni₃Fe. Cu₂NiZn, as an alloy with an L_1 structure, can best be compared with Ni₃Fe and Ni₃Mn in its mechanical behavior, instead of with Cu₃Au. Transmission electron microscopy has revealed that antiphase domain growth in Cu₂NiZn obeys a $D^n - D_0^n = kt$ law, where n decreases with increasing temperature, except near the critical temperature T_{cl} , where the antiphase boundaries align themselves along {100} planes.

PREVIOUS investigations on the relation between the mechanical properties of alloys with an L_1 structure and their state of order have mostly been concerned with Cu₃Au. An excellent review on this subject is published by Stoloff and Davies.¹ Already in 1955 Ardley² performed experiments on Cu₃Au single crystals and scrutinized separately the consequences of varying the antiphase domain size and the degree of order. Marcinkowski and Miller³ investigated the change in yield and flow stress with quench temperature and the change in flow stress with aging time for different ordering temperatures on Ni₃Mn polycrystalline wires. Davies and Stoloff⁴ have performed Vickers hardness measurements on Cu₃Au and several Ni-Fe and Ni-Mn alloys close to stoichiometric Ni₃X to determine the isothermal hardening curves. More recently Calvayrac and Fayard⁵ carried out tensile tests on Ni₃Fe in which they determined the yield and flow stress as a function of the annealing time at a temperature just below the critical temperature.

The main conclusions that can be drawn from these investigations are:

- 1) If the long-range order parameter decreases, the flow stress increases (provided that the domain size is kept large). The increment is much larger for Cu₃Au than for Ni₃Mn.
- 2) Close to the critical temperature the flow stress falls sharply to a value corresponding to the short-range ordered structure. For Cu₃Au this decrease occurs at the critical temperature, for Ni₃Mn about 15 K below it.
- 3) If the domain size increases, the room temperature flow stress passes through a maximum at a domain diameter of about 3 nm. Calvayrac and Fayard, however, claim that the maximum in flow stress for Ni₃Fe is attained at a domain diameter of about 11 nm. Beyond the maximum softening occurs as a result of domain

growth.⁶ The extent of this softening process is much larger in Cu₃Au than in Ni₃Mn or Ni₃Fe.

The aim of this research is to determine the Vickers microhardness of Cu₂NiZn as a function of the degree of long-range order and the average domain size. The influence of impurities on the state of order is studied by performing the measurements on highly pure Cu₂NiZn and on commercial Cu₂NiZn.

The interpretation of the mechanical properties of L_1 alloys is still a controversial matter. As Calvayrac and Fayard⁵ already stated, the behavior of Cu₃Au is too often extrapolated to all the L_1 alloys. Therefore the experimental data on Cu₂NiZn will elucidate some of the general behavior of L_1 alloys.

At high temperature Cu₂NiZn possesses an f.c.c. disordered structure. Below the first critical temperature, $T_{c1} \approx 774$ K for the stoichiometric alloy, a modified L_1 structure exists, in which the Zn atoms occupy one of the four interpenetrating simple cubic sublattices, while the Cu and Ni atoms are still randomly distributed over the remaining three sublattices. Below a second critical temperature, $T_{c2} \approx 600$ K, a modified L_1 structure exists, in which Cu occupies two sublattices and Ni the remaining sublattice.⁷

EXPERIMENTAL

The highly pure alloy was made by melting together appropriate amounts of 5N copper, 4N nickel and 5N zinc in an evacuated tube of fused quartz. The alloy was homogenized at 1120 K for 10 days and subsequently cold-worked to bars of $4 \times 4 \times 15$ mm³. These samples were annealed at 1120 K for 5 days in evacuated tubes of fused quartz to remove internal stresses and to obtain a large grain size. The commercial alloy was kindly provided by Wieland-Metallwerke, Ulm (FRG). Chemical analyses result in a composition of 51.6 at. pct Cu, 24.7 at. pct Ni and 23.7 at. pct Zn for the highly pure alloy and 49.7 at. pct Cu, 25.0 at. pct Ni and 25.3 at. pct Zn for the commercial alloy, with main impurities: 0.013 at. pct Mn and 0.008 at. pct Fe.

The bars were annealed in evacuated tubes of Pyrex

G. J. L. VAN DER WEGEN, P. M. BRONSVELD, and J. TH. M. DE HOSSON are Student, Scientific Co-Worker and Professor of Applied Physics, respectively, University of Groningen, Department of Applied Physics, Materials Science Centre, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, Nijenborgh 18, 9747 AG Groningen, The Netherlands. Manuscript submitted March 20, 1981.

glass at 830 K and quenched in water to maintain the disordered structure. Bars for investigating the microhardness as a function of the quench temperature were annealed at 723 K for 96 h to obtain a large domain size (about 105 nm) and were also quenched in water. Subsequent annealing treatments at appropriate temperatures were done in the same way. The annealing time varied from three hours for high temperature to two hundred hours for low temperature treatments. The bars were embedded in a thermoplast and carefully mechanically polished with diamond paste up to a quarter of a micron and then chemically etched. The Vickers microhardness was determined by taking the average of 24 independent indentations for the highly pure alloy and 36 independent indentations for two commercial alloys each. The average size of the grains is 200 μm and 100 μm , respectively for the two types of alloys compared with an indentation of about 40 μm in size.

The average domain size as a function of the annealing time at several temperatures is determined by imaging the antiphase domains in the Philips EM 300

Fig. 1—Vickers microhardness vs the quench temperature for the highly pure and for the commercial alloy. The error bars represent the standard deviations.

Fig. 2—Average domain size vs the annealing time for temperatures indicated.

transmission electron microscope. The preparation of the specimens is done in the same way as described in Ref. (8).

RESULTS

In Fig. 1 the relationship between the Vickers microhardness and the quench temperature is depicted both for the highly pure and for the commercial alloy. The commercial alloy has on the whole a higher microhardness than the highly pure alloy. The latter exhibits a rather strong dependence of the microhardness on the quench temperature for the L_1 structure. The commercial alloy, on the contrary, shows a constancy in the temperature range of 620 K to 750 K. The maximum in the hardness of the commercial alloy lies at about 767 K, about 18 K below its critical temperature. For the highly pure alloy the maximum is situated at 750 K, about 17 K below its critical temperature which is 767 K for this composition. Taking the same temperature difference, T_{c2} for the latter alloy can be estimated as 600 K. The resulting temperature range in which L_1 is stable is supported by X-ray data.⁷

Figure 2 shows the relation between the average domain size and the annealing time for the temperatures: 623 K, 673 K, 723 K and 763 K. All curves obey

Fig. 3—Antiphase domain boundaries corresponding to a temperature of 630 K. Dark field strong beam image; projection plane (110); $g = [010]$.

Fig. 4—Antiphase domain boundaries corresponding to a temperature of 763 K. Dark field strong beam image; projection plane (100); $g = [010]$.

an $D^n - D_0^n = kt$ law. In contrast to results on Cu_3Au and Ni_3Fe , n is not equal to 2 and it is temperature dependent. As the temperature increases, n is decreasing except near T_{c1} , where n increases with temperature like in Ni_3Fe .⁹ Below about 730 K the domain boundaries are curved like in Ni_3Fe and Ni_3Mn (Fig. 3), while above 730 K the boundaries are oriented preferentially along the cubic planes like in Cu_3Au (Fig. 4). This is opposite of what one would expect, because the tendency for antiphase boundaries to align themselves along certain planes should decrease as the temperature increases.¹⁰ The curves of 623 K, 673 K and 723 K are used to construct the curve appropriate for 608 K (dotted line). The curves of 608 K and 723 K are extrapolated to short annealing times needed for the kinetic studies in the next section. However, after the nucleation, the domain grows first at the expense of the short-range ordered matrix, a process which is much faster than the growth at a later stage, when domains are in contact with each other. This results in two linear stages as observed in Ni_3Fe .^{5,9} The transition points in the case of Ni_3Fe would occur at domain sizes smaller than 6 nm. Since the measurements are performed at annealing times corresponding to larger domain sizes, this first stage is absent in Fig. 2. Domain sizes at these short annealing times cannot be determined by means of transmission electron microscopy, because of the large experimental error involved, nor by X-ray diffraction techniques, because of the similar scattering factors.

Figure 5 shows the microhardness as a function of the $L1_2$ antiphase domain size at 723 K. The curve of the commercial alloy displays a maximum at some intermediate value of the domain size, like all other $L1_2$ alloys. The peak is situated at a domain size of about 12 nm. The highly pure alloy exhibits no maximum, and hence, only domain hardening occurs. Figure 26 shows the microhardness as a function of the $L1_2$ domain size at 608 K. The maximum is situated at a domain size of about 7.5 nm.

DISCUSSION

Microhardness reveals the strength of a material in a rather complex manner, because it is a combination of yield strength and strain hardening. For wedge shaped

Fig. 5—Vickers microhardness vs the $L1_2$ domain size at 723 K. The error bars represent the standard deviations.

indentations, the microhardness should be compared with the flow stress at 15.2 pct strain.¹¹ Since the strain hardening coefficient of Cu_2NiZn is not known as a function of quench temperature, it is not possible to give a quantitative comparison between the experimental results of Fig. 1 and the existing theories of the yield stress for ordered alloys. Such a comparison between the experimental and theoretical yield stress as function of the long-range order parameters will be the subject of a subsequent paper.

Marcinkowski and Miller³ measured the flow stress of Ni_3Mn as a function of the quench temperature. The curve for 10 pct strain is similar to Fig. 1 with respect to position, width and height of the maximum just below T_{c1} and the magnitude of the drop in microhardness relative to the $L1_2$ strength. Ardley² measured the yield stress of Cu_3Au single crystals at temperature. He observed a maximum at the critical temperature with a relative height much larger than the one observed in Fig. 1.

Several order strengthening theories are proposed in the literature. Due to the very large domains (> 100 nm), only a very small contribution of Cottrell's domain hardening mechanism⁶ is adding to the strength of the present alloys. Flinn's mechanism of antiphase boundary formation as a result of dislocation climb¹⁰ does not apply here, because the deformation is performed at room temperature and hence no dislocation climb occurs. Brown¹² accounts for the difference in energy between the thermal equilibrium configuration of the antiphase boundary connecting the two unit dislocations of a superdislocation, and its higher energy state after shear. However, this theory cannot account for the maximum at strains as large as 10 pct, since at these high strains most of the initially pinned dislocations will be free from their thermal equilibrium antiphase boundaries, so no maximum should occur. None of these strengthening mechanisms can account for the observed microhardness as a function of the quench temperature. Sumino¹³ argued that the stress field of the dislocations causes oriented short-range order resulting in a maximum strength at the critical temperature. However, the maximum strength is observed 18 K below the critical temperature (like in Ni_3Mn) in disagreement with Sumino's theory. Marcinkowski and Miller explained their results on Ni_3Mn with short-range order strength-

Fig. 6—Vickers microhardness vs the $L1_2$ domain size at 608 K. The error bars represent the standard deviations.

ening, based on the work of Fisher¹⁴ and Rudman.¹⁵ Nearest neighbor short-range order and long-range order parameters calculated¹⁶ within the tetrahedron approximation of the Cluster Variation Method of Kikuchi for Cu₂NiZn are used to determine the short-range order strengthening as proposed by Fisher and Rudman. No significant strengthening was calculated for the ordered alloy, so this mechanism is not likely to be predominant. Davies and Stoloff¹⁷ suggested that a transition of superdislocation to single dislocation motion occurs at the critical temperature. Cook¹⁸ and Moine¹⁹ developed this suggestion into a quantitative description of the yield strength as a function of the order parameters. For Cu₂NiZn these theories result in a yield stress for the disordered alloy much lower than for the ordered alloy. Preliminary tensile measurements on both types of alloys, however, indicate that the yield stress is about the same for the ordered and disordered alloy. As a matter of fact, the yield stress measured is 120 MPa for a commercial alloy and 110 MPa for the highly pure alloy. Moreover, the strain hardening coefficient for both alloys is 1180 MPa and 830 MPa for the ordered and for the disordered alloys, respectively. We now express the Vickers hardness as a function of the flow stress according to the equation:¹¹

$$VH = C \cdot [\sigma_Y + 0.152 \cdot \theta_{II}], \quad [1]$$

where σ_Y is the yield strength and θ_{II} is the strain hardening coefficient. The proportionality coefficient C calculated from the mechanical properties of the disordered alloys is 0.406 for both alloys. The Vickers microhardness, calculated from the above data for the ordered alloys using the same C -value are 121 (kgf/mm²) and 117 (kgf/mm²), respectively, which is in good agreement with the observed values. The strong dependence of the microhardness on the quench temperature close to T_{c1} in Fig. 1 and the absence of a maximum in the annealing curve of Fig. 5 for the highly pure alloy can be explained by its composition. The alloy is not stoichiometric and therefore possesses a two phase structure close to T_{c1} .

The maximum in the annealing curves of Figs. 5 and 6 should be due to the transition from single dislocation slip to superdislocation slip,⁴ as was observed by electron microscopy in the case of Ni₃Fe and Ni₃Mn.^{5,20} At small domain sizes, when slip takes place by the movement of unit dislocations, short-range order strengthening as proposed by Fisher¹⁴ occurs. Just before the maximum a two phase structure of ordered domains in a short-range ordered matrix exist.^{4,5} The superdislocations will move easily through the ordered domains but require extra stress to move through the matrix as they decrease the short-range order.³ At the maximum a contiguous domain structure is present, so Cottrell's domain strengthening mechanism applies:

$$\tau = \frac{\gamma}{D} \left(1 - \frac{\alpha t}{D}\right), \quad [2]$$

where τ is the critical resolved shear stress, γ is the antiphase boundary energy, D is the average domain size, α is a geometrical factor, being 6 for cubic domains and 3 for spherical domains and t is the thickness of the domain boundary.⁶ Since the microhardness is meas-

ured as an average over many grains, the shear stress in Eq. [2] should be multiplied by the Taylor factor m . For very large domain sizes no domain hardening occurs, the microhardness then being proportional to the flow stress at 15.2 pct strain. Assuming that these two contributions (Eq. [1] and Eq. [2]) to the strength are additive, the microhardness can be written as:

$$VH = C \left[\frac{m\gamma}{D} \left(1 - \frac{\alpha t}{D}\right) + (\sigma_Y + 0.152 \cdot \theta_{II}) \right], \quad [3]$$

where VH is the Vickers microhardness in kgf/mm², C is the proportionality coefficient, σ_Y is the yield strength of the ordered alloy in MPa for very large domain sizes and θ_{II} is the strain hardening coefficient of the ordered alloy in MPa. Equation [3] results in a maximum at a domain size of $2\alpha t$, which is obtained from Figs. 5 and 6. The antiphase boundary energy has been calculated using theoretical ordering energies and long-range order parameters²¹ resulting in the values 0.080 (J/m²) at 723 K and 0.084 (J/m²) at 608 K. Since all parameters in Eq. [3] are known, theoretical curves of the microhardness as a function of the average domain size can be computed. They are displayed in Figs. 5 and 6 as solid lines. Equation [3] only applies when a contiguous domain structure is present. The left part of the calculated curves are therefore shown as dotted lines. The experimental values agree very well as far as the commercial alloy is concerned. However, for the highly pure alloy less agreement is obtained, probably due to a non-stoichiometric composition, resulting in a two phase structure of ordered domains in a short-range ordered matrix. Taking α equal to 4, the antiphase domain boundary thickness t is 1.4 nm at 723 K and 0.9 nm at 608 K, which is smaller than observed in transmission electron microscopy (Figs. 3 and 4).

On comparison with the strength at infinite domain size, the contribution of the domain hardening to the total strength of the alloys is 4 pct at the maximum and 1 pct at a domain size of 100 nm, as can be seen in Figs. 5 and 6. According to Ardley² the domain hardening in Cu₃Au amounts to 55 pct of the total strength at 598 K, where as for Ni₃Fe and Ni₃Mn alloys this value is about 5 pct.⁴

CONCLUSION

From this work the following conclusions can be drawn:

1) The maximum in strength as a function of the quench temperature is situated at about 18 K below the critical temperature, like in Ni₃Mn. The width and the height of the maximum and the drop in microhardness after the maximum is similar to the curve of the flow stress as a function of the quench temperature for 10 pct strain of Ni₃Mn.³

2) The theories of Brown, Flinn and Rudman cannot account for the observed dependence of the microhardness on the quench temperature in the case of Cu₂NiZn.

3) Antiphase domain growth in Cu₂NiZn obey a $D^n - D_0^n = kt$ law, where n decreases with increasing temperature, except near T_{c1} , where the antiphase

boundaries align themselves along {100} planes.

4) The extent of domain hardening in Cu_2NiZn is small, like in Ni_3Mn and Ni_3Fe .⁴ The opposite is true for Cu_3Au .²

5) Cu_2NiZn , as an alloy with an $L1_2$ structure, can best be compared with Ni_3Mn and Ni_3Fe as regards its mechanical behavior, instead of with Cu_3Au .

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are much indebted to Dr. Dürrschnabel, associated with Wieland-Metallwerke, Ulm (FRG), who kindly provided the commercial alloy. Particular thanks are due to Mr. H. J. Bron for performing the micro-hardness measurements and to Mr. J. Harkema and Mr. U. B. Nieborg for technical assistance in preparing the samples. The work reported was carried out as part of a project on ordering in ternary alloys of the Foundation for Fundamental Research on Matter (FOM-Mt VI/2) at Utrecht and was also made possible by financial support from the Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research (ZWO) at the Hague, The Netherlands.

REFERENCES

1. N. S. Stoloff and R. G. Davies: *Prog. Mater. Sci.*, 1966, vol. 13, p. 1-83.
2. G. W. Ardley: *Acta Metall.*, 1955, vol. 3, 525.
3. M. J. Marcinkowski and D. S. Miller: *Philos. Mag.*, 1961, vol. 6, p. 871.
4. R. G. Davies and N. S. Stoloff: *Acta Metall.* 1963, vol. 11, p. 1347.
5. Y. Calvayrac and M. Fayard: *Phys. Status Solidi*, (a) 1973, vol. 17, p. 407.
6. A. H. Cottrell: *Seminar on Relations of Properties to Microstructure*, American Society for Metals, Cleveland, OH, 1955, p. 151.
7. W. H. M. Van Der Vegt, G. J. L. Van Der Wegen, P. M. Bronsveld, and J. Th. M. De Hosson: *Int. Un. of Crystallography, XIIth Congress*, Ottawa (1981).
8. G. J. L. Van Der Wegen, P. M. Bronsveld, and J. Th. M. De Hosson: *Scr. Metall.*, 1980, vol. 14, p. 285.
9. D. G. Morris, G. T. Brown, R. C. Piller, and R. E. Smallman: *Acta Metall.* 1976, vol. 24, p. 21.
10. P. A. Flinn: *Trans. TMS-AIME* 1960, vol. 218, p. 145.
11. F. A. McClintock and A. S. Argon: *Mechanical Behavior of Materials*, 1st ed., p. 455, Addison-Wesley Publ. Co., Don Mills, Ontario, 1966.
12. N. Brown: *Philos. Mag.* 1959, vol. 4, p. 693.
13. K. Sumino: *Sci. Rep. Res. Inst Tôhoku Univ.* 1958, vol. A 10, p. 283.
14. J. C. Fisher: *Acta Metall.*, 1954, vol. 2, p. 9.
15. P. S. Rudman: *Acta Metall.*, 1962, vol. 10, p. 253.
16. A. De Rooy, E. W. Van Royen, P. M. Bronsveld, and J. Th. M. De Hosson: *Acta Metall.*, 1980, vol. 28, p. 1339.
17. N. S. Stoloff and R. G. Davies: *Acta Metall.*, 1964, vol. 12, p. 473.
18. H. E. Cook: *Trans. TMS-AIME* 1968, vol. 242, p. 1599.
19. P. Moine, J. P. Eymery, and P. Grosbras: *Phys. Status Solidi* (b), 1971, vol. 46, p. 177.
20. F. M. C. Besag and R. E. Smallman: *Proc. 3rd Bolton Landing Conf. AIME*, p. 259, 1970.
21. J. De Groot, P. M. Bronsveld, and J. Th. M. De Hosson: *Phys. Status Solidi* (a) 1979, vol. 52, p. 635.