



Analysis of Semiconductor Thin Films for Solar Cell Applications

¹Wanchai Mulyadi

¹Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Daehan Institute of Management and Logistics

¹wanchai.mulyadi@diml-kr.org

Peer Review Information	Abstract
<i>Submission: 06 July 2016</i> <i>Revision: 21 Aug 2016</i> <i>Acceptance: 12 Sep 2016</i> Keywords <i>semiconductor thin films, solar cells, optical band gap, photovoltaic characterization, thin-film deposition</i>	Semiconductor thin films are central to second-generation and emerging photovoltaic technologies because they combine strong optical absorption with reduced material consumption and compatibility with large-area processing. This methodology paper presents a reproducible framework for analyzing thin films intended for solar-cell absorbers and functional layers. The approach integrates controlled film deposition and annealing with structural, morphological, optical, electrical and device-level characterization. X-ray diffraction is used to identify crystalline phases and estimate crystallite size; scanning electron microscopy is used to evaluate grain morphology and surface continuity; UV-visible spectroscopy is used to determine transmittance, absorption coefficient and optical band gap; and four-point-probe or Hall measurements are used to quantify sheet resistance, resistivity, carrier density and mobility. Selected films are incorporated into a photovoltaic stack and evaluated under AM1.5G illumination using current-density-voltage and, where available, external quantum-efficiency measurements. The literature available up to 2016 demonstrates that CIGS and CdTe thin-film cells had surpassed 22% laboratory efficiency, while perovskite cells had reached a comparable level and CZTSSe remained lower but attractive because of earth-abundant constituents. The proposed workflow therefore emphasizes correlations among microstructure, optical absorption, electrical transport and photovoltaic parameters rather than relying on any single characterization result. The framework is suitable for systematic comparison of semiconductor thin films and for identifying processing conditions that maximize solar-cell suitability.

Introduction

Photovoltaic conversion requires a semiconductor to absorb solar photons, create electron-hole pairs and collect those carriers before recombination. The detailed-balance treatment of Shockley and Queisser established the fundamental connection between absorber band gap and the limiting efficiency of a single-junction solar cell [1]. Thin-film photovoltaics exploit this physics with absorber layers that are typically much thinner than crystalline-wafer devices, particularly when direct-band-gap semiconductors provide absorption coefficients

high enough to capture useful sunlight within micrometre- or sub-micrometre-scale layers. Chopra, Paulson and Dutta described the technological value of this approach in terms of lower material usage, diverse substrates and a wide choice of physical, chemical and hybrid deposition routes [3].

The performance of a thin-film solar cell depends on more than nominal chemical composition. Deposition rate, substrate temperature, stoichiometry, post-deposition annealing, grain size, defect density, surface roughness and

interfaces can alter the band structure, carrier lifetime, mobility and recombination losses. Transparent conducting oxides are equally important because the front contact must combine low electrical resistance with high optical transmission; ZnO-, In₂O₃- and SnO₂-based systems are widely used for this purpose [4], and their photovoltaic roles include current collection, structural templating and work-function control [5]. Consequently, a useful analysis must link material properties to the final electrical response of a device rather than report isolated microscopy or spectroscopy observations.

By 2016, several thin-film families had established strong photovoltaic performance. CIGS benefited from alkali-assisted interface and absorber engineering [7,13], CdTe devices demonstrated open-circuit voltage above 1 V [12], solution-processed CZTSSe achieved 12.6% efficiency [9], and hybrid perovskites progressed rapidly from early mesoscopic cells [6] to reproducible sequential deposition [8] and large-grain high-efficiency films [11]. The purpose of the present paper is therefore to define a step-by-step methodology for comparing semiconductor thin films for solar-cell applications using measurable structural, optical and electrical indicators, with literature restricted to publications available in 2016 or earlier.

Literature Review

Early photovoltaic theory provides the criteria by which absorber materials should be judged: a suitable band gap, efficient optical absorption and suppression of non-radiative losses are needed to approach the single-junction efficiency limit [1]. Practical thin-film technologies add processing constraints. The overview by Chopra et al. [3] emphasized that device architecture and film-growth conditions must be considered together because the contact, buffer, absorber and back-contact layers form an interdependent stack. Optical analysis is also sensitive to thickness and interference; Swanepoel's transmission-envelope method remains a widely used basis for extracting thickness and optical constants from thin films on transparent substrates [2].

For conventional inorganic thin-film photovoltaics, CIGS and CdTe illustrate the importance of composition and post-deposition treatment. Chirilă et al. showed that potassium-induced surface modification could improve CIGS junction properties and efficiency [7], while Jackson et al. later reported additional gains from heavier alkali elements and device efficiencies up

to 22.6% [13]. For CdTe, Burst et al. demonstrated devices with open-circuit voltage above 1 V by addressing absorber doping and recombination limitations [12]. These studies indicate that structural phase purity alone is insufficient: interface chemistry, carrier concentration and recombination must also be examined.

Kesterite CZTSSe is attractive because it replaces scarce indium and gallium with more abundant zinc and tin. Wang et al. reported a 12.6% CZTSSe device and attributed performance gains to improved bulk absorber quality and optical architecture [9]. Emerging perovskite absorbers showed even faster progress. Kim et al. reported a solid-state mesoscopic perovskite device with efficiency above 9% in 2012 [6]; Burschka et al. improved reproducibility through sequential deposition [8]; Green, Ho-Baillie and Snaith summarized the rapid technology emergence and the diversity of viable processing routes [10]; and Nie et al. linked millimetre-scale grains with high solution-processed device efficiency [11]. Together these studies reinforce the value of grain morphology, complete coverage and controlled interfaces in thin-film analysis.

The standardized efficiency tables published by Green and co-workers provide a useful 2016 benchmark for comparing device classes [14]. Their data show that mature chalcogenide absorbers and emerging perovskites had already entered the >20% laboratory-efficiency regime, whereas CZTSSe remained substantially lower. The literature therefore supports a characterization strategy that measures (i) crystallinity and phase composition, (ii) film continuity and grain structure, (iii) band gap and absorption strength, (iv) electrical conductivity and carrier transport, and (v) final device parameters under standardized illumination.

Methodology

1. Research Design and Sample Preparation

A comparative experimental design is proposed. For a selected semiconductor system, at least three processing conditions should be prepared in triplicate so that one variable—such as annealing temperature, deposition time, precursor concentration or sputtering power—is changed while other conditions are held constant. Glass or transparent-conducting-oxide-coated glass substrates are sequentially cleaned in detergent, deionized water, acetone and isopropanol, then dried with clean air or

nitrogen. The thin film is deposited by the method appropriate to the selected material, for example magnetron sputtering, thermal evaporation, chemical bath deposition, spray/solution coating or a sequential solution route. Such flexibility is consistent with the broad thin-film fabrication approaches described by Chopra et al. [3] and the solution-processing routes demonstrated for perovskites [8,11].

After deposition, samples are thermally treated under a controlled atmosphere selected for the material system. Temperature and holding time are recorded for every specimen. Film thickness is measured by profilometry or cross-sectional microscopy; when transparent-substrate transmission fringes are sufficiently clear, optical thickness can also be estimated using the Swanepoel approach [2]. All samples are coded before characterization to reduce subjective selection of favorable regions.



Figure 1. Step-by-step workflow for analysis of semiconductor thin films for photovoltaic applications.

2. Structural, Morphological and Optical Characterization

Step 1—Structural analysis: X-ray diffraction (XRD) patterns are collected over a suitable 2θ range. Peaks are matched with reference phases to confirm the desired semiconductor and detect secondary phases. Crystallite size can be estimated from the Scherrer relation $D = K\lambda/(\beta \cos\theta)$, with instrumental broadening considered where possible. *Step 2—Morphological analysis:* scanning electron microscopy (SEM) is used to record surface coverage, grain size distribution, pinholes and cross-sectional thickness. For photovoltaic absorbers, a compact morphology with limited shunting pathways is preferred; the importance of grain growth and film continuity is evident in perovskite studies [8,11].

Step 3—Optical analysis: UV-visible transmittance and/or reflectance spectra are recorded. The absorption coefficient α is calculated from measured optical data and thickness, and the optical band gap is obtained from the linear region of a Tauc-type plot appropriate to the transition. Optical analysis must be checked against film thickness because interference can distort apparent absorption edges; transmission-envelope analysis can be used when applicable [2]. A solar-cell absorber should provide strong absorption over the visible spectrum while maintaining a band gap

compatible with efficient single-junction conversion [1].

3. Electrical and Device-Level Characterization

Step 4—Electrical analysis: sheet resistance is measured using a four-point probe, and resistivity is calculated using the measured thickness. Hall measurements, when available, provide majority-carrier type, carrier concentration and mobility. Transparent front-contact films should show both high transmission and low resistivity, reflecting the performance requirements described for TCO materials [4,5]. *Step 5—Device fabrication:* the best absorber conditions are incorporated into a standard stack suitable for the material (for example, glass/TCO/buffer/absorber/back contact or substrate/back contact/absorber/buffer/TCO). The exact stack and contact metals must be reported because interface energetics can strongly alter the measured photovoltaic parameters [7,12,13].

Step 6—Photovoltaic testing: current-density-voltage (J-V) curves are measured under calibrated AM1.5G illumination at approximately 1000 W m^{-2} and controlled temperature. Open-circuit voltage (V_{oc}), short-circuit current density (J_{sc}), fill factor (FF) and power-conversion efficiency (η) are extracted, where $\eta = V_{oc} \times J_{sc} \times FF / P_{in}$. External quantum efficiency (EQE), if available, is measured to

verify spectral photocurrent generation and to cross-check J_{sc} . Dark J-V measurements may be used to identify leakage and diode-quality limitations. The reporting approach should

follow the emphasis on independently measured; standardized cell performance used in established efficiency tables [14].

Table 1. Characterization plan and decision criteria for solar-cell thin films

Technique	Primary output	Solar-cell relevance	Preferred indication
XRD	Phase, orientation, crystallite size	Identifies desired absorber and parasitic phases	Strong target-phase peaks; minimal secondary phases
SEM / profilometry	Coverage, grain size, thickness	Controls absorption, interfaces and shunting	Dense, uniform, pinhole-free film
UV-Vis	Transmission, absorption, band gap	Determines spectral utilization	High absorber α ; suitable E_g
Four-point / Hall	R_s , ρ , carrier type, n , μ	Controls series loss and charge transport	Low resistive loss; stable carrier transport
J-V / EQE	V_{oc} , J_{sc} , FF, η , spectral response	Direct photovoltaic performance	High reproducible η with consistent EQE

4. Data Treatment and Quality Control

For each condition, numerical results are reported as mean $\pm$ standard deviation from at least three samples or devices. One-way analysis of variance may be used when three or more processing conditions are compared, followed by an appropriate post-hoc test at $p < 0.05$. Correlation analysis is then used to determine whether changes in crystallite size, roughness, band gap, resistivity or carrier mobility track changes in V_{oc} , J_{sc} , FF or η . Instrument calibration, repeated thickness measurements and repeated illuminated J-V scans are required. For perovskite-type films, forward/reverse scans and stabilized power output should be considered because transient behavior can affect apparent efficiency; for mature inorganic absorbers, contact and interface stability should be checked before accepting a device result.

Results

Because this paper defines a methodology rather than reporting a newly completed laboratory experiment, no fabricated experimental values are assigned to the proposed samples. Instead, expected analytical outputs are stated and compared with verified literature benchmarks available by 2016. A successful XRD result should

show the target absorber phase with reduced secondary phases after optimization. SEM should reveal continuous coverage and sufficiently large, well-connected grains. Optical analysis should provide a reproducible absorption edge and a band gap within the range appropriate to the selected semiconductor. Electrical measurements should show reduced sheet resistance for contact layers and transport properties consistent with the intended p- or n-type function.

At device level, the optimized thin film should increase one or more of J_{sc} , V_{oc} or FF without causing a compensating loss in another parameter. Changes in J_{sc} are commonly associated with absorption and carrier collection, whereas V_{oc} and FF are particularly sensitive to recombination, junction quality, resistive losses and interface defects. The 2016 efficiency landscape in Table 2 demonstrates why identical characterization criteria cannot be applied mechanically to every material family: CIGS and CdTe were mature high-efficiency thin films, perovskites were rapidly emerging, and CZTSSe still exhibited a significant voltage/performance deficit despite the advantage of earth-abundant constituents [9,14].

Table 2. Representative thin-film photovoltaic benchmarks reported by 2016

Technology	Representative efficiency (%)	2016 analytical significance	Key source
CIGS	22.3 (confirmed class benchmark)	High performance; interface/alkali treatment critical	[14]; see also [7,13]
CdTe	22.1 (confirmed class benchmark)	Voc and recombination control remain central	[14]; see also [12]
CZTSSe	12.6 (reported champion)	Earth-abundant absorber with larger voltage deficit	[9,14]
Perovskite	22.1 (2016 benchmark)	Rapid gains from morphology and processing control	[10,11,14]

Conclusion and Discussion

The proposed methodology treats a solar-cell thin film as a coupled optical-electrical-structural system. This is essential because improved crystallinity does not automatically produce a better device if the same processing step creates unfavorable interfaces, changes carrier concentration or increases contact resistance. Similarly, a nominally favorable band gap does not guarantee high efficiency when defects or pinholes cause non-radiative recombination and shunting. The literature up to 2016 shows that the best-performing technologies reached high efficiency through coordinated control of absorber quality, junction interfaces and contact layers rather than through one isolated material metric [7,12-14]. For practical implementation, the experimental sequence should begin with reproducible deposition and annealing, proceed through XRD/SEM/optical/electrical characterization, and finish with standardized device testing. The strongest evidence for an optimized film is convergence among these measurements: phase-pure and continuous morphology, strong absorption at an appropriate band gap, sufficiently favorable transport, and a device-level increase in Voc, Jsc, FF and efficiency. TCO selection should simultaneously preserve optical transmission and minimize sheet resistance [4,5]. Where optical interference is significant, thickness and optical constants should be treated together rather than inferred from a single absorption spectrum [2]. The framework is intentionally applicable to multiple thin-film absorber families. For CIGS, alkali treatment and interfaces deserve special attention [7,13]; for CdTe, doping and recombination control are key to voltage

improvement [12]; for CZTSSe, reducing the voltage deficit remains a principal target [9]; and for perovskites, morphology, reproducibility and stability must accompany high initial efficiency [6,8,10,11]. The method therefore provides a defensible basis for selecting fabrication conditions and for explaining why a semiconductor thin film is—or is not—suitable for solar-cell application.

References

- W. Shockley and H. J. Queisser, "Detailed Balance Limit of Efficiency of p-n Junction Solar Cells," *Journal of Applied Physics*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 510–519, 1961. DOI: 10.1063/1.1736034.
- R. Swanepoel, "Determination of the thickness and optical constants of amorphous silicon," *Journal of Physics E: Scientific Instruments*, vol. 16, no. 12, pp. 1214–1222, 1983. DOI: 10.1088/0022-3735/16/12/023.
- K. L. Chopra, P. D. Paulson, and V. Dutta, "Thin-film solar cells: an overview," *Progress in Photovoltaics: Research and Applications*, vol. 12, no. 2–3, pp. 69–92, 2004. DOI: 10.1002/pip.541.
- T. Minami, "Transparent conducting oxide semiconductors for transparent electrodes," *Semiconductor Science and Technology*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. S35–S44, 2005. DOI: 10.1088/0268-1242/20/4/004.

E. Fortunato, D. Ginley, H. Hosono, and D. C. Paine, "Transparent conducting oxides for photovoltaics," *MRS Bulletin*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 242–247, 2007. DOI: 10.1557/mrs2007.29.

H.-S. Kim et al., "Lead Iodide Perovskite Sensitized All-Solid-State Submicron Thin Film Mesoscopic Solar Cell with Efficiency Exceeding 9%," *Scientific Reports*, vol. 2, article 591, 2012. DOI: 10.1038/srep00591.

Chirilă et al., "Potassium-induced surface modification of Cu(In,Ga)Se₂ thin films for high-efficiency solar cells," *Nature Materials*, vol. 12, pp. 1107–1111, 2013. DOI: 10.1038/nmat3789.

J. Burschka et al., "Sequential deposition as a route to high-performance perovskite-sensitized solar cells," *Nature*, vol. 499, pp. 316–319, 2013. DOI: 10.1038/nature12340.

W. Wang et al., "Device Characteristics of CZTSSe Thin-Film Solar Cells with 12.6% Efficiency," *Advanced Energy Materials*, vol. 4, no. 7, article 1301465, 2014. DOI: 10.1002/aenm.201301465.

M. A. Green, A. Ho-Baillie, and H. J. Snaith, "The emergence of perovskite solar cells," *Nature*

Photonics, vol. 8, pp. 506–514, 2014. DOI: 10.1038/nphoton.2014.134.

W. Nie et al., "High-efficiency solution-processed perovskite solar cells with millimeter-scale grains," *Science*, vol. 347, no. 6221, pp. 522–525, 2015. DOI: 10.1126/science.aaa0472.

J. M. Burst et al., "CdTe solar cells with open-circuit voltage breaking the 1 V barrier," *Nature Energy*, vol. 1, article 16015, 2016. DOI: 10.1038/nenergy.2016.15.

P. Jackson, R. Wuerz, D. Hariskos, E. Lotter, W. Witte, and M. Powalla, "Effects of heavy alkali elements in Cu(In,Ga)Se₂ solar cells with efficiencies up to 22.6%," *physica status solidi (RRL) – Rapid Research Letters*, vol. 10, no. 8, pp. 583–586, 2016. DOI: 10.1002/pssr.201600199.

M. A. Green, K. Emery, Y. Hishikawa, W. Warta, and E. D. Dunlop, "Solar cell efficiency tables (version 48)," *Progress in Photovoltaics: Research and Applications*, vol. 24, no. 7, pp. 905–913, 2016. DOI: 10.1002/pip.2788.