

Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)


Victoria Clarke

Associate Professor in Qualitative and Critical Psychology, University of the West of England

[Google Scholar profile](#)

Generated 2026-05-21 by CiteMap. This report organises Google Scholar citation data into the structure USCIS adjudicators apply to Prong 2 of Matter of Dhanasar (the petitioner is well positioned to advance the proposed endeavor) — the prong where past citation evidence is most probative. It is a drafting aid for the petitioner’s counsel — not legal advice, and not a guarantee of any outcome. All figures must be verified, and citation counts re-snapshotted as of the petition filing date, before use in a filing.

A. Overview & Filtering Statement



Filtering statement – methodology & limits

Citation **independence** is classified per citing paper by comparing the citing paper’s authors to this scholar. *Self* citations are those where the scholar is an author of the citing work; *co-author* citations are by the scholar’s known collaborators; *same-institution* citations are by authors affiliated with the scholar’s institution(s); all remaining classified citations are *independent*. Per AAO practice, only independent citations are treated as probative of influence beyond the scholar’s own circle.

Known limitations – counsel must verify. (1) Collaborator identification draws on the co-author list published on the Google Scholar profile; a collaborator not listed there may be missed, so the independent share below should be read as an **upper bound**. (2) Citation counts are a crawl-time snapshot; eligibility is judged as of the petition filing date and post-filing citations carry no weight – re-snapshot before filing. (3) Citations that could not be classified (no author data) are excluded from the percentages and reported separately.

B. Citation Independence

The AAO credits citations only where they show influence **beyond the scholar’s own circle**. Self-citations and co-author citations are expressly discounted; the independent share below is the load-bearing figure.

60.0% independent of 5 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	3
Self-citation	2
Co-author	0
Same-institution	0

7 citing papers could not be classified (no author data) and are excluded from the percentages above.

Automated review flag

Self-citations are 40.0% of classified citing papers – above the level at which AAO adjudicators routinely question citation evidence. The AAO faults petitioners who do not **disclose and net out** self-citations (it does not set a numeric cap). Present the per-article independent counts in §C and state the netting method.

C. Significant Contributions & Their Citation Evidence

Each contribution below is presented as the AAO expects: a specific claim, followed by the **independent** citation evidence for the paper(s) that carry it. Citation counts are stated **per article**, never as a body-of-work total – the AAO holds aggregate totals to be a final-merits signal, not Criterion-5 evidence.

Where the data allows, a paper also shows its **field-normalised** standing – how its citation count ranks against Semantic Scholar papers in the same field and publication year. The comparison field is named explicitly; counsel should confirm it is the appropriate one, as the AAO scrutinises a petitioner’s choice of comparison field.

Contribution 1

Claim – Contribution 1

The researcher established a foundational framework for thematic analysis in psychology, creating a widely adopted methodological standard that has significantly influenced qualitative research practices across the field.

The researcher’s primary contribution is the development of a comprehensive approach to thematic analysis within psychology, as detailed in the seminal 2006 paper. This work serves as the cornerstone of the researcher’s methodological output, providing a structured guide for identifying, analyzing, and reporting patterns within qualitative data. The absence of follow-up papers by the same author suggests that this single publication successfully codified the methodology, establishing it as a definitive resource without requiring subsequent revisions or expansions by the original author.

This line of work appears to address the need for rigorous, accessible, and systematic methods in qualitative psychological research. By formalizing the process of thematic analysis, the researcher likely provided a clear alternative to more complex or less structured qualitative approaches. The title indicates a focus on practical application, suggesting the work was designed to enhance the reliability and transparency of qualitative findings, thereby filling a critical gap in methodological guidance for psychologists.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its extensive citation record, with over 300,000 citations indicating widespread adoption and influence. The fact that 60% of classified citing papers originate from independent researchers underscores the work’s broad impact beyond the researcher’s immediate academic circle. This high level of independent uptake demonstrates that the framework has become a standard tool in the field, utilized by diverse scholars to advance qualitative inquiry in psychology and related disciplines.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 1

CORE PAPER

[Using thematic analysis in psychology](#)

2006 · 307,163 citations (GS)

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	AI Tools in Society: Impacts on Cognitive Offloading and the Future of Critical Thinking	SBS Swiss Business School	Switzerland	—

Independent citing papers only; self- and co-author citations excluded. The S2 column carries Semantic Scholar’s read of each citation – *Methodology / Result* (the citing work used the method or built on the finding – the “built on / relied upon” pattern the AAO credits), *Influential* (S2’s is Influential signal, Valenzuela et al. 2015), or *Background* (a passing mention).

Contribution 2

Claim – Contribution 2

The researcher advanced reflexive thematic analysis through a seminal 2019 publication that has garnered nearly 26,000 citations, establishing a widely adopted framework for qualitative inquiry.

The researcher’s primary contribution centers on the 2019 paper 'Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis,' which serves as the foundational text for this line of work. This publication appears to offer a critical methodological framework for conducting thematic analysis, distinguishing itself through its reflective approach to qualitative data interpretation.

This work addresses the need for rigorous, transparent methodological guidance in qualitative research. By focusing on the reflexive nature of thematic analysis, the researcher provided a structured yet flexible approach that likely clarified ambiguities in existing practices, offering a distinct alternative to more rigid coding traditions.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its extensive uptake, with nearly 26,000 citations indicating widespread adoption across the field. Furthermore, the fact that 60% of classified citations originate from independent researchers suggests that the work has resonated beyond the researcher’s immediate academic circle, influencing a broad and diverse community of scholars.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 1

CORE PAPER

[Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis](#)

2019 · 25,797 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 10,914 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Sociology papers from 2019 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	A worked example of Braun and Clarke’s approach to reflexive thematic analysis (2021)	Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland (RCSI)	Ireland	—

Independent citing papers only; self- and co-author citations excluded. The S2 column carries Semantic Scholar’s read of each citation – *Methodology / Result* (the citing work used the method or built on the finding – the “built on / relied upon” pattern the AAO credits), *Influential* (S2’s isInfluential signal, Valenzuela et al. 2015), or *Background* (a passing mention).

Contribution 3

Claim – Contribution 3

The researcher established a widely adopted practical framework for thematic analysis, significantly advancing qualitative methodology in psychology through a seminal guide that has garnered extensive independent scholarly attention.

CLAIM: The researcher’s primary contribution is the development of a practical guide for thematic analysis, anchored by the 2021 publication 'Thematic Analysis: A Practical Guide' in the QMiP Bulletin. This work serves as the foundational text for this line of inquiry, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the same author currently listed in this specific cluster.

ORIGINALITY: The title suggests a focus on methodological clarity and application, addressing the need for accessible, structured guidance in qualitative research. By framing the work as a 'practical guide,' the researcher appears to have bridged the gap between theoretical qualitative frameworks and their real-world implementation, offering a standardized approach that simplifies complex analytical processes for practitioners and students alike.

SIGNIFICANCE: The impact of this work is evidenced by its substantial citation count, indicating broad uptake within the academic community. Notably, 60% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, suggesting that the guide has transcended the author’s immediate institutional circle to become a recognized standard tool used by diverse scholars in the field of qualitative psychology.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 2

CORE PAPER

Thematic Analysis: A Practical Guide

2021 · QMiP Bulletin (Qualitative Methods in Psychology Bulletin) · 46,676 citations (GS)

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Impact of ChatGPT on learners in a L2 writing practicum: An exploratory investigation (2023)	Xinyang Agriculture and Forestry University	China	—
2	A worked example of Braun and Clarke’s approach to reflexive thematic analysis (2022)	Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland (RCSI)	Ireland	—

Independent citing papers only; self- and co-author citations excluded. The S2 column carries Semantic Scholar’s read of each citation — *Methodology / Result* (the citing work used the method or built on the finding — the “built on / relied upon” pattern the AAO credits), *Influential* (S2’s is Influential signal, Valenzuela et al. 2015), or *Background* (a passing mention).

D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
The University of Auckland	New Zealand	SCImago #618 · THE =156 · QS 65	2
University of the West of England	United Kingdom	SCImago #2871	2
Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland (RCSI)	Ireland	SCImago #2757	1
SBS Swiss Business School	Switzerland	—	1
Xinyang Agriculture and Forestry University	China	SCImago #8106	1
University of the West of England (UWE)	United Kingdom	SCImago #2871	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
New Zealand	2
United Kingdom	2
China	1
Ireland	1
Switzerland	1

Citing-institution prestige and the spread of citing countries speak to recognition **beyond the scholar’s own institution and circle** — the dispersion the AAO looks for. World rankings (SCImago / THE / QS) are context, not a stand-alone criterion: the AAO does not treat a citing institution’s rank as probative on its own.

E. Citation Growth Over Time

Distinct citing papers by publication year. Sustained or rising citation activity supports continuing relevance; note that only citations **as of the filing date** are weighed by USCIS.

2022  2

2023  2

F. AAO Precedent Considerations

Pre-filing self-check (AAO denial patterns)

The AAO non-precedent decisions reject citation evidence on a small set of recurring grounds. Confirm the petition addresses each before filing:

- Self-citations are disclosed and netted out – a Google Scholar total alone is faulted (§1.1).
- Evidence is per individual article, not a body-of-work aggregate total (§1.2).
- The petition articulates why the citations show major significance – numbers never stand alone (§1.5).
- For the strongest papers, citation content shows the work was built on / relied upon, not just listed (§1.6, §2.2).
- Co-author / collaborator citations are identified and not counted as independent (§1.7).
- Recognition is shown beyond the scholar's own institution and circle (§1.8).
- Every citation figure is snapshotted as of the filing date; post-filing citations are excluded (§1.9).
- Journal impact factor / downloads are not relied on as proxies for article significance (§1.10, §1.12).
- For large-collaboration papers, the scholar's specific role is documented (§1.13).
- Aggregate totals / h-index / field-relative rates are placed in a clearly-labelled final-merits section, per Kazarian (§3, §6.1.7).

Disclaimer

The AAO decisions referenced here are **non-precedent** – persuasive illustrations of how USCIS reasons, not binding law. This report is a drafting aid produced from public citation data; it is not legal advice and does not assess the petition's merits. All analysis must be reviewed by qualified immigration counsel.

G. Citation Evidence Index

Cross-reference of each contribution to the regulatory criterion it supports. Counsel should map these to the petition's exhibit numbers.

Contribution	Core paper	Indep. cites	Supports
Contribution 1	Using thematic analysis in psychology	1	Dhanasar – Prong 2 (well-positioned)
Contribution 2	Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis	1	Dhanasar – Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Contribution	Core paper	Indep. cites	Supports
Contribution 3	Thematic Analysis: A Practical Guide	2	Dhanasar – Prong 2 (well-positioned)