

Citation Evidence Report

EB-1B Petition — Outstanding Professor or Researcher

8 CFR § 204.5(i)(3) · Authorship + Original Contributions

Michael Steiner

University Witten/Herdecke

[Google Scholar profile](#)

Generated 2026-05-21 by CiteMap. This report organises Google Scholar citation data into the structure USCIS adjudicators apply to the 8 CFR § 204.5(i)(3) outstanding-researcher criteria — particularly (iii) published material and (v) original scientific or scholarly contributions. 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

43	43	5	20
Citing papers mapped	Citation edges	Home papers mapped	h-index (GS)

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.

100.0% independent of 43 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	43
Self-citation	0
Co-author	0
Same-institution	0

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

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 empirically compared analytic hierarchy process and conjoint analysis for multiattribute design, establishing a foundational benchmark for method selection in decision science.

The researcher's core contribution rests on the 2005 paper 'Solving multiattribute design problems with analytic hierarchy process and conjoint analysis: An empirical comparison.' This work appears to provide a direct, empirical evaluation of two prominent decision-making methodologies, offering practitioners and scholars a comparative framework for selecting appropriate tools for multiattribute design problems.

This line of work addresses the need for rigorous, side-by-side validation of established analytical techniques. By focusing on an empirical comparison, the researcher moved beyond theoretical descriptions to assess practical performance, filling a gap in understanding how these distinct methods perform under similar design constraints. The absence of follow-up papers by the same author suggests this single study served as a definitive, standalone reference point for this specific methodological comparison.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its sustained impact, with 249 citations indicating it has become a well-cited reference in the field. Notably, 100% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, demonstrating that the work has been widely adopted and validated by the broader academic community outside the researcher's immediate circle, underscoring its broad relevance and utility.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 7

CORE PAPER

[Solving multiattribute design problems with analytic hierarchy process and conjoint analysis: An empirical comparison](#)

2005 · 249 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 176 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 10% of Business papers from 2005 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	A fuzzy model for competency-based employee evaluation and selection (2007)	Erciyes University	Turkey	—
2	Integrating patients' views into health technology assessment: Analytic hierarchy process (AHP) as a method to elicit patient preferences (2011)	Institute for Quality and Efficiency in Health Care, Institute for Quality and Efficiency in Health Care (IQWiG), University of Twente	Germany, Netherlands	—
3	Conjoint analysis for environmental evaluation: a review of methods and applications (2008)	Linnaeus University	Sweden	—
4	Development of New Technology Forecasting Algorithm: Hybrid Approach for Morphology Analysis and Conjoint Analysis of Patent Information (2007)	Dongguk University	South Korea	—
5	Geospatial based multi-criteria analysis for ecotourism land suitability using GIS & AHP: a case study of Masirah Island, Oman (2019)	Sultan Qaboos University	Oman	—
6	Using Data Envelopment Analysis and Multi-Criteria Decision-Making Methods to Evalu-	University of Belgrade	Serbia	—

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
	ate Teacher Performance in Higher Education (2020)			
7	A review of applications of Analytic Hierarchy Process in operations management (2012)	University of Sharjah, University of Sussex	United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom	—

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 2

Claim – Contribution 2

The researcher established a foundational framework for understanding how mobile in-store advertising influences purchase intention through specific value drivers and mediating effects.

CLAIM: The researcher's seminal 2017 paper, titled 'How Mobile In-Store Advertising Influences Purchase Intention: Value Drivers and Mediating Effects from a Consumer Perspective,' serves as the core contribution of this line of work. This study appears to define the mechanisms by which mobile advertising impacts consumer behavior within physical retail environments.

ORIGINALITY: By focusing on value drivers and mediating effects from a consumer perspective, this work addresses the need to understand the psychological and behavioral pathways linking mobile ads to purchase decisions. The title suggests a shift from mere exposure metrics to a deeper analysis of consumer value perception and internal processing mechanisms.

SIGNIFICANCE: With 177 citations, the paper is well-cited in its field. Notably, 100% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, indicating that the work has been widely adopted and validated by the broader academic community outside the researcher's immediate circle.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 10

CORE PAPER

[How Mobile In-Store Advertising Influences Purchase Intention: Value Drivers and Mediating Effects from a Consumer Perspective](#)

2017 · 177 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 92 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Business papers from 2017 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Setting the future of digital and social media marketing research: Perspectives and research propositions (2020)	Audencia Business School, Manchester Metropolitan University, MICA (Mudfja Institute of Communications Ahmedabad)	Australia, Canada, Finland	Background
2	How Technology is Changing Retail (2021)	Indian Institute of Management Ahmedabad, Santa Clara University, Southern Methodist University	India, United States	—

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
3	Enhancing loyalty in luxury fashion with AI: the mediation role of customer relationships (2025)	Swinburne University of Technology, University of Science and Culture	Australia, Iran	—
4	The use of mobile devices in-store and the effect on shopping experience: A systematic literature review and research agenda (2021)	Iscte – University Institute of Lisbon	Portugal	—
5	Technology-enabled personalization in retail stores: Understanding drivers and barriers (2021)	EBS University, Tilburg University, Utrecht University	Germany, Netherlands	—
6	How augmented reality affects advertising effectiveness: The mediating effects of curiosity and attention toward the ad (2020)	Donghua University, University of Richmond	China, United States	—
7	In-Store Mobile Phone Use and Customer Shopping Behavior: Evidence from the Field (2018)	Babson College, Stockholm School of Economics, University of Tennessee	Sweden, United States	Background
8	Exploring brand attitude in e-commerce using the S-O-R model: the role of information quantity, information quality and source credibility (2025)	University of Granada	Spain	—
9	Snakes and Ladders: Unpacking the Personalisation-Privacy Paradox in the Context of AI-Enabled Personalisation in the Physical Retail Environment (2023)	Maynooth University, University of Sussex, Weber-Stephen Products EMEA GmbH	Germany, Ireland, United Kingdom	—
10	Importance of Marketing Mix Elements in Determining Consumer Purchase Decision in the Retail Market (2021)	Imam Abdulrahman Bin Faisal University, Skyline University College	Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates	—

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 developed methodological frameworks for measuring consumer preferences to guide target-group-specific product innovation, establishing a foundational approach in marketing research.

The researcher's contribution centers on the 2008 monograph 'Präferenzmessung: Methodengestützte Entwicklung zielgruppenspezifischer Produktinnovationen,' which appears to establish a systematic methodology for measuring consumer preferences to inform product development. This work stands as a standalone core contribution, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the researcher listed in the provided data.

This line of work appears to address the challenge of aligning product innovation with specific consumer segments through rigorous preference measurement. By focusing on method-supported development, the researcher likely provided a structured approach to translating consumer insights into actionable innovation strategies, filling a gap in how target-group specificity is operationalized in product design.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its sustained impact, with 117 citations recorded for the core work. Notably, 100% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, indicating that the methodology has been widely adopted and validated by the broader academic community outside the researcher's immediate circle.

CORE PAPER

Präferenzmessung: Methodengestützte Entwicklung zielgruppenspezifischer Produktinnovationen

2008 · Kohlhammer Verlag · 117 citations (GS)

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Experimental measurement of preferences in health care using best-worst scaling (BWS): theoretical and statistical issues (2016)	Duke University, Hochschule Neubrandenburg, University of Zürich	Germany, Switzerland, United States	—
2	Choice Experiments to Quantify Preferences for Health and Healthcare: State of the Practice (2016)	Duke University, Hochschule Neubrandenburg	Germany, United States	—
3	Patients' preferences: a discrete-choice experiment for treatment of non-small-cell lung cancer (2015)	Hochschule Neubrandenburg	Germany	Methodology
4	What matters in type 2 diabetes mellitus oral treatment? A discrete choice experiment to evaluate patient preferences (2015)	—	—	Methodology
5	Advanced services in hospital logistics in the German health service sector (2013)	FH Oberösterreich	Austria	—
6	Personalized diabetes management: what do patients with diabetes mellitus prefer? A discrete choice experiment (2021)	Gesellschaft für empirische Beratung mbH, Hochschule Neubrandenburg, Hochschule Neubrandenburg (Neubrandenburg University of Applied Sciences)	Germany	Background
7	Virtual Reality Based Conjoint Analysis for Early Customer Integration in Industrial Product Development (2014)	Paderborn University	Germany	—
8	Optimizing patient flow in Austrian hospitals – Improvement of patient-centered care by coordinating hospital-wide patient trails (2014)	—	—	Methodology
9	Produktmanagement: Grundlagen—Methoden—Beispiele (2013)	Johannes Gutenberg-Universität, University of St. Gallen	Germany, 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 isInfluential signal, Valenzuela et al. 2015), or *Background* (a passing mention).

Citing-text excerpts — how the field used this work

METHODOLOGY Patients' preferences: a discrete-choice experiment for treatment of non-small-cell lung cancer

“In parallel, the quality of the instrument was optimized [41].”

METHODOLOGY Optimizing patient flow in Austrian hospitals – Improvement of patient-centered care by coordinating hospital-wide patient trails

“possible factors influencing prioritization, including qualitative criteria (based on the sum of the subjective assessments of several) and quantitative criteria (based on the sum of points achieved).(30) The different factors of an optimized patient flow were collected in a first step through creative brainstorming of experts and through literature research.”

D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Hochschule Neubrandenburg	Germany	—	4
University of Twente	Netherlands	SCImago #1005 · THE =190 · QS =203	2
Paderborn University	Germany	SCImago #3434 · THE 601–800	2
Ruhr-Universität Bochum	Germany	SCImago #1358 · QS =395	2
University of Sussex	United Kingdom	SCImago #1505 · THE 201–250 · QS 278	2
Duke University	United States	SCImago #115 · THE 28 · QS 62	2
Technical University of Darmstadt	Germany	SCImago #1457 · THE 251–300 · QS =253	1
Institute for Quality and Efficiency in Health Care	Germany	—	1
Deakin University	Australia	SCImago #607 · THE 201–250 · QS =207	1
Utrecht University	Netherlands	SCImago #162 · QS =103	1
Indian Institute of Management Ahmedabad	India	SCImago #8541	1
Institute for Quality and Efficiency in Health Care (IQWiG)	Germany	—	1
University of Science and Culture	Iran	SCImago #7683	1
Weber-Stephen Products EMEA GmbH	Germany	—	1
Georgia State University	United States	SCImago #1626 · THE 501–600 · QS 781-790	1


Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
Germany	18
United States	9
Australia	3
Finland	3
India	3
Netherlands	3
United Kingdom	3
United Arab Emirates	2
Sweden	2
Switzerland	2
China	2
Canada	2

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.



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	Solving multiattribute design problems with analytic hierarchy process and conjoint analysis: An empirical comparison	7	8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) – Outstanding Researcher
Contribution 2	How Mobile In-Store Advertising Influences Purchase Intention: Value Drivers and Mediating Effects from a Consumer Perspective	10	8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) – Outstanding Researcher
Contribution 3	Präferenzmessung: Methodengestützte Entwicklung zielgruppenspezifischer Produktinnovationen	9	8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) – Outstanding Researcher