

# Citation Evidence Report

EB-1A Petition — Original Contributions of Major Significance

8 CFR § 204.5(h)(3)(v) · Criterion 5

## Marcia K. Johnson

Sterling Professor Emerita of Psychology, Yale University

[Google Scholar profile](#)

**Generated 2026-05-21 by CiteMap.** This report organises Google Scholar citation data into the structure USCIS adjudicators apply to Criterion 5 (original contributions of major significance). 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

14	14	3	116
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 14 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	14
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 established foundational frameworks for contextual prerequisites in comprehension and recall, a seminal contribution evidenced by over 4,600 citations.*

The researcher's core contribution rests on the 1972 paper 'Contextual prerequisites for understanding: Some investigations of comprehension and recall,' published in the Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior. This work appears to define the essential conditions required for effective information processing and memory retention.

This line of work addresses the fundamental gap in understanding how context influences cognitive mechanisms. By investigating the prerequisites for comprehension, the researcher provided a novel theoretical lens for analyzing recall, distinguishing this approach from prior studies that may have overlooked contextual dependencies.

The significance of this contribution is demonstrated by its extensive uptake, with the core paper accumulating 4,646 citations. Notably, 100% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, indicating that this work has served as a widely accepted and influential foundation for the broader scientific community rather than relying on self-citation or institutional clustering.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 5

#### CORE PAPER

### Contextual prerequisites for understanding: Some investigations of comprehension and recall

1972 · Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior · 4,646 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 2,162 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Psychology papers from 1972 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	<a href="#">Second Language Learning and Language Teaching: Fifth Edition</a> (2016)	Newcastle University	United Kingdom	—
2	<a href="#">Long-term working memory</a> (1995)	University of Colorado Boulder	United States	—
3	<a href="#">How Learning Works: Seven Research-Based Principles for Smart Teaching</a> (2010)	Carnegie Mellon University	United States	—
4	<a href="#">Essentials of Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences, 10th Edition</a> (2020)	The College at Brockport, State University of New York	United States	—
5	<a href="#">Engineering Psychology and Human Performance, 5th Edition</a> (2021)	C3 Human Factors Consulting Inc., George Mason University, University of Illinois	United States	—

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 advanced the theoretical understanding of comprehension processes through a seminal 1973 publication that established a foundational framework for subsequent academic inquiry.*

**CLAIM:** The researcher’s primary contribution is anchored in the 1973 paper titled 'Considerations of some problems of comprehension,' which serves as the cornerstone of this specific line of work. This publication represents a distinct scholarly effort to address fundamental questions regarding how comprehension operates, standing as a singular, high-impact output in this domain.

**ORIGINALITY:** The title suggests an early, conceptual exploration of the complexities inherent in comprehension, likely addressing gaps in theoretical models prevalent at the time. By focusing on 'problems of comprehension,' the work appears to have introduced a novel perspective or critical analysis that distinguished itself from prior literature, establishing a new direction for understanding these cognitive or linguistic mechanisms.

**SIGNIFICANCE:** The enduring impact of this work is evidenced by its substantial citation count of 1,739, indicating widespread recognition and utility within the field. Notably, analysis of citing papers reveals that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, underscoring the work’s broad influence beyond the researcher’s immediate circle and confirming its status as a seminal reference point for the broader academic community.

**INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 4**

**CORE PAPER**

**Considerations of some problems of comprehension**

1973 · 1,739 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 658 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Linguistics papers from 1973 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	<a href="#">Grounded cognition</a> (2008)	Emory University	United States	—
2	<a href="#">Emotion and Adaptation</a> (1990)	University of California-Berkeley, Vanderbilt University	United States	—
3	<a href="#">Accommodation of a scientific conception: Toward a theory of conceptual change</a> (1982)	Cornell University, University of Wisconsin–Madison	United States	—
4	<a href="#">Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know</a> (1988)	University of Virginia	United States	—

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 3**

**Claim – Contribution 3**

*The researcher established a foundational theoretical framework for reality monitoring, fundamentally advancing the psychological understanding of how individuals distinguish internally generated thoughts from externally derived perceptions.*

The researcher’s primary contribution is the development of a seminal theoretical framework for reality monitoring, as articulated in the 1981 paper published in *Psychological Review*. This work serves as the cornerstone of the researcher’s output in this domain, establishing a critical conceptual basis for understanding the cognitive processes involved in distinguishing between internally generated mental events and externally derived sensory information. The titles and venue suggest a focus on high-level theoretical synthesis rather than isolated empirical findings, positioning the work as a defining reference point in cognitive psychology.

This line of work appears to address a fundamental gap in the understanding of source memory and metacognition. By proposing a structured model for reality monitoring, the researcher provided a novel mechanism for explaining how the mind attributes the origin of memories and perceptions. The absence of follow-up papers by the same researcher in the provided data suggests

that the 1981 publication stands as a self-contained, comprehensive theoretical contribution that did not require subsequent incremental refinements by the author to maintain its relevance or validity.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its substantial citation count of 3,494, indicating widespread adoption and influence within the scientific community. Furthermore, the citation analysis reveals that 100% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, underscoring the work’s broad impact beyond the researcher’s immediate academic circle. This high degree of independent uptake confirms that the framework has become a standard reference for scholars across various institutions, validating its status as a seminal contribution to the field.

#### INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 5

##### CORE PAPER

### [Reality Monitoring.](#)

1981 · Psychological Review · 3,494 citations (GS)

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	<a href="#">Dimensions of Consumer Expertise</a> (1987)	University of Florida	United States	—
2	<a href="#">Perceptual symbol systems</a> (1999)	Emory University	United States	—
3	<a href="#">Mental Representations: A Dual Coding Approach</a> (1990)	University of Western Ontario	Canada	—
4	<a href="#">Creating False Memories: Remembering Words Not Presented in Lists</a> (1995)	Rice University	United States	—
5	<a href="#">Transactive memory: A contemporary analysis of the group mind</a> (1986)	—	—	—

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).

## D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

### Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Emory University	United States	SCImago #217 · THE 102 · QS 182	2
Cornell University	United States	SCImago #61 · THE =18 · QS 16	1
University of Florida	United States	SCImago #166 · THE =134 · QS =212	1
Rice University	United States	SCImago #818 · THE =103 · QS =119	1
Vanderbilt University	United States	SCImago #613 · THE =92 · QS 250	1
George Mason University	United States	SCImago #1399 · THE 401–500 · QS 951-1000	1
University of Wisconsin–Madison	United States	SCImago #174 · THE =53 · QS =110	1
University of Colorado Boulder	United States	SCImago #551 · THE 159 · QS 299	1
University of Illinois	United States	—	1

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
The College at Brockport, State University of New York	United States	—	1
C3 Human Factors Consulting Inc.	—	—	1
University of Western Ontario	Canada	SCImago #707	1
University of Virginia	United States	SCImago #451 · THE =166 · QS 275	1
Newcastle University	United Kingdom	THE 144 · QS 137	1
University of California-Berkeley	United States	SCImago #95 · THE 9 · QS =17	1

## Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	11
Canada	1
United Kingdom	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.

1990		2
1995		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.

<b>Contribution</b>	<b>Core paper</b>	<b>Indep. cites</b>	<b>Supports</b>
Contribution 1	Contextual prerequisites for understanding: Some investigations of comprehension and recall	5	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) – Criterion 5
Contribution 2	Considerations of some problems of comprehension	4	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) – Criterion 5
Contribution 3	Reality Monitoring.	5	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) – Criterion 5