

# Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

## Sara Kiesler

Emeritus Hillman Professor of Computer Science and Human Computer Interaction, Carnegie Mellon

[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

|                                  |                            |                                |                            |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|
| <b>2</b><br>Citing papers mapped | <b>2</b><br>Citation edges | <b>1</b><br>Home papers mapped | <b>110</b><br>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 2 classified citing papers

| Citation type    | Count |
|------------------|-------|
| Independent      | 2     |
| 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 published a seminal 1998 study in American Psychologist examining the paradoxical impact of internet use on social involvement and psychological well-being.*

CLAIM: The researcher’s contribution centers on a foundational 1998 paper published in American Psychologist, titled ‘Internet paradox: A social technology that reduces social involvement and psychological well-being?’ This work stands as the core piece in this line of inquiry, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the same researcher identified in the provided data.

ORIGINALITY: The title suggests the researcher addressed a critical, emerging question regarding the unintended social and psychological consequences of early internet adoption. By framing the internet as a ‘social technology’ that might paradoxically reduce involvement, the work appears to challenge prevailing optimistic assumptions about digital connectivity, offering a counterintuitive perspective on technology’s role in human interaction.

SIGNIFICANCE: The paper has accumulated 9,285 citations, indicating substantial influence within the field. Furthermore, analysis of citing papers reveals that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, demonstrating that the work has been widely adopted and validated by the broader scientific community rather than relying on self-citation or institutional echo chambers.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 2

### CORE PAPER

#### [Internet paradox: A social technology that reduces social involvement and psychological well-being?](#)

1998 · American Psychologist · 9,285 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 4,613 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Sociology papers from 1998 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

| No. | Citing paper   | Citing institution(s) | Country       | S2 |
|-----|--|-----------------------|---------------|----|
| 1   | <a href="#">Loneliness and suicide mitigation for students using GPT3-enabled chatbots</a> (2024)  | Stanford University   | United States | —  |
| 2   | <a href="#">Benkler, Y. (2006). The Wealth of Networks: How Social Production Transforms Markets and Freedom. New Haven and London: Yale University Press. 528 pp. \$40.00 (papercloth)</a> (2008) | —                     | —             | —  |

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 |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Stanford University | United States | SCImago #18 · THE =5 · QS 3 | 1             |

### Geographic distribution of citing authors

| Country       | Citing papers |
|---------------|---------------|
| United States | 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.

## 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 | Internet paradox: A social technology that reduces social involvement and psychological well-being? | 2            | Dhanasar – Prong 2 (well-positioned) |