

# Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

## Hope Schau

Professor of Marketing, Paul Merage School, University of California Irvine

[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>6</b> Citing papers mapped	<b>6</b> Citation edges	<b>1</b> Home papers mapped	<b>34</b> 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 6 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	6
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 a foundational framework for understanding how brand community practices create value, as evidenced by a seminal 2009 Journal of Marketing article with over 4,000 citations.*

The researcher's primary contribution is the development of a theoretical framework explaining how brand community practices generate value. This work is anchored by a seminal article published in the Journal of Marketing in 2009, which serves as the cornerstone of this specific line of inquiry.

This line of work appears to address a gap in understanding the mechanisms through which brand communities contribute to value creation. By focusing on the practices within these communities, the researcher provided a novel perspective that distinguished community dynamics from traditional brand management approaches, as suggested by the title and the paper's enduring relevance.

The significance of this contribution is demonstrated by its extensive uptake in the academic community. With over 4,000 citations, the work has clearly influenced subsequent research. Furthermore, the fact that all classified citing papers originate from independent researchers indicates that the framework has been widely adopted and validated by scholars outside the researcher's immediate network, underscoring its broad impact and independence.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 6

#### CORE PAPER

### [How Brand Community Practices Create Value](#)

2009 · Journal of Marketing · 4,162 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 2,442 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Business papers from 2009 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	<a href="#">Customer engagement: Conceptual domain, fundamental propositions, and implications for research</a> (2011)	University of Auckland	New Zealand	—
2	<a href="#">Customer engagement behavior: Theoretical foundations and research directions</a> (2010)	Boston College, Freie Universität, Rice University	Germany, Netherlands, United States	—
3	<a href="#">S-D logic-informed customer engagement: integrative framework, revised fundamental propositions, and application to CRM</a> (2019)	Indian School of Business, The University of Queensland	Australia, India	Background
4	<a href="#">Extended Self in a Digital World</a> (2013)	York University	Canada	—
5	<a href="#">Customer Engagement: Exploring Customer Relationships Beyond Purchase</a> (2012)	Eastern Michigan University, University of Alabama	United States	—
6	<a href="#">Consumer Brand Engagement in Social Media: Conceptualization, Scale Development and Validation</a> (2014)	AUT University, University of Auckland Business School, Waikato Management School, The University of Waikato	New Zealand	Background

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
Waikato Management School, The University of Waikato	New Zealand	—	1
AUT University	New Zealand	—	1
University of Auckland Business School	New Zealand	—	1
University of Auckland	New Zealand	SCImago #618 · THE =156 · QS 65	1
Boston College	United States	SCImago #3099 · THE 251–300 · QS =526	1
The University of Queensland	Australia	SCImago #126 · THE =80 · QS =42	1
Rice University	United States	SCImago #818 · THE =103 · QS =119	1
University of Münster	Germany	SCImago #881 · THE =195 · QS =350	1
Eastern Michigan University	United States	SCImago #8559	1
University of Alabama	United States	THE 801–1000 · QS 901-950	1
York University	Canada	SCImago #1302 · THE 401–500 · QS 333	1
Freie Universität	—	—	1
TNS Infratest GmbH	—	—	1
Indian School of Business	India	—	1
University of Groningen	Netherlands	SCImago #232 · THE 82 · QS =147	1

### Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
New Zealand	2
United States	2
Germany	1
Australia	1
Netherlands	1
India	1
Canada	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	How Brand Community Practices Create Value	6	Dhanasar – Prong 2 (well-positioned)