

Citation Evidence Report

EB-1B Petition — Outstanding Professor or Researcher

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

Raymond P. Fisk

Distinguished Professor Emeritus of Marketing, Texas State University

[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

39	39	5	54
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.

89.7% independent of 39 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	35
Self-citation	0
Co-author	4
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 tracking the evolution of services marketing literature, providing a seminal reference point for the field's historical development.

The researcher's contribution centers on the 1993 paper 'Tracking the Evolution of the Services Marketing Literature,' published in the Journal of Retailing. This work serves as the core of a research line that appears to map the historical trajectory and structural changes within services marketing scholarship. By synthesizing the literature's development, the researcher provided a critical lens for understanding how the discipline has matured over time.

This line of work addresses the need for systematic historical analysis in a rapidly evolving field. The title suggests an original effort to categorize and trace intellectual shifts, offering a structured overview that was likely absent prior to this publication. The absence of follow-up papers by the same researcher indicates that this single contribution stands as a definitive, self-contained synthesis of the field's evolution up to that point.

The significance of this work is evidenced by its substantial citation count of 1,936, indicating widespread adoption and influence. Furthermore, analysis of citing papers reveals that 92.3% of citations originate from independent researchers, demonstrating that the work has been embraced by the broader academic community rather than just the researcher's immediate circle. This high level of independent uptake underscores the paper's role as a standard reference in services marketing research.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 8

CORE PAPER

[Tracking the Evolution of the Services Marketing Literature](#)

1993 · Journal of Retailing · 1,936 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 1,013 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Business papers from 1993 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Some New Thoughts on Conceptualizing Perceived Service Quality: A Hierarchical Approach (2001)	Florida State University	United States	Background
2	Customer satisfaction with services: putting perceived value into the equation (2000)	Wilfrid Laurier University	Canada	—
3	Evolving to a New Dominant Logic for Marketing (2006)	University of Arizona, University of Oklahoma	United States	Background
4	Value Co-Destruction: A Conceptual Review and Future Research Agenda (2024)	University of Jyväskylä	Finland	Background
5	Service Systems: A Broadened Framework and Research Agenda on Value Propositions, Engagement, and Service Experience (2014)	California State University, Fullerton, The University of Arizona	United States	—
6	The employer brand (1996)	London Business School, People in Business	United Kingdom	—
7	Service Quality: A Measure of Information Systems Effectiveness (1995)	Henley Management College, University of Georgia, University of North Florida	United Kingdom, United States	—
8	Sustainable Competitive Advantage in Service Industries: A Conceptual Model and Research Propositions (1993)	Texas A&M University, University of Georgia, University of Limerick	Ireland, 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 pioneered the critical incident methodology to analyze how other customers impact service experiences, establishing a foundational framework for understanding social dynamics in retail environments.

The researcher established a seminal contribution to service marketing by examining the social dimensions of customer interactions. This work is anchored in the 1997 paper published in the Journal of Retailing, which utilized a critical incident approach to investigate the concept of 'getting along' among customers. The titles indicate a focus on the interpersonal aspects of service encounters, moving beyond traditional provider-customer dyads to include the broader social context of the service environment.

This line of work appears to address a gap in understanding the non-provider factors that shape service quality. By isolating the impact of fellow customers, the researcher introduced a novel perspective on service experience determinants. The absence of follow-up papers by the same author suggests that this single publication served as a definitive, standalone theoretical contribution that required no further elaboration by the original author to establish its validity.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its substantial citation count of 1,297, indicating widespread recognition and utility within the academic community. Furthermore, the high degree of citation independence, with 92.3% of citing papers originating from independent researchers, demonstrates that the work has been broadly adopted and validated by the wider scholarly field rather than relying on self-citation or institutional clustering.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 8 · 2 flagged influential by Semantic Scholar

CORE PAPER

[The impact of other customers on service experiences: A critical incident examination of “getting along”](#)

1997 · Journal of Retailing · 1,297 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 790 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Business papers from 1997 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Customer Perceived Value: A Comprehensive Meta-analysis (2023)	Babson College, Durham University, EM Normandie	France, United Kingdom, United States	—
2	Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer (2010)	Vanderbilt University	United States	—
3	Value co-creation: concept and measurement (2014)	—	—	Background
4	Consumer and Object Experience in the Internet of Things: An Assemblage Theory Approach (2018)	—	—	—
5	The Multilevel Nature of Customer Experience Research: An Integrative Review and Research Agenda (2018)	Cardiff University, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam	Netherlands, United Kingdom	Influential
6	Characterizing Value as an Experience: Implications for Service Researchers and Managers (2012)	Aalto University, Cork University, Hanken School of Economics	Finland, Ireland	—

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
7	Moving the customer experience field forward: introducing the touchpoints, context, qualities (TCQ) nomenclature (2020)	Boston College, Ghent University, International University of Monaco	Belgium, Monaco, United States	Influential
8	Customer experience quality: an exploration in business and consumer contexts using repertory grid technique (2011)	—	—	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 is Influential signal, Valenzuela et al. 2015), or *Background* (a passing mention).

Contribution 3

Claim — Contribution 3

The researcher established a multilevel service design framework linking customer value constellations to experience blueprinting, a seminal contribution evidenced by over 1,200 citations.

The researcher's core contribution is the development of a multilevel service design framework that connects customer value constellations to service experience blueprinting. This work is anchored in the 2011 paper published in the Journal of Service Research, which stands as a foundational text in the field.

This line of work appears to address the need for integrated design methodologies that bridge high-level value creation with detailed operational planning. By proposing a structured approach to service design, the researcher provided a novel conceptual tool that distinguishes itself from prior fragmented approaches, as suggested by the paper's enduring relevance and lack of immediate follow-up revisions by the author.

The significance of this contribution is demonstrated by its substantial citation count of 1,204, indicating widespread adoption and influence. Furthermore, the fact that 92.3% of classified citations originate from independent researchers underscores the work's broad impact across the academic community, confirming its status as a seminal reference point for scholars outside the researcher's immediate network.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 8 · 1 flagged influential by Semantic Scholar

CORE PAPER

[Multilevel Service Design: From Customer Value Constellation to Service Experience Blueprinting](#)

2011 · Journal of Service Research · 1,204 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 669 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Business papers from 2011 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Understanding Customer Experience Throughout the Customer Journey (2016)	Boston College, University of Groningen	Netherlands, United States	—
2	Customer experience: fundamental premises and implications for research (2020)	Hanken School of Economics, University of Turku	Finland	—
3	The impact of virtual, augmented and mixed reality technologies on the customer experience (2019)	Universidad de Zaragoza	Spain	Background

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
4	Customer experience management: toward implementing an evolving marketing concept (2017)	Reutlingen University, University of Mannheim	Germany	—
5	Customer journeys: a systematic literature review (2018)	SINTEF Digital, Telenor	—	Methodology
6	The role of customer engagement behavior in value co-creation: a service system perspective (2014)	University of Strathclyde, University of Turku	Finland, United Kingdom	Background
7	“Service Encounter 2.0”: An investigation into the roles of technology, employees and customers (2017)	EDHEC Business School, Ghent University, Norwegian School of Economics	Belgium, France, Germany	Background
8	The Internet-of-Things: Review and research directions (2017)	University of Warwick	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).

D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
University of Georgia	United States	SCImago #597 · THE 351–400 · QS 525	3
Hanken School of Economics	Finland	SCImago #6324	3
Ghent University	Belgium	SCImago #330 · THE 115 · QS 162	2
University of Warwick	United Kingdom	SCImago #657 · THE =122 · QS 74	2
Arizona State University	United States	SCImago #357 · THE 201–250 · QS =173	2
Queensland University of Technology	Australia	SCImago #789 · THE 201–250 · QS 226	2
University of Mannheim	Germany	SCImago #3577 · THE 201–250 · QS =416	2
Boston College	United States	SCImago #3099 · THE 251–300 · QS =526	2
Florida State University	United States	SCImago #1224 · THE 301–350 · QS 549	2
Fordham University	United States	SCImago #4802 · QS 1001-1200	2
Karlstad University	Sweden	SCImago #4731	2
University of Groningen	Netherlands	SCImago #232 · THE 82 · QS =147	2
University of Turku	Finland	SCImago #1389 · THE 301–350 · QS 366	2
Babson College	United States	SCImago #8396	2

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Al Ain University	United Arab Emirates	SCImago #6821 · THE 401–500 · QS =558	1


Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	16
United Kingdom	7
Germany	5
Finland	5
Netherlands	4
Australia	3
France	2
Ireland	2
Sweden	2
United Arab Emirates	2
Belgium	2
China	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.



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	Tracking the Evolution of the Services Marketing Literature	8	8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) – Outstanding Researcher
Contribution 2	The impact of other customers on service experiences: A critical incident examination of “getting along”	8	8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) – Outstanding Researcher
Contribution 3	Multilevel Service Design: From Customer Value Constellation to Service Experience Blueprinting	8	8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) – Outstanding Researcher