Citation Evidence Report

EB-1A Petition — Original Contributions of Major Significance

8 CFR § 204.5(h)(3)(v) · Criterion 5

Kartik Kalaignanam

Moore Fellow and Professor of Marketing, University of South Carolina

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

15	15	5	13
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.

86.7% independent of 15 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	13
Self-citation	0
Co-author	1
Same-institution	1

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 advanced strategic alliance theory by analyzing power asymmetries in new product development partnerships, establishing a foundational framework for understanding win-win versus win-lose outcomes.

The researcher's core contribution centers on the 2007 Management Science article, 'Asymmetric New Product Development Alliances: Win-Win or Win-Lose Partnerships?' This work appears to address the critical gap in understanding how power imbalances shape collaboration outcomes in innovation contexts. By focusing on asymmetry, the researcher moved beyond traditional symmetric alliance models to explore the nuanced dynamics of unequal partnerships.

The originality of this line of work lies in its specific focus on the structural inequalities inherent in new product development alliances. The title suggests a departure from assuming mutual benefit, instead proposing that asymmetry can lead to divergent outcomes. This theoretical shift provided a new lens for examining partnership stability and value creation, distinguishing it from prior literature that often treated alliances as balanced entities.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its substantial citation count of 363, indicating widespread recognition within the field. Furthermore, the high degree of citation independence, with 93.3% of classified citations coming from independent researchers, underscores the work's broad impact beyond the researcher's immediate network. This suggests the framework has been adopted and utilized by a diverse academic community to advance the study of strategic alliances.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 0

CORE PAPER

Asymmetric New Product Development Alliances: Win-Win or Win-Lose Partnerships?

2007 · Management Science · 363 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 250 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Business papers from 2007 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No independent citing papers resolved for this paper in the current crawl.

Contribution 2

Claim — Contribution 2

The researcher established a nuanced framework linking product and environmental social performance to firm outcomes, challenging monolithic views of corporate social responsibility.

CLAIM: The researcher's seminal 2013 article in the Strategic Management Journal, titled 'Product and environmental social performance: Varying effect on firm performance,' serves as the foundational contribution of this line of work. This paper appears to propose that the impact of social performance on firm success is not uniform but varies depending on whether the performance relates to product or environmental dimensions.

ORIGINALITY: By distinguishing between product and environmental social performance, this work addresses a critical gap in strategic management literature that previously may have treated corporate social responsibility as a singular construct. The title suggests a methodological or theoretical advancement in understanding how different facets of social performance yield divergent effects on firm performance, offering a more granular perspective than prior broad-brush approaches.

SIGNIFICANCE: The paper has garnered 427 citations, indicating substantial influence within the field. Notably, 93.3% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, demonstrating that the work has been widely adopted and built upon by the broader academic community rather than merely by the researcher's immediate circle. This high degree of independent uptake underscores the contribution's role in shaping mainstream discourse on the strategic implications of social performance.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 7

CORE PAPER

Product and environmental social performance: Varying effect on firm performance

2013 · Strategic Management Journal · 427 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 294 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Environmental Science papers from 2013 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Corporate social responsibility and firm performance: a theory of dual responsibility (2022)	Georgia Southwestern State University, University of Texas at Arlington, University of Texas at Tyler	United States	—
2	Biodiversity risk and firm performance: Evidence from US firms (2025)	Lincoln University, National Economics University, University of Wollongong	Australia	—
3	Digital innovation and performance of manufacturing firms: An affordance perspective (2023)	Peking University, Zhejiang University	China	—
4	Analysis of corporate sustainability performance and corporate financial performance causal linkage in the Indian context (2020)	Indian Institute of Foreign Trade	India	—
5	Consumer reactions to corporate social responsibility: The role of CSR domains (2019)	Baruch College, CUNY, University of New Hampshire, University of Pittsburgh	United States	—
6	Business model innovation performance: When does adding a new business model benefit an incumbent? (2015)	California State University, Long Beach, Iowa State University	United States	—
7	Evaluating green supply chain performance based on ESG and financial indicators (2022)	—	—	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).

Contribution 3

Claim — Contribution 3

The researcher established the foundational framework for marketing agility, defining its core concept, antecedents, and a comprehensive research agenda in a seminal 2021 Journal of Marketing article.

CLAIM: The researcher's primary contribution is the conceptualization of marketing agility, anchored by the 2021 Journal of Marketing paper titled 'Marketing Agility: The Concept, Antecedents, and a Research Agenda.' This work serves as the definitive starting point for this specific line of inquiry.

ORIGINALITY: The titles indicate that this work addresses a critical gap by formally defining the construct of marketing agility and outlining its antecedents. By proposing a structured research agenda, the researcher appears to have provided the necessary theoretical scaffolding for subsequent studies, effectively launching a new domain of scholarly focus rather than merely extending existing literature.

SIGNIFICANCE: The work has achieved substantial impact, evidenced by 473 citations. Notably, 93.3% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, suggesting that the framework has been widely adopted and utilized by the broader academic community beyond the researcher's immediate circle, confirming its broad relevance and influence.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 3

CORE PAPER

Marketing Agility: The Concept, Antecedents, and a Research Agenda

2021 · Journal of Marketing · 473 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 221 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Business papers from 2021 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Artificial intelligence and adaptive response to market changes: A strategy to enhance firm performance and innovation (2024)	Baylor University, TBS Business School	France, United States	—
2	Understanding the relationship between marketing analytics, customer agility, and customer satisfaction: A longitudinal perspective (2024)	Cardiff Metropolitan University, Nottingham Business School, Nottingham Trent University	Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia	—
3	Digital content marketing in business markets: Activities, consequences, and contingencies along the customer journey (2022)	University of Jyväskylä, University of Turku	Finland	—

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
Tilburg University	Netherlands	SCImago #3248 · THE 301–350 · QS =347	1
TBS Business School	France	—	1
University of Wollongong	Australia	SCImago #1289 · THE 201–250 · QS =184	1
Tanta University	Egypt	SCImago #4228 · THE 1001–1200 · QS 1201-1400	1
University of Texas at Tyler	United States	—	1
Georgia Southwestern State University	United States	—	1
National Economics University	Vietnam	SCImago #6745	1
Indian Institute of Foreign Trade	India	—	1
Umm Al-Qura University	Saudi Arabia	SCImago #2390 · THE 401–500 · QS =622	1
University of Turku	Finland	SCImago #1389 · THE 301–350 · QS 366	1

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
University of Jyväskylä	Finland	SCImago #2621 · THE 401–500 · QS 498	1
KU Leuven	Belgium	SCImago #180 · THE 46 · QS 60	1
University of Washington	United States	SCImago #45 · THE 25 · QS 81	1
University of Pittsburgh	United States	SCImago #212 · QS =281	1
United Arab Emirates University	United Arab Emirates	SCImago #2170 · THE 201–250 · QS 229	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	7
Belgium	1
Canada	1
China	1
Egypt	1
Finland	1
France	1
Australia	1
Netherlands	1
New Zealand	1
Saudi Arabia	1
Tunisia	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).

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	Asymmetric New Product Development Alliances: Win-Win or Win-Lose Partnerships?	0	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) — Criterion 5
Contribution 2	Product and environmental social performance: Varying effect on firm performance	7	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) — Criterion 5
Contribution 3	Marketing Agility: The Concept, Antecedents, and a Research Agenda	3	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) — Criterion 5