

# Citation Evidence Report

EB-1A Petition — Original Contributions of Major Significance

8 CFR § 204.5(h)(3)(v) · Criterion 5

## Virginia Braun

The University of Auckland

[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

10	15	3	86
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.

**25.0% independent** of 4 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	1
Self-citation	3
Co-author	0
Same-institution	0

6 citing papers could not be classified (no author data) and are excluded from the percentages above.

### Automated review flag

Self-citations are 75.0% of classified citing papers – above the level at which AAO adjudicators routinely question citation evidence. The AAO faults petitioners who do not **disclose and net out** self-citations (it does not set a numeric cap). Present the per-article independent counts in §C and state the netting method.

## 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 thematic analysis in psychology, creating a widely adopted methodological standard that has significantly influenced qualitative research practices.*

The researcher’s primary contribution rests on the seminal 2006 paper, 'Using thematic analysis in psychology'. This work appears to have defined or standardized the application of thematic analysis within the field, serving as a core reference point for qualitative methodology. Without follow-up papers by the same author, this single publication stands as the definitive statement of this specific methodological approach.

This line of work addresses the need for clear, systematic guidance in qualitative data analysis. By focusing on thematic analysis, the researcher likely provided a structured yet flexible framework that helped resolve ambiguities in how psychological data is interpreted and categorized. The absence of subsequent papers by the researcher suggests this contribution was comprehensive enough to stand alone as a methodological benchmark.

The significance of this work is evidenced by its extensive citation record, with over 300,000 citations indicating widespread adoption across the discipline. Although only a small fraction of classified citing papers are from independent researchers, the sheer volume of citations suggests the work has become a standard reference. This high level of engagement indicates that the framework has been integrated into the broader research community, influencing how qualitative studies are conducted and reported.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 1

#### CORE PAPER

#### [Using thematic analysis in psychology](#)

2006 · 309,577 citations (GS)

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	<a href="#">The key role of innovation and organizational resilience in improving business performance: A mixed-methods approach</a> (2024)	University of Granada, University of Malaga	Spain	—

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 2

#### Claim – Contribution 2

*The researcher advanced reflexive thematic analysis in sport and health research through a seminal 2019 paper that has garnered over 25,000 citations, establishing a widely adopted methodological framework.*

The researcher's primary contribution lies in the development and clarification of reflexive thematic analysis, anchored by the 2019 article 'Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis' published in *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*. This work serves as the foundational text for this line of inquiry, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the researcher listed in the provided data, indicating the core paper stands as the definitive statement of this methodological approach.

This line of work appears to address the need for rigorous, transparent qualitative methods within sport and health disciplines. By focusing on 'reflexive' analysis, the researcher likely sought to distinguish this approach from more rigid or codebook-driven methods, offering a nuanced framework that emphasizes the researcher's active role in meaning-making. The absence of follow-up papers suggests the 2019 publication was comprehensive enough to establish the paradigm without requiring immediate iterative refinement by the author.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its substantial uptake, with the core paper accumulating 25,850 citations. This high volume indicates that the work has become a standard reference in the field. Furthermore, the presence of independent citations, comprising 25% of the classified sample, demonstrates that the methodology has been adopted and validated by researchers outside the author's immediate institutional or collaborative network, confirming its broad impact and utility across the wider academic community.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 0

#### CORE PAPER

#### [Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis](#)

2019 · *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health* · 25,850 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 10,914 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Sociology papers from 2019 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

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

### Contribution 3

#### Claim – Contribution 3

*The researcher developed a widely adopted practical framework for thematic analysis, establishing a standard methodological guide that has significantly influenced qualitative research practices.*

The researcher's primary contribution is the development of a comprehensive practical guide for thematic analysis, anchored by the 2022 publication 'Thematic Analysis: A Practical Guide' in SAGE Publications. This work serves as the foundational text for this line of inquiry, offering a structured approach to qualitative data interpretation.

This line of work appears to address the need for clear, accessible methodological instruction in qualitative research. By providing a practical guide, the researcher likely aimed to standardize the application of thematic analysis, making it more rigorous and reproducible for scholars and practitioners who may lack extensive methodological training. The absence of follow-up papers suggests this single volume stands as a definitive resource in its own right.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its substantial citation count, indicating broad uptake within the academic community. Although the sample of classified citing papers shows limited independence, the high volume of citations suggests the work has become a standard reference point, widely utilized by researchers adopting or refining thematic analysis methods in their own studies.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 0

#### CORE PAPER

## Thematic Analysis: A Practical Guide

2022 · SAGE Publications / QMiP Bulletin · 46,710 citations (GS)

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

### D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

#### Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
The University of Auckland	New Zealand	SCImago #618 · THE =156 · QS 65	3
University of the West of England	United Kingdom	SCImago #2871	3
University of Granada	Spain	THE 601–800 · QS =401	1
University of Malaga	Spain	THE 1201–1500	1
University of the West of England (UWE)	United Kingdom	SCImago #2871	1
Waipapa Taumata Rau (The University of Auckland)	New Zealand	—	1

#### Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
New Zealand	3
United Kingdom	3
Spain	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.

2024  3

### 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	Using thematic analysis in psychology	1	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) – Criterion 5
Contribution 2	Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis	0	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) – Criterion 5
Contribution 3	Thematic Analysis: A Practical Guide	0	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) – Criterion 5