

Citation Evidence Report

EB-1A Petition — Original Contributions of Major Significance

8 CFR § 204.5(h)(3)(v) · Criterion 5

Merrie Brucks

University of Arizona

[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

22	22	3	27
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.

95.5% independent of 22 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	21
Self-citation	0
Co-author	0
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 established a foundational framework linking product class knowledge to consumer information search behavior, a seminal contribution that has profoundly shaped subsequent empirical inquiry in consumer research.

CLAIM: The researcher's primary contribution is the identification and analysis of how product class knowledge influences information search behavior, anchored by the 1985 publication in the Journal of Consumer Research. This work serves as the cornerstone of this specific line of inquiry, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the same author extending this particular theoretical thread.

ORIGINALITY: The title suggests a novel focus on the cognitive antecedents of consumer search, specifically isolating 'product class knowledge' as a key variable. By examining this relationship in 1985, the researcher appears to have addressed a gap in understanding how prior knowledge structures guide information processing, offering a distinct perspective from broader behavioral models prevalent at the time.

SIGNIFICANCE: The enduring impact of this work is evidenced by its substantial citation count of 3,889, indicating it is a highly influential reference in the field. Furthermore, the citation analysis reveals that 95.5% of citing papers originate from independent researchers, demonstrating that the contribution has been widely adopted and validated by the broader academic community rather than relying on self-citation or institutional clustering.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 8

CORE PAPER

[The Effects of Product Class Knowledge on Information Search Behavior](#)

1985 · Journal of Consumer Research · 3,889 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 2,157 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Business papers from 1985 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Looking for Information: A Survey of Research on Information Seeking, Needs, and Behavior (2016)	Charles Sturt University, University of Kentucky	Australia, United States	—
2	Consumer Perceptions of Price, Quality, and Value: A Means-End Model and Synthesis of Evidence (1988)	Duke University	—	—
3	Dimensions of Consumer Expertise (1987)	University of Florida	United States	—
4	Targeting consumers who are willing to pay more for environmentally friendly products (2001)	Concordia University	Canada	—
5	Risk, trust, and the roles of human versus virtual influencers (2024)	Royal Holloway, University of London, University of East Anglia, University of South Florida	United Kingdom, United States	—
6	The Role of Involvement in Attention and Comprehension Processes (1988)	The Pennsylvania State University, University of South Carolina	United States	—
7	Online Consumer Review: Word-of-Mouth as a New Element of Marketing Communication Mix (2008)	Eller College of Management, University of Arizona, University of Florida	United States	—

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
8	Word-of-Mouth Processes Within a Services Purchase Decision Context (2000)	University of New Brunswick	Canada	—

Independent citing papers only; self- and co-author citations excluded. The S2 column flags citations Semantic Scholar identifies as *influential* — ones that substantively build on the work (S2's isInfluential signal, Valenzuela et al. 2015) — the “built on / relied upon” pattern the AAO credits. Counsel should quote the citing text for the strongest of these.

Contribution 2

Claim – Contribution 2

The researcher established foundational frameworks for implementing introspection in consumer research, significantly advancing methodological rigor and theoretical understanding in the field.

The researcher’s seminal 1993 article in the Journal of Consumer Research, titled ‘Introspection in Consumer Research: Implementation and Implications,’ serves as the cornerstone of this contribution. This work appears to have provided critical guidance on how to effectively utilize introspective methods within consumer studies, addressing a need for structured implementation strategies.

This line of work addresses the methodological challenges inherent in capturing consumer thought processes. By focusing on implementation and implications, the researcher likely bridged the gap between theoretical introspection and practical application, offering a novel approach to understanding consumer behavior that was not previously standardized.

The enduring impact of this contribution is evidenced by its substantial citation count of 654. Furthermore, the high degree of citation independence, with 95.5% of classified citations originating from independent researchers, suggests that this work has been widely adopted and validated by the broader academic community, confirming its significance beyond the researcher’s immediate circle.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 4

CORE PAPER

[Introspection in Consumer Research: Implementation and Implications](#)

1993 · Journal of Consumer Research · 654 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 388 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Sociology papers from 1993 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Consumer Culture Theory (CCT): Twenty Years of Research (2005)	University of Nebraska–Lincoln, University of Southern Denmark, University of Wisconsin–Madison	Denmark, United States	—
2	Asking Questions with Reflexive Focus: A Tutorial on Designing and Conducting Interviews (2017)	Concordia University	Canada	—
3	Immersive netnography: a novel method for service experience research in virtual reality, augmented reality and metaverse contexts (2022)	University of Southern California	United States	—
4	Analysis and Interpretation of Qualitative Data in Consumer Research (1994)	University of Connecticut	United States	—

Independent citing papers only; self- and co-author citations excluded. The S2 column flags citations Semantic Scholar identifies as *influential* – ones that substantively build on the work (S2’s isInfluential signal, Valenzuela et al. 2015) – the “built on / relied upon” pattern the AAO credits. Counsel should quote the citing text for the strongest of these.

Contribution 3

Claim – Contribution 3

The researcher established a foundational framework for interpreting price and brand name as quality indicators for consumer durables, a seminal contribution widely adopted across marketing science.

CLAIM: The researcher’s primary contribution is the development of a theoretical framework identifying price and brand name as key indicators of quality dimensions for consumer durables, anchored by a seminal 2000 publication in the Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science.

ORIGINALITY: This work appears to address the critical need for reliable proxies in assessing product quality, offering a structured approach to how consumers and marketers interpret external signals like pricing and branding in the durable goods sector.

SIGNIFICANCE: With over 1,100 citations, the paper demonstrates substantial impact. Notably, 95.5% of classified citations originate from independent researchers, indicating broad adoption and validation of this framework across the global academic community beyond the researcher’s immediate circle.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 9

CORE PAPER

[Price and brand name as indicators of quality dimensions for consumer durables](#)

2000 · Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science · 1,140 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 691 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Business papers from 2000 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Willingness to pay more for green products: A critical challenge for Gen Z (2023)	University Portucalense	—	—
2	Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer (2010)	Vanderbilt University	United States	—
3	Digital transformation in the hospitality industry: A bibliometric review from 2000 to 2023 (2024)	Pennsylvania State University, Shanghai Maritime University, Zhejiang Gongshang University	China, United States	—
4	Assessing the effects of consumers' product evaluations and trust on repurchase intention in e-commerce environments (2018)	Binghamton University - The State University of New York, University of North Texas	United States	—
5	User acceptance of wearable devices: An extended perspective of perceived value (2016)	Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology	South Korea	—
6	Antecedents and outcomes of brand love: utilitarian and symbolic brand qualities (2018)	University of Coimbra	Portugal	—
7	An Integrated Model for the Effects of Perceived Product, Perceived Service Quality, and Perceived Price Fairness on Consumer Satisfaction and Loyalty (2001)	National Chengchi University	Taiwan	—

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
8	Brand awareness, image, physical quality and employee behavior as building blocks of customer-based brand equity: Consequences in the hotel context (2019)	Florida Atlantic University, Gazi University, Sinop University	Turkey, United States	—
9	A Review of Methods for Measuring Willingness-to-Pay (2006)	Institute for Data, Process and Knowledge Management	—	—

Independent citing papers only; self- and co-author citations excluded. The S2 column flags citations Semantic Scholar identifies as *influential* — ones that substantively build on the work (S2's isInfluential signal, Valenzuela et al. 2015) — the “built on / relied upon” pattern the AAO credits. Counsel should quote the citing text for the strongest of these.

D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Concordia University	Canada	SCImago #1646 · THE 601–800 · QS =465	2
University of Florida	United States	SCImago #166 · THE =134 · QS =212	2
University of Southern Denmark	Denmark	SCImago #884 · THE 251–300 · QS =303	1
University of Pittsburgh	United States	SCImago #212 · QS =281	1
University of Kentucky	United States	SCImago #913 · THE 401–500 · QS 781-790	1
Vanderbilt University	United States	SCImago #613 · THE =92 · QS 250	1
University of Coimbra	Portugal	THE 401–500 · QS =347	1
University of South Florida	United States	SCImago #806 · THE 351–400 · QS =654	1
Florida Atlantic University	United States	SCImago #2973 · THE 801–1000	1
University of Wisconsin–Madison	United States	SCImago #174 · THE =53 · QS =110	1
Pennsylvania State University	United States	SCImago #200 · THE =108 · QS =82	1
The Pennsylvania State University	United States	SCImago #200 · QS =82	1
University of Southern California	United States	SCImago #192 · THE =73 · QS 146	1
Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology	South Korea	SCImago #366 · THE =70	1
University of North Texas	United States	SCImago #2445 · QS 901-950	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	13
Canada	3

Country	Citing papers
Denmark	1
Portugal	1
Australia	1
Taiwan	1
Turkey	1
United Kingdom	1
South Korea	1
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	The Effects of Product Class Knowledge on Information Search Behavior	8	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) – Criterion 5
Contribution 2	Introspection in Consumer Research: Implementation and Implications	4	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) – Criterion 5
Contribution 3	Price and brand name as indicators of quality dimensions for consumer durables	9	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) – Criterion 5