Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Sarah Pressman

Professor of Psychology and Assoc. Dean of Undergrad Education, University of California

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

16	17	3	36
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.

68.8% independent of 16 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	11
Self-citation	0
Co-author	5
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 linking positive affect to health outcomes, subsequently refining the theoretical mechanisms and conditions for this relationship.

The researcher's core contribution centers on the seminal 2005 paper in Psychological Bulletin, which investigates whether positive affect influences health. This work serves as the anchor for a sustained line of inquiry into the psychological determinants of physical well-being.

Originality is suggested by the chronological progression from establishing the basic link in 2005 to a 2017 follow-up that explicitly addresses the conditional nature of this influence. The titles indicate a shift from verifying existence to elucidating the specific mechanisms, contexts, and future research directions required to understand how subjective well-being impacts health.

Significance is demonstrated by the substantial citation counts, with the core paper accumulating 3389 citations and the follow-up reaching 1140. Furthermore, the high proportion of independent citations, comprising nearly 69% of the classified sample, suggests that this framework has been widely adopted and utilized by researchers outside the scholar's immediate network.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 12 · **1 flagged influential by Semantic Scholar**

CORE PAPER

Does positive affect influence health?

2005 · Psychological Bulletin · 3,389 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 2,124 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Psychology papers from 2005 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	A New Look at Social Support: A Theoretical Perspective on Thriving Through Relationships (2015)	Carnegie Mellon University, University of California, Santa Barbara	United States	**Influential**
2	Positive psychology interventions: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled studies (2013)	Trimbos Institute, Netherlands Institute of Mental Health and Addiction	Netherlands	—
3	Physiology and neurobiology of stress and adaptation: central role of the brain (2007)	The Rockefeller University	United States	—
4	Positive Psychology: A Personal History (2019)	University of Pennsylvania	United States	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).

FOLLOW-UP WORK

If, why, and when subjective well-being influences health, and future needed research

2017 · 1,140 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 568 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Psychology papers from 2017 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Ageism and Psychological Well-Being Among Older Adults: A Systematic Review (2022)	George Mason University, University of Pittsburgh	United States	Methodology
2	Positive Psychology: A Personal History (2019)	University of Pennsylvania	United States	—
3	Well-being is more than happiness and life satisfaction: a multidimensional analysis of 21 countries (2020)	Columbia Business School, Columbia University, Trinity College Dublin	Ireland, Spain, United States	Background
4	Sense of Belonging, Meaningful Daily Life Participation, and Well-Being: Integrated Investigation (2023)	—	—	Background
5	Health behaviour changes during COVID-19 and the potential consequences: A mini-review (2020)	Zayed University	United Arab Emirates	Background
6	The impact of gardening on well-being, mental health, and quality of life: an umbrella review and meta-analysis (2024)	King's College London, University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine of Cluj-Napoca	Romania, United Kingdom	—
7	Smartphone-Based Ecological Momentary Assessment of Well-Being: A Systematic Review and Recommendations for Future Studies (2021)	The University of Queensland, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam	Australia, Netherlands	—
8	When Pandemic Hits: Exercise Frequency and Subjective Well-Being During COVID-19 Pandemic (2020)	CUNY Lehman College, University of Potsdam	Germany, 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).

Citing-text excerpts — how the field used this work

METHODOLOGY Ageism and Psychological Well-Being Among Older Adults: A Systematic Review

"We adopted a broader definition of psychological well-being as suggested by Diener et al. (2017)."

Contribution 2

Claim — Contribution 2

The researcher established a foundational link between enjoyable leisure activities and holistic well-being, producing a seminal, highly cited study that appears to have significantly influenced subsequent health psychology research.

The researcher's primary contribution centers on the 2009 publication in Psychosomatic Medicine, titled 'Association of Enjoyable Leisure Activities With Psychological and Physical Well-Being.' This work serves as the cornerstone of the applicant's record in this domain, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the same author listed to extend this specific line of inquiry. The core paper stands alone as the definitive output for this particular research thread.

This line of work appears to address the critical intersection of leisure behavior and health outcomes. By focusing on 'enjoyable' activities rather than general physical exercise, the research suggests a novel perspective on how subjective enjoyment in leisure time contributes to both psychological and physical health. The title indicates a broad, integrative approach to well-being that likely filled a gap in understanding the non-exercise components of a healthy lifestyle.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its substantial citation count of 751, indicating it is a well-cited and influential piece of scholarship. Furthermore, analysis of citing papers reveals that 68.8% of citations originate from independent researchers, rather than the author's own network. This high degree of independent uptake suggests the work has been widely recognized and utilized by the broader scientific community, validating its impact beyond the researcher's immediate circle.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 0

CORE PAPER

Association of Enjoyable Leisure Activities With Psychological and Physical Well-Being

2009 · Psychosomatic Medicine · 751 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 444 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Psychology papers from 2009 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

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
University of Virginia	United States	SCImago #451 · THE =166 · QS 275	2
University of Pennsylvania	United States	SCImago #52 · THE 14 · QS 15	1
Trinity College Dublin	Ireland	SCImago #926 · THE 173	1
Michigan State University	United States	SCImago #436 · THE =105 · QS 161	1
The University of Queensland	Australia	SCImago #126 · THE =80 · QS =42	1
Zayed University	United Arab Emirates	SCImago #3771 · THE 401–500 · QS =595	1
University of California, Irvine	United States	SCImago #329 · THE 97 · QS 293	1
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	United States	SCImago #206 · THE =41	1
The Rockefeller University	United States	SCImago #365	1
University of Missouri	United States	—	1
University of Texas at Dallas	United States	THE 401–500 · QS =597	1
University of Pittsburgh	United States	SCImago #212 · QS =281	1
Columbia University	United States	SCImago #65 · THE 20 · QS =38	1
George Mason University	United States	SCImago #1399 · THE 401–500 · QS 951-1000	1
University of Potsdam	Germany	SCImago #1786 · THE 201–250 · QS =477	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	11

Country	Citing papers
Netherlands	2
Ireland	1
Australia	1
Spain	1
United Arab Emirates	1
United Kingdom	1
Romania	1
Germany	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	Does positive affect influence health?	12	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)
Contribution 2	Association of Enjoyable Leisure Activities With Psychological and Physical Well-Being	0	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)