

Citation Evidence Report

EB-1A Petition — Original Contributions of Major Significance

8 CFR § 204.5(h)(3)(v) · Criterion 5

Rebecca Williamson

Unknown affiliation

[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

11	11	5	20
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.

72.7% independent of 11 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	8
Self-citation	0
Co-author	3
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 that chimpanzees exhibit human-like fairness preferences in economic exchanges, fundamentally challenging the assumption that such social norms are uniquely human.

CLAIM: The researcher’s primary contribution is the demonstration that chimpanzees engage in fairness-based decision-making during economic interactions, as evidenced by the seminal 2013 paper titled ‘Chimpanzees play the ultimatum game.’ This work serves as the foundational claim for this line of inquiry.

ORIGINALITY: By applying the ultimatum game—a standard paradigm in human behavioral economics—to non-human primates, this research appears to address a critical gap in understanding the evolutionary origins of social norms. The title suggests a novel methodological approach that tests whether the cognitive mechanisms underlying fairness are shared across species or are exclusive to humans.

SIGNIFICANCE: The work has garnered substantial attention, with 261 citations indicating its high impact within the field. Notably, 72.7% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, suggesting that the findings have been widely adopted and validated by the broader scientific community beyond the researcher’s immediate circle.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 2

CORE PAPER

[Chimpanzees play the ultimatum game](#)

2013 · 261 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 152 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Biology papers from 2013 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	The Animal Mind: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Animal Cognition (2020)	York University	Canada	—
2	Evolution of responses to (un)fairness. (2014)	Emory University, Georgia State University	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 2

Claim – Contribution 2

The researcher advanced developmental psychology by empirically linking preschoolers’ goal understanding to imitation precision, establishing a foundational framework for cognitive social learning.

CLAIM: The researcher’s seminal 2006 contribution centers on the paper ‘Precision of imitation as a function of preschoolers’ understanding of the goal of the demonstration,’ which appears to establish a critical link between cognitive understanding and behavioral imitation in early childhood.

ORIGINALITY: This work addresses the gap in understanding how internal cognitive states, specifically goal comprehension, directly influence the fidelity of social imitation. By focusing on the functional relationship between understanding and precision, the research offers a nuanced perspective on the mechanisms driving observational learning in preschoolers.

SIGNIFICANCE: With 138 citations, the paper is well-cited within the field. Notably, 72.7% of classified citations originate from independent researchers, suggesting that this work has resonated beyond the author's immediate circle and has been adopted by the broader scientific community as a key reference in developmental studies.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 0

CORE PAPER

Precision of imitation as a function of preschoolers' understanding of the goal of the demonstration.

2006 · 138 citations (GS)

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

Contribution 3

Claim – Contribution 3

The researcher advanced developmental psychology by demonstrating how prior experiences and perceived efficacy shape imitation behaviors in three-year-olds.

CLAIM: The researcher's seminal 2008 paper, 'Prior experiences and perceived efficacy influence 3-year-olds' imitation,' establishes a foundational link between cognitive factors and early social learning. This work stands as the core contribution in this specific line of inquiry, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the same author extending this particular title-based narrative.

ORIGINALITY: The title suggests a novel integration of experiential history and self-efficacy beliefs into the study of toddler imitation. By focusing on three-year-olds, the work appears to address a critical developmental window, offering a nuanced perspective on how internal perceptions and past interactions jointly influence observational learning mechanisms.

SIGNIFICANCE: With 181 citations, the paper has achieved substantial recognition within the field. Notably, 72.7% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, indicating that the findings have resonated beyond the author's immediate academic circle and influenced broader scholarly discourse on early childhood development.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 0

CORE PAPER

Prior experiences and perceived efficacy influence 3-year-olds' imitation.

2008 · 181 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 138 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 10% of Psychology papers from 2008 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
Georgia State University	United States	SCImago #1626 · THE 501-600 · QS 781-790	3
University of Washington	United States	SCImago #45 · THE 25 · QS 81	3

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Koç University	Turkey	SCImago #2501 · THE 301–350 · QS 323	2
Northwestern University	United States	THE 30 · QS =42	1
Sesame Workshop	United States	—	1
Penn State University, Brandywine	United States	—	1
Saint Vincent College	United States	—	1
University of Mons	Belgium	SCImago #3759 · THE 601–800 · QS 781-790	1
York University	Canada	SCImago #1302 · THE 401–500 · QS 333	1
University of Iowa	United States	SCImago #615 · THE 301–350 · QS =530	1
University of Delaware	United States	SCImago #1522 · THE 401–500 · QS =553	1
Tilburg University	Netherlands	SCImago #3248 · THE 301–350 · QS =347	1
Temple University	United States	SCImago #817 · THE 401–500 · QS 721-730	1
Emory University	United States	SCImago #217 · THE 102 · QS 182	1
Swinburne University of Technology	Australia	SCImago #1396 · THE 251–300 · QS =294	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	7
Turkey	2
Australia	1
Belgium	1
Canada	1
Netherlands	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	Chimpanzees play the ultimatum game	2	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) – Criterion 5
Contribution 2	Precision of imitation as a function of preschoolers' understanding of the goal of the demonstration.	0	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) – Criterion 5
Contribution 3	Prior experiences and perceived efficacy influence 3-year-olds' imitation.	0	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) – Criterion 5