

# Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

## Ruth Lupton

Professor of Education, University of Manchester

[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

<b>1</b> Citing papers mapped	<b>1</b> Citation edges	<b>1</b> Home papers mapped	<b>43</b> 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.

**0.0% independent** of 1 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	0
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 advanced the integration of social justice frameworks with school improvement strategies, specifically targeting educational quality enhancement in impoverished neighborhoods through a seminal 2005 publication.*

The researcher's contribution centers on the intersection of social justice and school improvement, as evidenced by the core paper 'Social justice and school improvement: improving the quality of schooling in the poorest neighbourhoods' published in the British Educational Research Journal in 2005. This work represents a focused effort to address educational disparities in disadvantaged communities.

This line of work appears to address the critical gap between theoretical social justice principles and practical school improvement mechanisms in low-income areas. By explicitly linking these domains, the researcher likely provided a novel framework for understanding how equity concerns can drive tangible improvements in schooling quality within the poorest neighborhoods, distinguishing this approach from general educational reform literature.

The significance of this contribution is reflected in its citation record, with the core paper accumulating 409 citations. While the provided data indicates that none of the classified citing papers are from independent researchers, the substantial citation count suggests the work has been recognized and utilized within the field, potentially serving as a foundational reference for discussions on equity in education.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 0

### CORE PAPER

#### [Social justice and school improvement: improving the quality of schooling in the poorest neighbourhoods](#)

2005 · British Educational Research Journal · 409 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 234 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Education papers from 2005 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 Manchester	United Kingdom	SCImago #196 · THE 56 · QS 35	1
University of Waikato	New Zealand	SCImago #4810 · THE 401–500 · QS =281	1

### Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
New Zealand	1
United Kingdom	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.

## 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	Social justice and school improvement: improving the quality of schooling in the poorest neighbourhoods	0	Dhanasar – Prong 2 (well-positioned)