



DA

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS
425 Eye Street N.W.
ULLB, 3rd Floor
Washington, D.C. 20536



File: EAC-01-051-52803 Office: Vermont Service Center

Date: OCT 07 2002

IN RE: Petitioner: [Redacted]
Beneficiary: [Redacted]

Petition: Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



PUBLIC COPY

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office that originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,
EXAMINATIONS

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The nonimmigrant visa petition was denied by the director and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner imports and exports construction materials and food products from Europe, primarily Turkey. It has three employees and a gross annual income of \$371,087. It seeks to extend its authorization to employ the beneficiary as a market research analyst for a period of three years. The director determined the petitioner had not established that the proffered position is a specialty occupation.

On appeal, counsel submits a brief.

8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(4)(ii) defines the term "specialty occupation" as:

an occupation which requires theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge in fields of human endeavor including, but not limited to, architecture, engineering, mathematics, physical sciences, social sciences, medicine and health, education, business specialties, accounting, law, theology, and the arts, and which requires the attainment of a bachelor's degree or higher in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, as a minimum for entry into the occupation in the United States.

The director denied the petition because the petitioner had not demonstrated that it requires the services of a market research analyst. On appeal, counsel states, in part, that the director's denial contradicts its own decisions in identical cases, contains internal inconsistencies, and completely disregards the petitioner's approval for the same beneficiary three years also.

Counsel's argument on appeal is not persuasive. The Service does not rely solely on the title of a position in determining whether that position qualifies as a specialty occupation. The specific duties of the offered position combined with the nature of the petitioning entity's business operations are factors that the Service considers. In the initial I-129 petition, the petitioner described the duties of the offered position as follows:

1. Research market conditions in particular region to determine potential sales of products and services;
2. Establish data methodology and design format for data gathering;
3. Examine and analyze statistical data on competitors and analyze prices and methods of distribution;

4. Collect data on customer preferences and prepare reports on findings; and
5. Use specialized knowledge of import/export procedures and tariffs in Europe [sic] countries, especially in Turkey tom [sic] assess the feasibility of importing/exporting certain construction and food products.

The above description of the beneficiary's duties appears to be a paraphrasing of the duties of a market research analyst position as set forth in the Department of Labor's (DOL) Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook), 2002-2003 edition. It does not appear to be a comprehensive description of the beneficiary's actual daily activities. Therefore, the Service is not persuaded to classify the position as the specialty occupation of a market research analyst.

The first reason why the Service is not persuaded to classify the offered position as a market research analyst position concerns the actual daily duties of the offered position compared with the duties of a typical market research analyst position. At page 239 of the Handbook, the DOL states that "[m]arket, or marketing, research analysts are concerned with the potential sales of a product or service. They gather data on competitors and analyze prices, sales, and methods of marketing and distribution." Although the petitioner claims that the beneficiary's duties include such activities as establishing data methodology, designing format for data gathering, collecting data on customer preferences and preparing reports on findings, the record contains no evidence that the beneficiary has performed such duties despite his employment with the petitioner since February 1998. Rather, the actual position appears to be that of a marketing manager or a market research manager for reasons that will be discussed herein.

The second reason why the Service is not persuaded to classify the offered position as a market research analyst position relates to the type of industry in which the beneficiary would be employed. Information in the Handbook, at page 240, provides insight into the types of industries in which market research analysts are normally found. According to the DOL:

Private industry provided about 9 out of 10 jobs for salaried workers, particularly economic and marketing research firms, management consulting firms, banks, securities and commodities brokers, and computer and data processing companies.

Although the list of private industry employers is not all inclusive, the DOL's description of a market research analyst's job implies that these types of positions are found within large firms or corporations, such as banks or worldwide pharmaceutical companies.

The record indicates that the petitioner, which is engaged in importing and exporting construction materials and food products, employs three persons and has a gross annual income of \$371,087. The business in which the petitioner is engaged is not within the DOL's list of industries that typically require the services of a full-time individual who performs only market research analyst duties. For these reasons, the Service is not persuaded to label the offered position as a market research analyst position.

Although the Service does not agree with the petitioner that the position it is offering is a market research analyst position, the petitioner could, nevertheless, qualify the offered position as a specialty occupation if the petitioner could establish that:

1. A baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position;
2. The degree requirement is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations or, in the alternative, an employer may show that its particular position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with a degree;
3. The employer normally requires a degree or its equivalent for the position; or
4. The nature of the specific duties is so specialized and complex that knowledge required to perform the duties is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree.

See. 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

An analysis of the beneficiary's proposed duties reveals that the job being offered is the job of a marketing manager or a market research manager. According to the Handbook at page 27:

Marketing managers develop the firm's detailed marketing strategy. With the help of subordinates, including *product development managers* and *market research managers*, they determine the demand for products and services offered by the firm and its competitors. In addition, they identify potential markets . . . Marketing managers develop pricing strategy with an eye towards maximizing the firm's share of the market and its profits while ensuring that the firms's customers are satisfied. In collaboration with sales, product development, and other managers, they monitor trends that indicate the need for new products and services and oversee product development.

In view of the foregoing, the actual position appears to be that of a marketing manager or market research manager. Information in the Handbook does not indicate that either position requires a bachelor's degree in a specific field of study. Rather, most employers prefer a wide-range of educational backgrounds or promote individuals from within companies. Thus, the petitioner has not shown that a bachelor's degree or its equivalent is required for the position being offered to the beneficiary.

Additionally, although the petitioner argues that it requires the minimum of a baccalaureate degree in business administration, marketing, or economics for the proffered position, the petitioner's reasoning is problematic when viewed in light of the statutory definition of specialty occupation. The petitioner's creation of a position with a perfunctory bachelor's degree requirement will not mask the fact that the position is not a specialty occupation. As with employment agencies as petitioners, the Service must examine the ultimate employment of the alien, and determine whether the position qualifies as a specialty occupation. Cf. Defensor v. Meissner, 201 F.3d 384 (5th Cir. 2000). The critical element is not the title of the position or an employer's self-imposed standards, but whether the position actually requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and the attainment of a bachelor's degree in the specific specialty as the minimum for entry into the occupation as required by the Act.¹ To interpret the regulations any other way would lead to absurd results: if the Service was limited to reviewing a petitioner's self-imposed employment requirements, then any alien with a bachelor's degree could be brought into the United States to perform a menial, non-professional, or an otherwise non-specialty occupation, so long as the employer required all such employees to have bachelor's degrees. See id. at 388.

In this case, although the petitioner claimed that its minimum requirement for the proffered position is a baccalaureate degree in business administration, marketing, or economics, the position, nevertheless, does not meet the statutory definition of specialty occupation. The position, itself, does not require the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge. Therefore, even though the petitioner has required a bachelor's degree in the past, the position still does not require a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty.

¹ The court in Defensor v. Meissner observed that the four criteria at 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) present certain ambiguities when compared to the statutory definition, and "might also be read as merely an additional requirement that a position must meet, in addition to the statutory and regulatory definition." Supra at 387.

Furthermore, although the record contains various job advertisements, the petitioner has not presented any documentary evidence that businesses similar to the petitioner in their type of operations, number of employees, and amount of gross annual income, require the services of individuals in parallel positions. Finally, the petitioner did not demonstrate that the nature of the beneficiary's proposed duties is so specialized and complex that the knowledge required to perform the duties is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specialized area.

The petitioner has failed to establish that any of the four factors enumerated above are present in this proceeding for the position of a marketing manager or a market research manager. Therefore, the director's decision is affirmed.

With respect to counsel's objection to denial of this petition in view of the approval of similar petitions in the past, the Associate Commissioner, through the Administrative Appeals Office, is not bound to follow the contradictory decision of a service center. Louisiana Philharmonic Orchestra v. INS, 2000 WL 282785 (E.D.La. 2000), aff'd, 248 F.3d 1139 (5th Cir. 2001), cert. denied, 122 S. Ct.51 (U.S. 2001).

Beyond the decision of the director, the labor condition application submitted by the petitioner was not certified by an authorized Department of Labor official pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(4)(i)(B)(1). As this matter will be dismissed on the grounds discussed, this issue need not be examined further.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1361. The petitioner has not sustained that burden. Accordingly, the decision of the director will not be disturbed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.