

(b)(6)

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services  
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)  
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

DATE: **MAY 21 2014** OFFICE: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER FILE: [REDACTED]

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)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) in your case.

This is a non-precedent decision. The AAO does not announce new constructions of law nor establish agency policy through non-precedent decisions. If you believe the AAO incorrectly applied current law or policy to your case or if you seek to present new facts for consideration, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen, respectively. Any motion must be filed on a Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B) within 33 days of the date of this decision. **Please review the Form I-290B instructions at <http://www.uscis.gov/forms> for the latest information on fee, filing location, and other requirements.** See also 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file a motion directly with the AAO.**

Thank you,

Ron Rosenberg  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The service center director denied the nonimmigrant visa petition. The matter is now on appeal before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The appeal will be dismissed. The petition will be denied.

The petitioner submitted a Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker (Form I-129) to the California Service Center on April 1, 2013. In the Form I-129 visa petition and supporting documentation, the petitioner describes itself as a business engaged in commercial dishwasher sales and services, and sales of chemical and janitorial supplies that was established in 2000.<sup>1</sup> In order to employ the beneficiary in what it designates as a sales and marketing account specialist position, the petitioner seeks to classify him as a nonimmigrant worker in a specialty occupation pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b).

The director denied the petition on July 29, 2013, finding that the petitioner failed to establish that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation in accordance with the applicable statutory and regulatory provisions. On appeal, counsel for the petitioner asserts that the director's basis for denial of the petition was erroneous and contends that the petitioner satisfied all evidentiary requirements.

The record of proceeding before the AAO contains: (1) the petitioner's Form I-129 and supporting documentation; (2) the director's request for evidence (RFE); (3) the petitioner's response to the RFE; (4) the director's denial letter; and (5) the Form I-290B and supporting documentation. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing its decision.

For the reasons that will be discussed below, the AAO agrees with the director that the petitioner has not established eligibility for the benefit sought. Accordingly, the director's decision will not be disturbed. The appeal will be dismissed, and the petition will be denied.

## I. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

In this matter, the petitioner stated in the Form I-129 that it seeks the beneficiary's services as a sales and marketing account specialist to work on a full-time basis at a rate of pay of \$37,149 per year. In a support letter dated April 1, 2013 the petitioner stated that the proffered position involves the following duties and requirements:

[The beneficiary] will spend the majority of his time (80%) on studying market conditions in the greater Kansas City area as well as the states of Missouri and Kansas, to examine potential sales of a product or service. . . . Other tasks may also include:

- Gather data on competitor's and analyze their prices, sales and method of marketing and distribution;

---

<sup>1</sup> In a letter dated April 1, 2013, the petitioner claimed to have been established in 1972. No explanation for the discrepancy was provided.

- Monitor industry statistics and follow trends in trade literature;
- Measure and assess customer satisfaction and feedback;
- Analyze sales data to measure the effectiveness of marketing and advertising strategies;
- Call on potential and established clients to assess their needs regarding commercial dishwasher sales and services as well as warehouse chemical sales and janitorial supplies.

As with any market research analyst position, the duties of the incumbent are highly technical requiring the skills of a professional who holds the minimum of a Bachelor's degree or higher.

The petitioner indicated that the beneficiary is qualified to perform services in the proffered position by virtue of his academic credentials, and provided a copy of the beneficiary's diploma from [REDACTED]. The diploma states that the beneficiary was granted a Bachelor of Business Administration in May 2012. The petitioner also submitted the beneficiary's resume.

In addition, the petitioner submitted a Labor Condition Application (LCA) in support of the instant H-1B petition. The LCA designation for the proffered position corresponds to the occupational classification "Market Research Analysts and Marketing Specialists" - SOC (ONET/OES Code) 13-1161, at a Level I (entry level) wage.

The petitioner also submitted various documents pertaining to its business operations, including (1) state unemployment tax documents, (2) payroll documents, (3) utility bills, and (4) copies of two dishwasher leases issued by the petitioner.

The director found the initial evidence insufficient to establish eligibility for the benefit sought, and issued an RFE on May 6, 2013. The director outlined the evidence to be submitted. The AAO notes that the director specifically requested that the petitioner submit probative evidence to establish that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation.

On July 15, 2013, the petitioner and counsel responded to the director's RFE. In a letter dated July 12, 2013, counsel provided a revised description of the proffered position.<sup>2</sup> In a separate letter

---

<sup>2</sup> In response to the director's RFE, the petitioner submitted a letter reiterating the list of duties provided with the initial submission. In addition, counsel submitted a letter with a revised description of the proffered position. Counsel's submission, however, differs significantly from the petitioner's duties and requirements for the proffered position. No explanation was provided for the variance.

Counsel's brief was not endorsed by the petitioner and the record of proceeding does not indicate the source of the duties, responsibilities and requirements that counsel attributes to the proffered position. Thus, counsel's revised description is not probative evidence as the description was provided by counsel, not the petitioner. Without documentary evidence to support the claim, the assertions of counsel will not satisfy the petitioner's burden of proof. The unsupported assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1 (BIA 1983); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980).



dated July 12, 2013, the petitioner reiterated the original list of duties of the proffered position, revising the amount of time to be spent on the listed duties to 90%, with the remaining time to be spent on "clerical and administrative work." In addition, the petitioner provided the following information regarding the proffered position:

[The beneficiary] will have the freedom to make decisions with very little supervision, he will have Face-to-Face discussions/meetings with [the petitioner's] clients and potential clients, and will be required to make decisions and solving problems in this field. Analyzing information and evaluating results to choose the best solution and solve problems, and establishing and maintaining interpersonal relationships are key.

Along with the above described letters, the petitioner and counsel submitted (1) the beneficiary's transcript; (2) additional tax documents; and (3) copies of previously submitted documents.

The director reviewed the information provided in the initial H-1B petition and in response to the RFE. Although the petitioner and counsel claimed that the beneficiary would serve in a specialty occupation, the director determined that the petitioner failed to establish how the beneficiary's immediate duties would necessitate services at a level requiring the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and attainment of a bachelor's or higher degree in the specific specialty (or its equivalent). The director denied the petition on July 29, 2013.

Counsel for the petitioner submitted an appeal of the denial of the H-1B petition. In support of the appeal, counsel submitted a brief and additional evidence, including: (1) printouts of excerpts from U.S. Department of Labor's (DOL) *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)* regarding the occupational categories of Market Research Analysts and Sales Managers; and (2) a Prevailing Wage Determination (ETA Form 9141) from DOL. The petitioner's job description for the proffered position on the Prevailing Wage Determination request is identical to its description as stated in the initial H-1B submission (although the order of duties is different). Specifically, the duties are described as follows:

Call on potential and established clients to assess their needs regarding commercial dish washer sales and service as well as warehouse chemical sales and janitorial supplies. Gather data on competitor's and analyze their prices, sales, and method of marketing and distribution. Monitor industry statistics and follow trends in trade literature. Measure and assess customer satisfaction and feedback. Analyze sales data to measure the effectiveness of marketing and advertising strategies.

---

Furthermore, it must be noted that a petitioner (or its counsel) cannot materially change a position's job responsibilities and requirements in response to an RFE. The petitioner must establish that the position offered to the beneficiary when the petition was filed merits classification for the benefit sought. *Matter of Michelin Tire Corp.*, 17 I&N Dec. 248, 249 (Reg. Comm'r 1978). A petitioner (or its counsel) may not make material changes to a petition in an effort to make a deficient petition conform to USCIS requirements. See *Matter of Izummi*, 22 I&N Dec. 169, 176 (Assoc. Comm'r 1998).



The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety and now issues this decision.

## II. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The issue before the AAO is whether the petitioner has provided sufficient evidence to establish that it will employ the beneficiary in a specialty occupation position. Based upon a complete review of the record of proceeding, and for the specific reasons described below, the AAO agrees with the director and finds that the evidence fails to establish that the position as described constitutes a specialty occupation.

For an H-1B petition to be granted, the petitioner must provide sufficient evidence to establish that it will employ the beneficiary in a specialty occupation position. To meet its burden of proof in this regard, the petitioner must establish that the employment it is offering to the beneficiary meets the applicable statutory and regulatory requirements.

Section 214(i)(1) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1), defines the term "specialty occupation" as an occupation that requires:

- (A) theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and
- (B) attainment of a bachelor's or higher degree in the specific specialty (or its equivalent) as a minimum for entry into the occupation in the United States.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) states, in pertinent part, the following:

*Specialty occupation* means an occupation which [(1)] 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 [(2)] 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.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), to qualify as a specialty occupation, a proposed position must also meet one of the following criteria:

- (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.

As a threshold issue, it is noted that 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) must logically be read together with section 214(i)(1) of the Act and 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). In other words, this regulatory language must be construed in harmony with the thrust of the related provisions and with the statute as a whole. *See K Mart Corp. v. Cartier, Inc.*, 486 U.S. 281, 291 (1988) (holding that construction of language which takes into account the design of the statute as a whole is preferred); *see also COIT Independence Joint Venture v. Federal Sav. and Loan Ins. Corp.*, 489 U.S. 561 (1989); *Matter of W-F-*, 21 I&N Dec. 503 (BIA 1996). As such, the criteria stated in 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) should logically be read as being necessary but not necessarily sufficient to meet the statutory and regulatory definition of specialty occupation. To otherwise interpret this section as stating the necessary *and* sufficient conditions for meeting the definition of specialty occupation would result in particular positions meeting a condition under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) but not the statutory or regulatory definition. *See Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F.3d 384, 387 (5th Cir. 2000). To avoid this result, 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) must therefore be read as providing supplemental criteria that must be met in accordance with, and not as alternatives to, the statutory and regulatory definitions of specialty occupation.

As such and consonant with section 214(i)(1) of the Act and the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii), U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) consistently interprets the term "degree" in the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) to mean not just any baccalaureate or higher degree, but one in a specific specialty that is directly related to the proffered position. *See Royal Siam Corp. v. Chertoff*, 484 F.3d 139, 147 (1st Cir. 2007) (describing "a degree requirement in a specific specialty" as "one that relates directly to the duties and responsibilities of a particular position"). Applying this standard, USCIS regularly approves H-1B petitions for qualified aliens who are to be employed as engineers, computer scientists, certified public accountants, college professors, and other such occupations. These professions, for which petitioners have regularly been able to establish a minimum entry requirement in the United States of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent directly related to the duties and responsibilities of the particular position, fairly represent the types of specialty occupations that Congress contemplated when it created the H-1B visa category.

To determine whether a particular job qualifies as a specialty occupation, USCIS does not simply rely on a position's title. The specific duties of the proffered position, combined with the nature of the petitioning entity's business operations, are factors to be considered. USCIS must examine the ultimate employment of the alien, and determine whether the position qualifies as a specialty occupation. *See generally Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d 384. The critical element is not the title of the position nor 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 baccalaureate or higher degree in the specific specialty as the minimum for entry into the occupation, as required by the Act.



In ascertaining the intent of a petitioner, USCIS looks to the Form I-129 and the documents filed in support of the petition. It is only in this manner that the agency can determine the exact position offered, the location of employment, the proffered wage, et cetera. Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(9)(i), the director has the responsibility to consider all of the evidence submitted by a petitioner and such other evidence that he or she may independently require to assist his or her adjudication. Further, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iv) provides that "[a]n H-1B petition involving a specialty occupation shall be accompanied by [d]ocumentation . . . or any other required evidence sufficient to establish . . . that the services the beneficiary is to perform are in a specialty occupation."

Thus, a crucial aspect of this matter is whether the petitioner has adequately described the duties of the proffered position, such that USCIS may discern the nature of the position and whether the position indeed requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge attained through at least a baccalaureate degree in a specific discipline, or its equivalent. The AAO finds that the petitioner has not done so.

More specifically, the wording of the majority of the duties provided by the petitioner for the proffered position are taken virtually verbatim from the occupation "Market Research Analysts and Marketing Specialists" as described in the Occupational Information Network (O\*NET) Code Connector. That is, O\*NET states, in pertinent part, the following regarding the tasks for the occupational category "Market Research Analysts and Marketing Specialists" Code – 13-1161.00:

- Gather data on competitors and analyze their prices, sales, and method of marketing and distribution.
- Monitor industry statistics and follow trends in trade literature.
- Measure and assess customer and employee satisfaction.
- Measure the effectiveness of marketing, advertising, and communications programs and strategies.

See Occupational Information Network (O\*NET) Code Connector, Market Research Analysts and Marketing Specialists–Code 13-1161.00 on the Internet at <http://www.onetonline.org/link/summary/13-1161.00> (last visited May 19, 2014).<sup>3</sup>

The AAO notes that copying a job description from O\*NET (or other source) is generally not sufficient for establishing H-1B eligibility. While this type of description may be appropriate when defining the range of duties that may be performed within an occupational category, it generally cannot be relied upon by a petitioner when discussing the duties attached to specific employment for H-1B approval. The description does not adequately convey the substantive work that the beneficiary will perform within the petitioner's business operations. In establishing a position as qualifying as a specialty occupation, a petitioner must describe the specific duties and responsibilities to be performed by a beneficiary in the context of the petitioner's business activities,

---

<sup>3</sup> The AAO hereby incorporates into the record the excerpt of the O\*NET Code Connector regarding the occupational category "Market Research Analysts and Marketing Specialists."



demonstrate a legitimate need for an employee exists, and substantiate that it has H-1B caliber work for the beneficiary for the period of employment requested in the petition.

Further, the AAO notes that the petitioner did not provide consistent information with regard to the order of importance and/or frequency of occurrence with which the beneficiary will perform these functions and tasks. The petitioner first indicated that the beneficiary would spend 80% of his time studying market conditions in Missouri and Kansas, in addition to the other tasks listed above, the last of which was "Call on potential and established clients to assess their needs regarding commercial dishwasher sales and services as well as warehouse chemical sales and janitorial supplies." Thus, it appears that the beneficiary will be engaging in sales calls, in addition to the claimed market research duties.

In response to the RFE, the petitioner stated that the beneficiary would spend 90% of his time completing all of the described tasks, but did not provide any further breakdown of the individual duties. On the Form ETA Form 9141, the petitioner did not claim that the beneficiary would engage in studying market conditions in Missouri and Kansas. The AAO observes that the petitioner listed the duty of making sales calls to potential and established clients first in the job description.

Upon review, the AAO finds that the petitioner did not specify to USCIS which tasks are major functions of the proffered position, nor did it establish the frequency with which each of the duties would be performed (e.g., regularly, periodically or at irregular intervals). As a result, the petitioner did not establish the primary and essential functions of the proffered position.

In the instant case, it is not evident that the proposed duties as described in this record of proceeding, and the position that they comprise, merit recognition of the proffered position as a specialty occupation. To the extent that they are described, the AAO finds the proposed duties do not provide a sufficient factual basis for conveying the substantive matters that would engage the beneficiary in the actual performance of the proffered position for the entire period requested, so as to persuasively support the claim that the work would require the theoretical and practical application of any particular educational level of highly specialized knowledge in a specific specialty directly related to the duties and responsibilities of the proffered position, or its equivalent. The petitioner's job descriptions fail to communicate (1) the actual work that the beneficiary would perform on a day-to-day basis; (2) the complexity, uniqueness and/or specialization of the tasks; and/or (3) the correlation between that work and a need for a particular level education of highly specialized knowledge in a specific specialty. The petitioner failed to provide sufficient details regarding the demands, level of responsibilities and requirements necessary for the performance of the duties of the proffered position.

Furthermore, the petitioner's statements regarding the academic requirements for the market analyst position do not establish that the position qualifies as a specialty occupation. That is, in its letter of support accompanying the initial Form I-129 petition, the petitioner described the education requirement for the proffered position as "a minimum of a Bachelor's degree or higher." A petitioner must demonstrate that the proffered position requires a precise and specific course of study that relates directly to the duties and responsibilities of the position in question. Since there

must be a close correlation between the required specialized studies and the position, the requirement of a general-purpose degree (or a degree with a generalized title without further specification) does not establish the position as a specialty occupation. *Cf. Matter of Michael Hertz Associates*, 19 I&N Dec. 558 (Comm'r 1988).

As previously mentioned, to demonstrate that a job requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge as required by section 214(i)(1) of the Act, a petitioner must establish that the position requires the attainment of a bachelor's or higher degree in a specialized field of study or its equivalent. USCIS interprets the degree requirement at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) to require a degree in a specific specialty that is directly related to the proposed position. Although a general-purpose bachelor's degree may be a legitimate prerequisite for a particular position, requiring such a degree, without more, will not justify a finding that a particular position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation. *See Royal Siam Corp. v. Chertoff*, 484 F.3d 139, 147 (1st Cir. 2007).<sup>4</sup>

Again, the petitioner in this matter claims that the duties of the proffered position can be performed by an individual with only a general-purpose bachelor's degree or a degree in any discipline. The petitioner's assertion is tantamount to an admission that the proffered position is not in fact a specialty occupation. The director's decision must therefore be affirmed.

Although the petition cannot be approved for the reasons described in the above discussion, the AAO will nonetheless review the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A). The AAO will first review the record of proceeding in relation to the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(I), which requires that a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position.

The AAO recognizes DOL's *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)* as an authoritative source on the duties and educational requirements of the wide variety of occupations that it addresses.<sup>5</sup> As

---

<sup>4</sup> Specifically, the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit explained in *Royal Siam* that:

[t]he courts and the agency consistently have stated that, although a general-purpose bachelor's degree, such as a business administration degree, may be a legitimate prerequisite for a particular position, requiring such a degree, without more, will not justify the granting of a petition for an H-1B specialty occupation visa. *See, e.g., Tapis Int'l v. INS*, 94 F.Supp.2d 172, 175-76 (D.Mass.2000); *Shanti*, 36 F. Supp.2d at 1164-66; *cf. Matter of Michael Hertz Assocs.*, 19 I & N Dec. 558, 560 ([Comm'r] 1988) (providing frequently cited analysis in connection with a conceptually similar provision). This is as it should be: otherwise, an employer could ensure the granting of a specialty occupation visa petition by the simple expedient of creating a generic (and essentially artificial) degree requirement.

*Id.*

<sup>5</sup> For additional information regarding market research analyst positions, *see* U.S. Dep't of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2013-14 ed., Market Research Analysts, on the Internet at <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/Business-and-Financial/Market-research-analysts.htm#tab-1> (last visited May 19,



previously mentioned, the petitioner asserts in the LCA that the proffered position falls under the occupational category "Market Research Analysts and Marketing Specialists."

The AAO reviewed the chapter of the *Handbook* entitled "Market Research Analysts," including the sections regarding the typical duties and requirements for this occupational category. However, the *Handbook* does not indicate that "Market Research Analysts" comprise an occupational group for which at least a bachelor's degree *in a specific specialty*, or its equivalent, is normally the minimum requirement for entry.

The subchapter of the *Handbook* entitled "How to Become a Market Research Analyst" states the following about this occupational category:

Most market research analysts need at least a bachelor's degree. Top research positions often require a master's degree. Strong math and analytical skills are essential.

#### **Education**

Market research analysts typically need a bachelor's degree in market research or a related field. Many have degrees in fields such as statistics, math, or computer science. Others have backgrounds in business administration, the social sciences, or communications. Courses in statistics, research methods, and marketing are essential for these workers; courses in communications and social sciences—such as economics, psychology, and sociology—are also important.

Some market research analyst jobs require a master's degree. Several schools offer graduate programs in marketing research, but many analysts complete degrees in other fields, such as statistics and marketing, and/or earn a Master of Business Administration (MBA). A master's degree is often required for leadership positions or positions that perform more technical research.

U.S. Dep't of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2014-15 ed., Market Research Analysts, on the Internet at <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/business-and-financial/market-research-analysts.htm#tab-4> (last visited May 19, 2014).

When reviewing the *Handbook*, the AAO must note that the petitioner designated the wage level of the proffered position as a Level I position on the LCA.<sup>6</sup> This designation is indicative of a

---

2014). The AAO hereby incorporates into the record of proceeding the excerpt from the *Handbook* regarding the occupational category "Market Research Analysts."

<sup>6</sup> The "Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance" issued by DOL provides a description of the wage levels. A Level I wage rate is described by DOL as follows:

**Level I** (entry) wage rates are assigned to job offers for beginning level employees who have only a basic understanding of the occupation. These employees perform routine tasks that require limited, if any, exercise of judgment. The tasks provide experience and familiarization with the



comparatively low, entry-level position relative to others within the occupation and signifies that the beneficiary is only expected to possess a basic understanding of the occupation and will perform routine tasks that require limited, if any, exercise of judgment. In accordance with the relevant DOL explanatory information on wage levels, the beneficiary will be closely supervised and his work closely monitored and reviewed for accuracy.<sup>7</sup> Furthermore, he will receive specific instructions on required tasks and expected results. The petitioner has not established that the beneficiary will serve in a top-research position, a high-level or leadership position, or a position that perform more technical research.

The *Handbook* does not state that a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the occupation. This passage of the *Handbook* reports that market research analysts have degrees and backgrounds in a wide-variety of disparate fields. The *Handbook* states that employees typically need a bachelor's degree in market research or a related field, but the *Handbook* continues by indicating that many market research analysts have degrees in fields such as statistics, math, or computer science. According to the *Handbook*, other market research analysts have a background in fields such as business administration, one of the social sciences, or communications. The *Handbook* notes that various courses are essential to this occupation, including statistics, research methods, and marketing. The *Handbook* states that courses in communications and social sciences (such as economics, psychology, and sociology) are also important.

In general, provided the specialties are closely related, e.g., chemistry and biochemistry, a minimum requirement of a bachelor's or higher degree in more than one specialty is recognized as satisfying the "degree in the specific specialty (or its equivalent)" requirement of section 214(i)(1)(B) of the Act. In such a case, the required "body of highly specialized knowledge" would essentially be the same. Since there must be a close correlation between the required "body of highly specialized knowledge" and the position, however, a minimum entry requirement of a degree in disparate fields, such as philosophy and engineering, would not meet the statutory requirement that the degree be "in the specific specialty (or its equivalent)," unless the petitioner establishes how each field is directly related to the duties and responsibilities of the particular position such that the required body of highly specialized knowledge is essentially an amalgamation of these different specialties. Section 214(i)(1)(B) of the Act (emphasis added).

---

employer's methods, practices, and programs. The employees may perform higher level work for training and developmental purposes. These employees work under close supervision and receive specific instructions on required tasks and results expected. Their work is closely monitored and reviewed for accuracy. Statements that the job offer is for a research fellow, a worker in training, or an internship are indicators that a Level I wage should be considered.

See U.S. Dep't of Labor, Emp't & Training Admin., *Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance*, Nonagric. Immigration Programs (rev. Nov. 2009), available at [http://www.foreignlaborcert.doleta.gov/pdf/NPWHC\\_Guidance\\_Revised\\_11\\_2009.pdf](http://www.foreignlaborcert.doleta.gov/pdf/NPWHC_Guidance_Revised_11_2009.pdf).

<sup>7</sup> In response to the RFE, the petitioner claimed that the beneficiary would have the freedom to make decisions with very little supervision. This statement does not appear to correspond with the wage level selected by the petitioner.

Here, although the *Handbook* indicates that an advanced degree is typically needed for these positions, it also indicates that baccalaureate degrees in various fields are acceptable for entry into the occupation. In addition to recognizing degrees in disparate fields and backgrounds (i.e., social science and computer science) as acceptable for entry into this occupation, the *Handbook* also states that "others have a background in business administration." Although a degree in business administration may be a legitimate prerequisite for a particular position, requiring such a degree, without more, will not justify a finding that a particular position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation. See *Royal Siam Corp. v. Chertoff*, 484 F.3d at 147. Therefore, the *Handbook's* recognition that a general, non-specialty "background" in business administration is sufficient for entry into the occupation strongly suggests that a bachelor's degree *in a specific specialty* is not normally the minimum entry requirement for this occupation.<sup>8</sup> Accordingly, as the *Handbook* indicates that working as a market research analyst does not normally require at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, for entry into the occupation, it does not support the proffered position as qualifying as a specialty occupation.

As previously stated, USCIS does not simply rely on a position's title to determine whether a particular position qualifies as a specialty occupation. Rather, USCIS considers the duties of a proffered position, the nature of the petitioning entity's business operations, and all other relevant factors to make its determination. Again, the critical element is not the title of the position nor 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 baccalaureate or higher degree in the specific specialty as the minimum for entry into the occupation, as required by the Act.

In response to the RFE, counsel indicates the occupational category "Market Research Analysts and Marketing Specialists" corresponds to a "Zone 4" skill level, and an "SVP Range" of 7.0 < 8.0. Counsel points to these classifications to support the assertion that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation. However, counsel's reliance on these classifications is misplaced. That is, O\*NET assigns this occupation a Job Zone Four rating, which groups it among occupations that are described as follows: "[m]ost of these occupations require a four-year bachelor's degree, but *some do not* (emphasis added)." O\*NET does not report that for those occupations with an academic degree requirement, that such a degree must be in a *specific specialty* directly related to the occupation. As previously discussed, USCIS consistently interprets the term "degree" in the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) to mean not just any baccalaureate or higher degree, but one in a specific specialty that is directly related to the duties and responsibilities of the position. Further, "most" is not indicative that a position normally requires at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, (the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(I)), or that a position is so specialized and complex as to require knowledge usually associated with attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty (the criterion at 8 C.F.R.

---

<sup>8</sup> A specialty occupation means an occupation which requires theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge in fields of human endeavor including, *business specialties*, 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. 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii).



§ 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(4)).<sup>9</sup> Notably, O\*NET indicates that some of these occupations do not require a four-year bachelor's degree.

In regard to the SVP rating, the AAO observes that an SVP rating of 7 to less than (" $<$ ") 8 does not indicate that at least a four-year bachelor's degree is required for an occupational category that has been assigned such a rating or, more importantly, that such a degree must be in a specific specialty directly related to the occupation. Rather, the SVP rating simply indicates that the occupation requires over 2 years up to and including 4 years of training of the wide variety of forms of preparation described above, including experiential training.<sup>10</sup> Therefore, an "SVP Range" of 7.0  $<$  8.0 does not demonstrate the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation.

On appeal, counsel cites to *Residential Fin. Corp. v. U.S. Citizenship & Immigration Services*, 839 F. Supp. 2d 985 (S.D. Ohio 2012) in which the court stated that "[t]he knowledge and not the title of the degree is what is important. Diplomas rarely come bearing occupation-specific majors. What is required is an occupation that requires highly specialized knowledge and a prospective employee who has attained the credentialing indicating possession of that knowledge."

The AAO agrees with the aforementioned proposition that "[t]he knowledge and not the title of the degree is what is important." In general, provided the specialties are closely related, e.g., chemistry and biochemistry, a minimum of a bachelor's or higher degree in more than one specialty is recognized as satisfying the "degree in the specific specialty (or its equivalent)" requirement of section 214(i)(1)(B) of the Act. In such a case, the required "body of highly specialized knowledge" would essentially be the same. Since there must be a close correlation between the required "body of highly specialized knowledge" and the position, however, a minimum entry requirement of a degree in two disparate fields, such as philosophy and engineering, would not meet the statutory requirement that the degree be "in *the* specific specialty (or its equivalent)," unless the petitioner establishes how each field is directly related to the duties and responsibilities of the particular position such that the required body of highly specialized knowledge is essentially an amalgamation of these different specialties. Section 214(i)(1)(B) of the Act (emphasis added). For the

---

<sup>9</sup> The first definition of "most" in *Webster's New Collegiate College Dictionary* 731 (Third Edition, Hough Mifflin Harcourt 2008) is "[g]reatest in number, quantity, size, or degree." As such, if merely 51% of such positions require a four-year bachelor's degree, it could be said that "most" of the positions require such a degree. It cannot be found, therefore, that a particular degree requirement for "most" positions in a given occupation equates to a normal minimum entry requirement for that occupation, much less for the particular position proffered by the petitioner, which as previously noted has been designated on the LCA as a Level I (entry) position. Instead, a normal minimum entry requirement is one that denotes a standard entry requirement but recognizes that certain, limited exceptions to that standard may exist. To interpret this provision otherwise would run directly contrary to the plain language of the Act, which requires in part "attainment of a bachelor's or higher degree in the specific specialty (or its equivalent) as a minimum for entry into the occupation in the United States." § 214(i)(1) of the Act.

<sup>10</sup> An SVP rating of "7 to  $<$  8" is less than 8 and, thus, does not include "[o]ver 4 years up to and including 10 years." For more information on SVP ratings, see National Center for O\*NET Development, *Stratifying Occupational Units by Specific Vocational Preparation (SVP)* (1999), available on the Internet at [http://www.onetcenter.org/dl\\_files/SVP.pdf](http://www.onetcenter.org/dl_files/SVP.pdf).



aforementioned reasons, however, the petitioner has failed to meet its burden and establish that the particular position offered in this matter requires a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, directly related to its duties in order to perform those duties. In any event, counsel has furnished no evidence to establish that the facts of the instant petition are analogous to those in *Residential Fin. Corp. v. U.S. Citizenship & Immigration Services*.<sup>11</sup>

Counsel also cites to *Unical Aviation, Inc. v. INS*, 248 F. Supp. 2d 931 (D.C. Cal 2002). The material facts of the present proceeding are distinguishable from those in *Unical*. Specifically, *Unical* involves: (1) a position for which there was a companion position held by a person with a Master's degree; (2) a record of proceedings that included an organizational chart showing that all of its employees in the marketing department held bachelor's degrees; and, in the court's words, (3) "sufficient evidence to demonstrate that there is a requirement of specialized study for [the beneficiary's] position." Also, the proffered position and related duties in the present proceeding are different from those in *Unical Aviation, Inc.*, where the beneficiary was to liaise with airline and Maintenance Repair Organization ("MRO") customers in China for supply of parts and services; analyze and forecast airline and MRO demands to generate plans to capture business; provide after-sales services to customers in China; and develop new products and services for the China market. Moreover, there is no indication in the record of proceeding that the petitioner is in the same industry or is in any way similar in size or type of business as *Unical Aviation, Inc.*

Further, in *Unical Aviation* the Court partly relied upon *Augut, Inc. v. Tabor*, 719 F. Supp. 1158 (D. Mass. 1989), for the proposition that Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS, now USCIS), had not used an absolute degree requirement in applying the "profession" standard at 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(32) for determining the merits of an 8 U.S.C. § 1153(a)(3) third-preference visa petition. That proposition is not relevant here, because the H-1B specialty occupation statutes and regulations, not in existence when INS denied the *Augut, Inc.* third-preference petition, mandate not just a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, but a degree "in the specific specialty." § 214(i)(1) of the Act; *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii).

In contrast to the broad precedential authority of the case law of a United States circuit court, the AAO is not bound to follow the published decision of a United States district court in matters arising even within the same district. *See Matter of K-S-*, 20 I&N Dec. 715 (BIA 1993). Although the reasoning underlying a district judge's decision will be given due consideration when it is properly before the AAO, the analysis does not have to be followed as a matter of law. *Id.* at 719.

The petitioner has not established that the proffered position falls under an occupational category for which the *Handbook*, or other independent, authoritative source, indicates that at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally the minimum requirement for

---

<sup>11</sup> It is noted that the district judge's decision in that case appears to have been based largely on the many factual errors made by the service center in its decision denying the petition. The AAO further notes that the service center director's decision was not appealed to the AAO. Based on the district court's findings and description of the record, if that matter had first been appealed through the available administrative process, the AAO may very well have remanded the matter to the service center for a new decision for many of the same reasons articulated by the district court if these errors could not have been remedied by the AAO in its *de novo* review of the matter.

entry into the occupation. Furthermore, the duties and requirements of the proffered position as described in the record of proceeding, particularly in light of the Level I wage designation on the LCA, do not indicate that the position is one for which a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally the minimum requirement for entry. Thus, the petitioner failed to satisfy the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1).

Next, the AAO will review the record regarding the first of the two alternative prongs of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2). This prong alternatively calls for a petitioner to establish that a requirement of a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is common to the petitioner's industry in positions that are both: (1) parallel to the proffered position; and (2) located in organizations that are similar to the petitioner.

In determining whether there is such a common degree requirement, factors often considered by USCIS include: whether the *Handbook* reports that the industry requires a degree; whether the industry's professional association has made a degree a minimum entry requirement; and whether letters or affidavits from firms or individuals in the industry attest that such firms "routinely employ and recruit only degreed individuals." See *Shanti, Inc. v. Reno*, 36 F. Supp. 2d 1151, 1165 (D. Minn. 1999) (quoting *Hird/Blaker Corp. v. Sava*, 712 F. Supp. 1095, 1102 (S.D.N.Y. 1989)).

As previously discussed, the petitioner has not established that its proffered position is one for which the *Handbook*, or other authoritative source, reports a standard industry-wide requirement for at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. Thus, the AAO incorporates by reference the previous discussion on the matter. Also, there are no submissions from the industry's professional association indicating that it has made a degree a minimum entry requirement. Furthermore, the petitioner did not submit any letters or affidavits from similar firms or individuals in the petitioner's industry attesting that such firms "routinely employ and recruit only degreed individuals." Thus, based upon a complete review of the record of proceeding, the AAO finds that the petitioner has not established that a requirement for at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is common to the petitioner's industry for positions that are (1) parallel to the proffered position; and, (2) located in organizations similar to the petitioner. The petitioner has therefore not satisfied the first alternative prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2).

The AAO will next consider the second alternative prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2), which is satisfied if the petitioner shows that its particular position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.

In support of its assertion that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation, the petitioner submitted various documents, including evidence regarding its business operations. For example, the petitioner submitted dishwasher lease contracts, tax documents, and utility bills. In addition, the petitioner provided information regarding the proffered position, including a description of the proffered position. The AAO reviewed the record of proceeding in its entirety. However, upon review of the record, the AAO finds that the petitioner failed to sufficiently develop relative complexity or uniqueness as an aspect of the proffered position.



Here, the petitioner has not demonstrated that the duties the beneficiary will be responsible for or perform on a day-to-day basis constitute a position so complex or unique that it can only be performed by a person with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. Additionally, the AAO finds that the petitioner has not provided sufficient documentation to support a claim that its particular position is so complex or unique that it can only be performed by an individual with a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.

Thus, based upon the record of proceeding, the record does not establish that the proffered position is so complex or unique that it can only be performed by an individual who has completed a baccalaureate program in a specific discipline that directly relates to the proffered position (or its equivalent). Specifically, the petitioner has not demonstrated how the duties of the position as described require the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge such that a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is required to perform them. For instance, the petitioner did not submit information relevant to a detailed course of study leading to a specialty degree and did not establish how such a curriculum is necessary to perform the duties it may believe are so complex and unique. While a few related courses may be beneficial, or even required, in performing certain duties of the position, the petitioner has failed to demonstrate how an established curriculum of such courses leading to a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is required to perform the duties of the proffered position. The description of the duties does not specifically identify any tasks that are so complex or unique that only a specifically degreed individual could perform them.

The petitioner has indicated that the beneficiary's educational background and prior work experience will assist him in carrying out the duties of the proffered position. However, the test to establish a position as a specialty occupation is not the skill set or education of a proposed beneficiary, but whether the position itself requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and attainment of a bachelor's or higher degree in the specific specialty (or its equivalent). In the instant case, the petitioner does not establish which of the duties, if any, of the proffered position would be so complex or unique as to be distinguishable from those of similar but non-degreed or non-specialty degreed employment. The petitioner has not demonstrated that its particular position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. Consequently, it cannot be concluded that the petitioner has satisfied the second alternative prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2).

The third criterion of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) entails an employer demonstrating that it normally requires a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, for the position. To this end, the AAO usually reviews the petitioner's past recruiting and hiring practices, as well as information regarding employees who previously held the position. In addition, the AAO reviews any other probative documentation provided by the petitioner to satisfy this criterion of the regulations.

To merit approval of the petition under this criterion, the record must establish that a petitioner's imposition of a degree requirement is not merely a matter of preference for high-caliber candidates but is necessitated by performance requirements of the position. Upon review of the record of



proceeding, the petitioner has not established a prior history of recruiting and hiring for the proffered position only persons with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.

While a petitioner may assert that a proffered position requires a specific degree, that opinion alone without corroborating evidence cannot establish the position as a specialty occupation. Were USCIS limited solely to reviewing a petitioner's claimed self-imposed requirements, then any individual with a bachelor's degree could be brought to the United States to perform any occupation as long as the petitioner artificially created a token degree requirement, whereby all individuals employed in a particular position possessed a baccalaureate or higher degree in the specific specialty, or its equivalent. *See Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F.3d at 388. In other words, if a petitioner's stated degree requirement is only designed to artificially meet the standards for an H-1B visa and/or to underemploy an individual in a position for which he or she is overqualified and if the proffered position does not in fact require such a specialty degree or its equivalent, to perform its duties, the occupation would not meet the statutory or regulatory definition of a specialty occupation. *See* § 214(i)(1) of the Act; 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) (defining the term "specialty occupation").

To satisfy this criterion, the evidence of record must show that the specific performance requirements of the position generated the recruiting and hiring history. A petitioner's perfunctory declaration of a particular educational requirement will not mask the fact that the position is not a specialty occupation. USCIS must examine the actual employment requirements, and, on the basis of that examination, determine whether the position qualifies as a specialty occupation. *See generally Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d 384. In this pursuit, the critical element is not the title of the position, or the fact that an employer has routinely insisted on certain educational standards, but whether performance of the position actually requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in the specific specialty as the minimum for entry into the occupation as required by the Act. To interpret the regulations any other way would lead to absurd results: if USCIS were constrained to recognize a specialty occupation merely because the petitioner has an established practice of demanding certain educational requirements for the proffered position - and without consideration of how a beneficiary is to be specifically employed - then any alien with a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty could be brought into the United States to perform non-specialty occupations, so long as the employer required all such employees to have baccalaureate or higher degrees. *See id.* at 388.

In the instant case, the petitioner stated in the Form I-129 petition that it has ten employees and was established in 2000 (approximately thirteen years prior to the filing of the H-1B petition), but it did not provide the total number of people it has employed to serve in the proffered position. In a letter dated April 1, 2013, the petitioner stated that "[a]ll employees hired at this level doing comparable work in the Beneficiary's department have at least [a bachelor's degree]." The petitioner did not provide, however, information regarding these positions or the education level attained by the individuals in these positions. The petitioner does not allege that the other positions require a bachelor's degree in a *specific specialty*, or its equivalent. Upon review of the record, the petitioner has not provided sufficient evidence to establish that it normally requires at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, for the proffered position. Thus, the petitioner has not

satisfied the third criterion of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

The fourth criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) requires a petitioner to establish that the nature of the specific duties is so specialized and complex that the knowledge required to perform them is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.

The AAO reviewed the petitioner's statements and the documentation provided regarding its business operations and the proffered position. Upon review, the AAO finds that the petitioner has not established that the proffered position satisfies this criterion of the regulations. More specifically, in the instant case, relative specialization and complexity have not been sufficiently developed by the petitioner as an aspect of the proffered position.

Furthermore, the AAO reiterates its earlier comments and findings with regard to the implication of the petitioner's designation of the proffered position in the LCA as a Level I (the lowest of four assignable levels). That is, the Level I wage designation is indicative of a low, entry-level position relative to others within the occupational category and hence one not likely distinguishable by relatively specialized and complex duties. As noted earlier, DOL indicates that a Level I designation is appropriate for "beginning level employees who have only a basic understanding of the occupation." Without further evidence, it has not been established that the petitioner's proffered position is one with specialized and complex duties. Notably, such a position would likely be classified at a higher-level, such as a Level III (experienced) or Level IV (fully competent) position, requiring a significantly higher prevailing wage. For instance, as previously mentioned, a Level IV (fully competent) position is designated by DOL for employees who "use advanced skills and diversified knowledge to solve unusual and complex problems."

The petitioner has submitted inadequate probative evidence to satisfy this criterion of the regulations. Thus, the petitioner has not established that the duties of the position are 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 specific specialty, or its equivalent. The AAO, therefore, concludes that the petitioner has not satisfied the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(4).

For the reasons related in the preceding discussion, the petitioner has failed to establish that it has satisfied any of the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) and, therefore, it cannot be found that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation.

Furthermore, the AAO notes that a beneficiary's credentials to perform a particular job are relevant only when the job is found to be a specialty occupation. As discussed in this decision, the petitioner has failed to establish that the proffered position requires a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. Therefore, the AAO need not and will not address the beneficiary's qualifications.

### III. CONCLUSION AND ORDER



In visa petition proceedings, it is the petitioner's burden to establish eligibility for the immigration benefit sought. Section 291 of the Act; *see e.g., Matter of Otiende*, 26 I&N Dec. 127, 128 (BIA 2013). Here, that burden has not been met.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed. The petition is denied.