



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

(b)(6)

[Redacted]

DATE: **FEB 04 2013** 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:
[Redacted]

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the AAO inappropriately applied the law in reaching its decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen in accordance with the instructions on Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. The specific requirements for filing such a motion can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file any motion directly with the AAO.** Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires any motion to be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Ra *Michael T. Kelly*
Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

On the Form I-129 visa petition, the petitioner describes itself as a real estate investment brokerage and finance company established in 1987. In order to employ the beneficiary in what it designates as a market research analyst position, the petitioner seeks to classify her 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 the basis of her determination that the petitioner had failed to demonstrate that the proffered position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation.

The record of proceeding before the AAO contains the following: (1) the Form I-129 and supporting documentation; (2) the director's request for additional evidence (RFE); (3) the petitioner's response to the RFE; (4) the director's letter denying the petition; and (5) the Form I-290B and supporting documentation.

Upon review of the entire record of proceeding, the AAO finds that the petitioner has failed to overcome the director's ground for denying this petition. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed, and the petition will be denied.

At the outset, the AAO finds that the petitioner provided as the supporting Labor Condition Application (LCA) for this petition an LCA which does not correspond to the petition, in that the LCA was certified for a wage level below that which is compatible with the levels of responsibility, judgment, and independence the petitioner claimed for the proffered position through its descriptions of its constituent duties.¹ This aspect of the petition undermines the credibility of the petition as a whole and any claim as to the proffered position or the duties comprising it as being particularly complex, unique, and/or specialized.

In its March 25, 2010 letter of support, the petitioner stated that the duties of the proffered position would include the following tasks:

- Assuming responsibility for all aspects of the petitioner's properly development and leasing projects;
- Performing research on local and regional market conditions;
- Assuming a full range of responsibilities related to leased properties, including conducting, reviewing, and analyzing credit data and financial statements; and determining the petitioner's risk exposure upon entering into a lease or other financial arrangement;

¹ The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis (*See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004)), and it was in the course of this review that the AAO identified this aspect of the petition.

- Making recommendations to the petitioner's president regarding advantageous business arrangements;
- Preparing required documentation and coordinating with clients to complete arrangements;
- Assisting clients complete government-required disclosure forms;
- Researching and developing marketing strategies on an ongoing basis for each project;
- Coordinating the implementation of projects;
- Researching market conditions in local, regional, or national areas in order to analyze the petitioner's potential for increasing its sales while recognizing the risks inherent to entering new and developing markets;
- Gathering information on competitors, prices, sales, and methods of marketing and distribution;
- Preparing a multi-faceted marketing plan utilizing print, online, and other efforts;
- Conducting surveys;
- Using survey results to create a marketing campaign based on regional preferences and buying habits;
- Reviewing and analyzing sample and client-specific commercial financial statements to determine the investment capacity of a particular sector or company; and
- Proposing methods for targeting potential groups.

The record contains several claims regarding the complexity and specialization of the duties of the proffered position. For example, in its March 25, 2010 letter the petitioner referenced the "range of responsibilities the position entails" claimed that such responsibilities are "extensive and diverse." In its May 17, 2010 letter, the petitioner addressed the position's "level of complexity."

In his May 19, 2010 letter, prior counsel claimed that the proposed duties are "specialized and complex," and argued as follows:

By virtue of the range of services offered alone, [the petitioner] stands as a unique business. Each area of services offered by the Company requires specialized materials and tools to be effectively administered. The Company seeks to expand its reach across the American continent providing services for all types of financial needs including residential, commercial, business loans, venture capital[,] and real estate project development . . . It is in this regard, that the Company seeks to hire a highly qualified individual for the position of Market Research Analyst as it will

necessarily entail grasping an encompassing understanding of how the business operates – its aims and goals, its position in the market, and its target audience – in order to coordinate various interests and formulate the best strategy for penetrating the market. Weighing financial risks and returns, winning contracts and clients, creating and taking advantage of opportunities, [and] tapping new markets, are all duties and responsibilities that require an intricate knowledge and familiarity of the business and the market in order to be carried out successfully without missing a step or overlooking important processes.

This combination of the extensive range of services and complex job duties and responsibilities is what gives the Company a unique business model and is also what renders the proffered position professional and specialty level occupation.

In his May 17, 2010 letter, [REDACTED],² whose statements were submitted as expert testimony, asserted that the beneficiary would be responsible for “advanced research design,” and claimed that performance of the proposed duties requires “a sophisticated understanding of marketing and market research and analysis.” He also stated the following:

[I]t is my professional opinion that the Market Research Analyst position offered by [the petitioner] is clearly a specialized Market Research Analyst position of strategic importance for the firm and is at [a] level of specialization and complexity[.]

However, as will now be discussed, these assertions materially conflict with the wage level designated in the LCA that the petitioner submitted with the petition. The LCA submitted by the petitioner in support of the instant position specifies the occupational classification for the position as “Market Research Analyst,” SOC (O*NET/OES) Code 19-3021.00, at a Level I (entry level) wage. The *Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance*³ issued by the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) states the following with regard to Level I wage rates:

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 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 [emphasis in original].

² [REDACTED] letter will be discussed in further detail later in this decision.

³ Available at http://www.foreignlaborcert.doleta.gov/pdf/Policy_Nonag_Progs.pdf (last accessed December 6, 2012).

The petitioner's assertions regarding the proposed duties' level of complexity, uniqueness, and specialization, as well as the level of independent judgment and responsibility and the occupational understanding required to perform them, are materially inconsistent with the petitioner's submission of an LCA certified for a Level I, entry-level position. The LCA's wage level (Level I, the lowest of the four that can be designated) is only appropriate for a low-level, entry position relative to others within the occupation. In accordance with the relevant DOL explanatory information on wage levels quoted above, this wage rate is appropriate for positions in which the beneficiary is only required to have a basic understanding of the occupation; will be expected to perform routine tasks requiring limited, if any, exercise of judgment; will be closely supervised and her work closely monitored and reviewed for accuracy; and will receive specific instructions on required tasks and expected results.

This aspect of the LCA undermines the credibility of the petition, and, in particular, the credibility of the petitioner's assertions regarding the proffered position's educational demands and level of responsibilities. Doubt cast on any aspect of the petitioner's proof may, of course, lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition. It is incumbent upon the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence. Any attempt to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies will not suffice unless the petitioner submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988).

It should be noted that, for efficiency's sake, the AAO's discussion and findings regarding the material conflict between assertions in the petition and the LCA wage-level are hereby incorporated as part of this decision's later analyses of each criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

Aside from the adverse impact of the LCA wage-level against the overall credibility of the petition, the AAO will now discuss that additional issue raised by the LCA which was noted at the outset of this decision as precluding approval of the petition, namely, the fact that the LCA does not appear to correspond to the instant petition.

The U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) has clearly stated that its LCA certification process is cursory, that it does not involve substantive review, and that it makes the petitioner responsible for the accuracy of the information entered in the LCA. With regard to LCA certification, the regulation at 20 C.F.R. § 655.715 states the following:

Certification means the determination by a certifying officer that a labor condition application is not incomplete and does not contain obvious inaccuracies.

Likewise, the regulation at 20 C.F.R. § 655.735(b) states, in pertinent part, that "[i]t is the employer's responsibility to ensure that ETA [(the DOL's Employment and Training Administration)] receives a complete and accurate LCA."

Further, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(i)(B)(2) also makes clear that certification of an LCA does not constitute a determination that a position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation:

Certification by the Department of Labor of a labor condition application in an occupational classification does not constitute a determination by that agency that the occupation in question is a specialty occupation. The director shall determine if the application involves a specialty occupation as defined in section 214(i)(1) of the Act. The director shall also determine whether the particular alien for whom H-1B classification is sought qualifies to perform services in the specialty occupation as prescribed in section 214(i)(2) of the Act.

While the DOL is the agency that certifies LCA applications before they are submitted to USCIS, DOL regulations note that the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) (i.e., its immigration benefits branch, USCIS) is the department responsible for determining whether the content of an LCA filed for a particular Form I-129 actually supports that petition. *See* 20 C.F.R. § 655.705(b), which states, in pertinent part (emphasis added):

For H-1B visas . . . DHS accepts the employer's petition (DHS Form I-129) with the DOL certified LCA attached. *In doing so, the DHS determines whether the petition is supported by an LCA which corresponds with the petition*, whether the occupation named in the [LCA] is a specialty occupation or whether the individual is a fashion model of distinguished merit and ability, and whether the qualifications of the nonimmigrant meet the statutory requirements of H-1B visa classification.

As previously noted, the conflict between the LCA and the petition adversely affects the merits of the petition, because it materially undermines the credibility of the petition's statements with regard to the nature and level of work that the beneficiary would perform.

The AAO will now address the director's determination that the proffered position is not a specialty occupation. Based upon a complete review of the record of proceeding, the AAO agrees with the director and finds that the evidence fails to establish that the position as described constitutes a specialty occupation.

To meet its burden of proof in this regard, the petitioner must establish that the employment it is offering to the beneficiary meets the following statutory and regulatory requirements.

Section 214(i)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1) defines the term "specialty occupation" as one 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 term "specialty occupation" is further defined at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) as:

An occupation which requires [(1)] 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 [(2)] 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, the 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 illogical and absurd result, 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) must therefore be read as stating additional requirements that a position must meet, supplementing the statutory and regulatory definitions of specialty occupation.

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 rely simply upon a proffered position’s title. The specific duties of the 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 beneficiary, and determine whether the position qualifies as a specialty occupation. *See generally* *Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d at 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 a specific specialty as the minimum for entry into the occupation, as required by the Act.

The letter from [REDACTED] Professor of Marketing and Associate Dean and Director of Graduate Programs at the [REDACTED] does not establish that the proffered position is a specialty occupation or that it satisfies any of the criteria enumerated above. In his May 17, 2010 letter, [REDACTED] briefly described the petitioner’s business operations; listed the credentials he believes qualify him to opine upon the minimum qualifications necessary to perform the duties of the proffered position; listed the duties proposed for the beneficiary; discussed the beneficiary’s qualifications to perform the duties of the position; and stated his opinion that the position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation.

However, although [REDACTED] stated the duties of the proffered position, he did not discuss them in any meaningful detail or specifically explain why their performance requires someone with a bachelor’s degree, or the equivalent, in a specific specialty. Nor did he indicate whether he had visited the petitioner’s business premises or spoken with anyone affiliated with the petitioner. He did not address the petitioner’s indication in the LCA that the proffered position is a comparatively low, entry-level position relative to others within its occupation and that the beneficiary would only be expected to possess a basic understanding of the occupation. In short, the AAO finds that this professor’s letter lacks sufficient factual and analytical bases for the AAO to accord it any probative weight. The AAO may, in its discretion, use as an advisory opinion statements submitted as expert testimony. However, where an opinion is not in accord with other information or is in any way questionable, the AAO is not required to accept or may give less weight to that evidence. *Matter of Caron International*, 19 I&N Dec. 791 (Comm’r 1988).

The AAO will now discuss the application of each supplemental, alternative criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) to the evidence in this record of proceeding.

The AAO will first discuss the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(I), which is satisfied by establishing that a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, in a specific specialty is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position that is the subject of the petition.

The AAO recognizes the U.S. Department of Labor's (DOL) *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)* as an authoritative source on the duties and educational requirements of the wide variety of occupations it addresses.⁴ The AAO agrees with counsel that the proposed duties align with those of market research analysts.

In relevant part, the *Handbook* summarizes the duties typically performed by market research analysts as follows:

Market research analysts typically do the following:

- Monitor and forecast marketing and sales trends
- Measure the effectiveness of marketing programs and strategies
- Devise and evaluate methods for collecting data, such as surveys, questionnaires, or opinion polls
- Gather data about consumers, competitors, and market conditions
- Analyze data using statistical software
- Convert complex data and findings into understandable tables, graphs, and written reports
- Prepare reports and present results to clients or management

Market research analysts perform research and gather data to help a company market its products or services. They gather data on consumer demographics, preferences, needs, and buying habits. They collect data and information using a variety of methods, such as interviews, questionnaires, focus groups, market analysis surveys, public opinion polls, and literature reviews.

Analysts help determine a company's position in the marketplace by researching their competitors and analyzing their prices, sales, and marketing methods. Using this information, they may determine potential markets, product demand, and pricing. Their knowledge of the targeted consumer enables them to develop

⁴ The *Handbook*, which is available in printed form, may also be accessed online at <http://www.stats.bls.gov/oco/>. The AAO's references to the *Handbook* are from the 2012-13 edition available online.

advertising brochures and commercials, sales plans, and product promotions.

Market research analysts evaluate data using statistical techniques and software. They must interpret what the data means for their client, and they may forecast future trends. They often make charts, graphs, or other visual aids to present the results of their research.

U.S. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2012-13 ed., "Market Research Analysts," <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/Business-and-Financial/Market-research-analysts.htm#tab-2> (accessed December 6, 2012).

The *Handbook* states the following with regard to the educational requirements necessary for entrance into this field:

Market research analysts need strong math and analytical skills. Most market research analysts need at least a bachelor's degree, and top research positions often require a master's degree.

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 a background in business administration, one of 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.

Many 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, marketing, or a Master of Business Administration (MBA). A master's degree is often required for leadership positions or positions that perform more technical research.

Id. at <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/Business-and-Financial/Market-research-analysts.htm#tab-4>.

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" 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 business management and engineering, would not meet the statutory requirement that the degree be "in *the* specific specialty."⁵ Section 214(i)(1)(b) (emphasis added).

⁵ Whether read with the statutory "the" or the regulatory "a," both readings denote a singular "specialty." Section 214(i)(1)(b) of the Act; 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). Still, the AAO does not so narrowly interpret

Here, although the *Handbook* indicates that a bachelor's or higher degree is required, it also indicates that baccalaureate degrees in various disparate fields are acceptable for entry into the occupation. In addition to recognizing degrees in disparate fields, i.e., social science and computer science as acceptable for entry into this field, the *Handbook* also states that "others have a background in business administration." A petitioner must demonstrate that its proffered position requires a precise and specific course of study that relates directly and closely to the position in question. Since there must be a close correlation between the required specialized studies and the position, the requirement of a degree with a generalized title, such as business administration, 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). To prove 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. As explained above, 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. USCIS has consistently stated that, although a general-purpose bachelor's degree, such as 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 139, 147 (1st Cir. 2007).

Nor does the record of proceeding contain any persuasive documentary evidence from any other relevant authoritative source establishing that the proffered position's inclusion in this occupational category is sufficient in and of itself to establish the proffered position as, in the words of this criterion, a "particular position" for which "[a] baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement for entry."

The materials from the DOL's Occupational Information Network (O*NET OnLine) do not establish that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation under the first criterion described at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), either. O*NET OnLine is not particularly useful in determining whether a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is a requirement for a given position, as O*NET OnLine's JobZone designations make no mention of the specific field of study from which a degree must come. As was noted previously, the AAO 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 proposed position. The Specialized Vocational Preparation (SVP) rating is meant to indicate only the total number of years of vocational preparation required for a particular position. It does not describe how those years are to be divided among training, formal education, and experience and it does not specify the particular type of degree, if any, that a position would require. For all of these reasons, the O*NET OnLine excerpt submitted by counsel is of little evidentiary value to the issue presented on appeal.

these provisions to exclude positions from qualifying as specialty occupations if they permit, as a minimum entry requirement, degrees in more than one closely related specialty.

Finally, as previously discussed, the petitioner submitted an LCA that was certified for a wage-level that is only appropriate for a comparatively low, entry-level position relative to others within its occupation, which signifies that the beneficiary is only expected to possess a basic understanding of the occupation.

As the evidence in the record of proceeding does not establish that a baccalaureate degree, or its equivalent, in a specific specialty is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position that is the subject of this petition, the petitioner has not established the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1).

Next, the AAO finds that the petitioner has not satisfied 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 at 1165 (D.Minn. 1999) (quoting *Hird/Blaker Corp. v. Sava*, 712 F. Supp. 1095, 1102 (S.D.N.Y. 1989)).

Here and as already discussed, the petitioner has not established that its proffered position is one for which the *Handbook* reports an industry-wide requirement for at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent. Also, there are no submissions from professional associations, individuals, or similar firms in the petitioner's industry attesting that individuals employed in positions parallel to the proffered position are routinely required to have a minimum of a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent for entry into those positions.

Nor do the thirteen job-vacancy announcements submitted by counsel satisfy the first alternative prong described at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2). First, counsel has not submitted any evidence to demonstrate that these advertisements are from companies "similar" to the petitioner. The petitioner has submitted no evidence to establish that these advertisers are similar to the petitioner in size, scope, and scale of operations, business efforts, expenditures, or other fundamental dimensions.⁶

⁶ The petitioner described itself on the Form I-129 as a real estate investment brokerage and finance company with twenty employees and provided a North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Code of 522292, "Real Estate Credit." U.S. Dep't of Commerce, U.S. Census Bureau, North American Industry Classification System, 2012 NAICS Definition, "522292 Real Estate Credit," <http://www.census.gov/cgi-bin/sssd/naics/naicsrch> (accessed December 6, 2012). However, the [REDACTED] is a branch of the central bank of the United States. [REDACTED] provides analytical reports and strategic planning services. [REDACTED] facilitates the online purchase of insurance policies. [REDACTED] describes itself as "a leader in quantitative market research." [REDACTED] describes itself as "a leading research and technology firm." [REDACTED] describes itself as "the world's leading in Lighting." [REDACTED] claims to be "a leading provider of consumer products and services over the

Second, the petitioner has not established that these thirteen positions are “parallel” to the proffered position.⁷ Nor has the petitioner established that the job-vacancy announcements require a bachelor’s degree, or the equivalent, in a specific specialty.⁸ Nor does the petitioner submit any evidence regarding how representative these advertisements are of the industry’s usual recruiting and hiring practices with regard to the positions advertised. Simply going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)).⁹

Internet.” [REDACTED] is a medical device company. The petitioner did not submit any information regarding the business operations of the unnamed company located in Toronto, Canada advertising its vacancy through [REDACTED]. Counsel did not explain how the petitioner is similar to any of these companies.

⁷ For example, it is noted that work experience is required for ten of these thirteen positions. However, as noted above, the petitioner indicated in the LCA that its proffered position is a comparatively low, entry-level position relative to others within its occupation and signifies that the beneficiary is only expected to possess a basic understanding of the occupation. It is therefore difficult to envision how these attributes assigned to the proffered position by the petitioner by virtue of its wage-level designation on the LCA would be parallel to these positions described in these job vacancy announcements.

⁸ For example, although the [REDACTED], the unnamed Boston, Massachusetts real estate services firm, [REDACTED], and the [REDACTED] require a bachelor’s degree, they do not mandate that the degree come from a specific specialty.

⁹ Furthermore, according to the *Handbook* there were approximately 282,700 persons employed as market research analysts and marketing specialists in 2010. *Handbook* at <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/business-and-financial/market-research-analysts.htm#tab-6> (last accessed December 6, 2012). Based on the size of this relevant study population, the petitioner fails to demonstrate what statistically valid inferences, if any, can be drawn from the thirteen submitted vacancy announcement with regard to determining the common educational requirements for entry into parallel positions in similar organizations. *See generally* Earl Babbie, *The Practice of Social Research* 186-228 (1995). Moreover, given that there is no indication that these advertisements were randomly selected, the validity of any such inferences could not be accurately determined even if the sampling unit were sufficiently large. *See id.* at 195-196 (explaining that “[r]andom selection is the key to [the] process [of probability sampling]” and that “random selection offers access to the body of probability theory, which provides the basis for estimates of population parameters and estimates of error”).

As such, even if these thirteen job-vacancy announcements established that the employers that issued them routinely recruited and hired for the advertised positions only persons with at least a bachelor’s degree in a specific specialty closely related to the positions, it cannot be found that these thirteen job-vacancy announcements which appear to have been consciously selected could credibly refute the statistics-based findings of the *Handbook* published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics that such a position does not require at least a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty for entry into the occupation in the United States.

Therefore, the petitioner has not satisfied the first of the two alternative prongs described at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2), as the evidence of record does not establish a requirement for at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty as 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.

Next, the AAO finds that the petitioner did not satisfy the second alternative prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2), which provides that "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."

In this particular case, the petitioner has failed to credibly demonstrate that the duties the beneficiary will 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, or the equivalent, in a specific specialty.

The record of proceeding does not contain evidence establishing relative complexity or uniqueness as aspects of the proffered position, let alone that the position is so complex or unique as to require the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge such that a person with a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent is required to perform them. Rather, the AAO finds, that the petitioner has not distinguished either the proposed duties, or the position that they comprise, from generic market-research-analysis work, which, the *Handbook* indicates, does not necessarily require a person with at least a bachelor's degree, or the equivalent, in a specific specialty.

The petitioner therefore failed to establish how the beneficiary's responsibilities and day-to-day duties comprise a position so complex or unique that the position can be performed only by an individual with a bachelor's degree, or the equivalent, in a specific specialty.

Additionally, the AAO incorporates here by reference and reiterates its earlier discussion regarding the LCA and its indication that the petitioner would be paying a wage-rate that is only appropriate for a low-level, entry position relative to others within the occupation, as this factor is inconsistent with the relative complexity and uniqueness required to satisfy this criterion. Based upon the wage rate, the beneficiary is only required to have a basic understanding of the occupation. Moreover, that wage rate indicates that the beneficiary will perform routine tasks that require limited, if any, exercise of independent judgment; that the beneficiary's work will be closely supervised and monitored; that she will receive specific instructions on required tasks and expected results; and that her work will be reviewed for accuracy.

Consequently, as it did not show that the particular position for which it filed this petition is so complex or unique that it can only be performed by a person with at least a bachelor's degree, or the equivalent, in a specific specialty, the petitioner has not satisfied the second alternative prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2).

The AAO turns next to the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(3), which entails an employer demonstrating that it normally requires a bachelor's degree, or the equivalent, in a specific specialty for the position.

The AAO's review of the record of proceeding under this criterion necessarily includes whatever evidence the petitioner has submitted with regard to its past recruiting and hiring practices and employees who previously held the position in question.

To satisfy this criterion, the record must contain documentary evidence demonstrating that the petitioner has a history of requiring the degree or degree equivalency, in a specific specialty, in its prior recruiting and hiring for the position. 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 the performance requirements of the proffered position.¹⁰ In the instant case, the record does not establish a prior history of recruiting and hiring for the proposed position of only persons with at least a bachelor's degree, or the equivalent, in a specific specialty.

It should be noted that a petitioner may believe or otherwise assert that a proffered position requires a 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 employer 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 387. In other words, if a petitioner's assertion of a particular degree requirement is not necessitated by the actual performance requirements of the proffered position, the position 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 at 387. 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 proposed position - and without consideration

¹⁰ Any such assertion would be undermined in this particular case by the fact that the petitioner indicated in the LCA that its proffered position is a comparatively low, entry-level position relative to others within its occupation.

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 this case, the petitioner has not submitted information regarding any of its previous market research analysts. While a first-time hiring for a position is not in itself generally a basis for precluding a position from recognition as a specialty occupation, certainly an employer that has never recruited¹¹ and hired for the position would not be able to satisfy the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(3), which requires a demonstration that it normally requires a bachelor's degree, or the equivalent, in a specific specialty for the position.

As the petitioner has failed to demonstrate a history of recruiting and hiring only individuals with a bachelor's degree, or the equivalent, in a specific specialty for the proffered position, it has failed to satisfy 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(3).

Next, the AAO finds that the petitioner has not satisfied the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(4), which requires the petitioner to establish that the nature of the proffered position's 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 the specialty.

Both on its own terms and also in comparison with the three higher wage-levels that can be designated in an LCA, the petitioner's designation of an LCA wage-level I is indicative of duties of relatively low complexity.

As earlier noted, the *Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance* issued by the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) states the following with regard to Level I wage rates:

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 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 [emphasis in original].

¹¹ Although the petitioner submitted a job vacancy announcement posted on its website, it is noted that the printout was dated May 12, 2010, after the director issued her RFE. The petitioner must establish eligibility at the time of filing the nonimmigrant visa petition. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(1). A visa petition may not be approved at a future date after the petitioner or beneficiary becomes eligible under a new set of facts. *Matter of Michelin Tire Corp.*, 17 I&N Dec. 248 (Reg. Comm'r 1978).

The pertinent guidance from the Department of Labor, at page 7 of its *Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance* describes the next higher wage-level as follows:

Level II (qualified) wage rates are assigned to job offers for qualified employees who have attained, either through education or experience, a good understanding of the occupation. They perform moderately complex tasks that require limited judgment. An indicator that the job request warrants a wage determination at Level II would be a requirement for years of education and/or experience that are generally required as described in the O*NET Job Zones.

The above descriptive summary indicates that even this higher-than-designated wage level is appropriate for only "moderately complex tasks that require limited judgment." The fact that this higher-than-here-assigned, Level II wage-rate itself indicates performance of only "moderately complex tasks that require limited judgment," is very telling with regard to the relatively low level of complexity imputed to the proffered position by virtue of its Level I wage-rate designation.

Further, the AAO notes the relatively low level of complexity that even this Level II wage-level reflects when compared with the two still-higher LCA wage levels, neither of which was designated on the LCA submitted to support this petition.

The aforementioned *Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance* describes the Level III wage designation as follows:

Level III (experienced) wage rates are assigned to job offers for experienced employees who have a sound understanding of the occupation and have attained, either through education or experience, special skills or knowledge. They perform tasks that require exercising judgment and may coordinate the activities of other staff. They may have supervisory authority over those staff. A requirement for years of experience or educational degrees that are at the higher ranges indicated in the O*NET Job Zones would be indicators that a Level III wage should be considered.

Frequently, key words in the job title can be used as indicators that an employer's job offer is for an experienced worker. . . .

The *Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance* describes the Level IV wage designation as follows:

Level IV (fully competent) wage rates are assigned to job offers for competent employees who have sufficient experience in the occupation to plan and conduct work requiring judgment and the independent evaluation, selection, modification, and application of standard procedures and techniques. Such employees use advanced skills and diversified knowledge to solve unusual and complex problems. These employees receive only technical guidance and their work is reviewed only for application of sound judgment and effectiveness in meeting the establishment's

procedures and expectations. They generally have management and/or supervisory responsibilities.

Here the AAO again incorporates its earlier discussion and analysis regarding the implications of the petitioner's submission of an LCA certified for the lowest assignable wage-level. By virtue of this submission the petitioner effectively attested that the proffered position is a low-level, entry position relative to others within the occupation, and that, as clear by comparison with DOL's instructive comments about the next higher level (Level II), the proffered position did not even involve "moderately complex tasks that require limited judgment" (the level of complexity noted for the next higher wage-level, Level II). The AAO also finds that, separate and apart from the petitioner's submission of an LCA with a wage-level I designation, the petitioner has also failed to provide sufficiently detailed documentary evidence to establish that the nature of the specific duties that would be performed if this petition were approved 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.

For all of these reasons, the evidence in the record of proceeding fails to establish that the proposed duties meet the specialization and complexity threshold at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(4).

As the petitioner has not satisfied at least one of the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), it cannot be found that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed and the petition will be denied on this basis.¹²

In visa petition proceedings, the burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, that burden has not been met.

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

¹² On appeal, counsel requests a refund of the filing fee paid by the petitioner for Premium Processing service. However, the AAO does not handle filing fees and exercises no control over requests such as the one made by counsel. As counsel believes the petitioner is entitled to a refund, she should either call the USCIS Customer Service Line at 1-800-375-5283, or submit a written request to the California Service Center. Counsel's request will be reviewed and, if the officer determines that USCIS made an error, the officer will execute Form G-266, Request for Refund of Fee.