

(b)(6)

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



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

[Redacted]

DATE: JAN 30 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:

[Redacted]

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 Director, California Service Center ("the director"), denied the nonimmigrant visa petition, and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

On the Form I-129, Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker, the petitioner describes itself as an "Export" business. The petitioner states that it was established in 2009, and currently employs twelve personnel in the United States. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a market research analyst on a part-time basis and 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 determining that the petitioner had not provided evidence sufficient to establish that the proffered position is a specialty occupation.

The record of proceeding before the AAO contains: (1) the Form I-129 and supporting documentation; (2) the director's request for evidence (RFE); (3) the petitioner's response to the RFE; (4) the notice of decision; and (5) the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, and counsel's brief.

Upon review of the entire record of proceeding, the AAO finds that the petitioner has failed to overcome the director's grounds for denying this petition.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed and the petition will remain denied.

### I. Facts and Procedural History

The petitioner identified the proffered position as a "Market Research Analyst" on the Form I-129, and attested on the required Labor Condition Application (LCA) that the occupational classification for the position is "Market Research Analysts and Marketing Specialists," SOC (ONET/OES) Code 13-1161, at a Level II (qualified) wage.<sup>2</sup> The LCA was certified on March 22, 2012, for a validity period from September 15, 2012 to September 15, 2015. The petitioner also indicated on the LCA that the prevailing annual wage for this occupational classification, at a Level II wage in the Los Angeles-Long Beach-Glendale, CA Metropolitan Division, as \$23.37 per hour at the time the LCA was certified.

In the March 25, 2012 letter submitted in support of the petition, the petitioner stated that it is a "newly established international automobile dealership which offers diversified solutions for international automobiles purchases" and that it had "recently expanded [its] business into secondhand automobile trade." The petitioner noted that it works with international clients and

---

<sup>1</sup> The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. See *Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004).

<sup>2</sup> 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).

that it exports to the China market. The petitioner stated that "[d]ue to the complexity of the duties involved, the minimum qualifications needed to perform the duties for this position require a Bachelor's Degree in Business Administration or related area." The petitioner identified the duties of the proffered position as follows:

Conduct research on market conditions in local, regional, national and international areas to determine potential sales of a product or service; gather data and information on competitors, prices, sales, and methods of marketing and distribution; conduct in-depth data analysis, interpret data, formulate reports, and make recommendations based upon the research findings.

Upon review of the initial record, the director requested additional evidence to establish that the proffered position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation. The director outlined the specific evidence to be submitted.

In a response dated November 12, 2012, the petitioner indicated that it was small in size but that its business transactional volume, its gross and net annual income, and its annual growth rate are high. The petitioner stated that it, like other small businesses in its industry and other industries, requires a baccalaureate degree as a minimum prerequisite for its key support personnel. The petitioner asserted its belief that a baccalaureate degree has become a prerequisite for a majority of jobs that require professional training and specialized knowledge in the performance of the duties. The petitioner noted that the job duties of the proffered position require the beneficiary "to possess basic professional training in market research and analysis" and that "this position, by nature, requires the knowledge of economics and finance." The petitioner stated that it is seeking the services of a professional researcher and that it is not seeking a trainee or intern as it does not and cannot provide job training. The petitioner also provided a description of the duties in a typical work week for the proffered position as follows:

1. Conduct qualitative and quantitative research on market conditions using traditional and advanced methods, including conduct phone interviews, study professional business analysis paper, and apply market research techniques such as SWOT analysis and Porter's Five Focuses Model (7.5 hrs/wk);
2. Collect data and information on competitors, prices, sales, and methods of marketing and distribution in North America and East Asia. (5 hrs/wk);
3. Study periodically published economic and industry data and conduct in-depth data analysis forecast on changes sales in East Asia and purchasing cost in North America (7.5 hrs/wk);
4. Collect economic, politic, and international business related information globally with a focus in Europe to formulate business development plan. (3 hrs/wk);

5. Formulate reports, and make recommendations on current business based upon the research findings (10 hrs/wk):
  - a. Generating graphs and data table (2 hrs/wk)
  - b. Make business forecast with reasonable ground (4 hrs/wk)
  - c. Prepare paper report and brief presentation to managers (4 hrs/wk)
6. Perform other related tasks on a needed bases (2 hrs/wk)[.]

The petitioner also referenced the Department of Labor's (DOL's) *Occupational Outlook Handbook's* (*Handbook's*) chapter on Market Research Analysts and concluded that more and more companies employ market research analysts to help them stay competitive. The petitioner also referenced a 1998/1999 Industry Report on Professional and Scientific Personnel Compensation, with a description of the general job responsibilities and requirements for several occupations, including that of market research analysts. The petitioner noted that the position of market research analyst typically requires a degree in the field of study and up to two years related experience. The petitioner provided copies of excerpts from both the *Handbook* and the 1998/1999 Industry Report on Professional and Scientific Personnel Compensation.

The petitioner also submitted its business license, its federal tax returns for 2010, 2011, and 2012, its first quarter 2012 bank statement, its 2012 payroll record, its quarterly report, its business plan, and its organizational chart.

Upon review of the record, the director denied the petition. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that the proffered position is a specialty occupation.

On appeal, counsel for the petitioner asserts that the director did not properly consider the evidence submitted and erred when determining the proffered position is not a specialty occupation. Counsel contends that it is highly unlikely that any business would entrust the job duties to someone without a college education in the relevant field and it is impossible that a person without a baccalaureate degree in a specific field would be able to perform the job duties. Counsel confirms that the petitioner had not previously employed a market research analyst but notes that the petitioner had employed the beneficiary as a market research analyst intern. Counsel avers that the beneficiary as a market research analyst will perform job duties which are the same or similar to those job duties ordinarily performed by other market research analysts. Counsel indicates that the petitioner requires the professional services of a market research analyst with at least a baccalaureate degree in business administration because of its special business necessities. Counsel asserts that the petitioner has submitted sufficient documentation to demonstrate that it has satisfied the requirements found at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1), (2), and (4).

## II. Law

The issue in this matter is whether the proffered position qualifies as 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 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), 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.

## II. Analysis

Preliminarily, the evidence of record in this matter presents a broad overview of the petitioner, its business operations, the duties that the petitioner ascribes to the proffered position, and the position itself. Consequently, as will be evident below, the AAO finds that the evidence of record does not present the proffered position or its constituent duties in sufficient detail to establish that the substantive nature of either the position or its duties as actually performed within the context of the petitioner's business operations would be so specialized, complex, and/or unique as to require the need for at least a bachelor's degree level of a body of highly specialized knowledge. As clearly evident in the above quotations of the record's duty descriptions, they describe the proposed duties exclusively in terms of general functions that the beneficiary would perform. As such, they do not inform the AAO of the substantive nature of the work that the beneficiary would perform, the substantive application of specialized knowledge that performance of those duties would involve, or

any particular level of educational attainment in any specialty that would be required to perform them.

As noted earlier and as clear in the plain language of the controlling definitions of an H-1B specialty occupation, at section 214(i)(1) of Act, and at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii), the determinative element is whether the evidence of record establishes that 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 petitioner's failure to establish the substantive nature of the work to be performed by the beneficiary precludes a finding that the proffered position satisfies any criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), because it is the substantive nature of that work that determines (1) the normal minimum educational requirement for the particular position, which is the focus of criterion 1; (2) industry positions which are parallel to the proffered position and thus appropriate for review for a common degree requirement, under the first alternate prong of criterion 2; (3) the level of complexity or uniqueness of the proffered position, which is the focus of the second alternate prong of criterion 2; (4) the factual justification for a petitioner normally requiring a degree or its equivalent, when that is an issue under criterion 3; and (5) the degree of specialization and complexity of the specific duties, which is the focus of criterion 4. Accordingly, as the petitioner has not established that it has satisfied any of the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), it cannot be found that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation. The appeal will be dismissed and the petition denied for this reason.

Nevertheless, assuming, *arguendo*, that the proffered duties as described by the petitioner would in fact be the duties to be performed by the beneficiary, the AAO will nevertheless analyze them and the evidence of record to determine whether the proffered position as described would qualify as a specialty occupation. To that end and to make its determination as to whether the employment described above qualifies as a specialty occupation, the AAO turns first 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 the normal minimum requirement for entry into the particular position. The AAO recognizes the DOL's *Handbook* as an authoritative source on the duties and educational requirements of the wide variety of occupations that it addresses.<sup>3</sup>

To satisfy the first criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) the petitioner must demonstrate that a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific discipline is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position. Thus, the proffered position must require 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*,

---

<sup>3</sup> The AAO references to the *Handbook*, are references to the 2014-2015 edition of the *Handbook*, which may be accessed at the Internet site <http://www.bls.gov/OCO/>.

19 I&N Dec. 558 (Comm'r 1988). Although a general-purpose bachelor's degree, or a degree in a variety of fields, may be acceptable for a particular occupation, such general requirements do not establish a standard, minimum requirement of at least a bachelor's degree *in a specific specialty* or its equivalent for entry into the particular position. As noted, the LCA submitted in support of this petition was certified for a job offer falling within the "Market Research Analysts and Marketing Specialists" occupational category, and the petitioner referenced the *Handbook's* entry for that occupational category in its November 12, 2012 letter submitted in response to the director's RFE. The AAO agrees that the generic duties proposed for the beneficiary paraphrase and correspond to the general duties set out in the *Handbook* for this occupational category.

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

Market research analysts study market conditions to examine potential sales of a product or service. They help companies understand what products people want, who will buy them, and at what price.

#### **Duties**

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 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, and other visual aids to present the results of their research.

U.S. Dep't of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2014-15 ed., "Market Research Analysts," <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/Business-and-Financial/Market-research-analysts.htm#tab-2> (last visited Jan. 24, 2014).

Regarding the education and training for market research analysts, the *Handbook* states:

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, and 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.

*Id.* at <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/business-and-financial/market-research-analysts.htm#tab-4> (last visited Jan. 24, 2014).

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.<sup>4</sup> Section 214(i)(1)(B) of the Act (emphasis added).

Here, although the *Handbook* indicates that a bachelor's or higher degree is required, it also indicates that baccalaureate degrees in various fields are acceptable for entry into the occupation. In addition to recognizing degrees in disparate fields, i.e., market research and computer science as acceptable for entry into this field, the *Handbook* also states that "others have backgrounds in business administration, the social sciences, or communications." 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 at 147. Therefore, the *Handbook's* recognition that a general, non-specialty "background" in business administration may be sufficient for entry into the occupation strongly suggests that a bachelor's degree *in a specific specialty* is not a standard, minimum entry requirement for this occupation. 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 particular position proffered here as being a specialty occupation. Moreover, the petitioner's acknowledgement that the duties of the proffered position only require a bachelor's degree in business administration is tantamount to an admission that the proffered position is not, in fact, a specialty occupation.

As the *Handbook* does not support the proposition that the proffered position is one that normally requires a minimum of a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or the equivalent, to satisfy this first alternative criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), it is incumbent upon the petitioner to provide persuasive evidence that the proffered position otherwise qualifies as a specialty occupation under this criterion, notwithstanding the absence of *Handbook* support on the issue. In that regard, the AAO acknowledges the petitioner's submission of a 1998/1999 Industry Report on Professional and Scientific Personnel Compensation. The excerpt provided is a "Level Guide for Four Level Finance, Human Resources, Administrative Services, Marketing and Sales, and Operations Positions" which identifies the experience, knowledge and responsibilities for different levels within the referenced occupations. This document, however, does not identify the market research analyst position as requiring a bachelor's degree in a specific discipline. Moreover, the probative value of a document created more than fourteen years ago in evaluating the current educational requirements for particular positions is questionable.

The evidence in the record of proceeding does not establish that a baccalaureate or higher degree

---

<sup>4</sup> 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 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. As just stated, this also includes even seemingly disparate specialties provided the evidence of record establishes how each acceptable, specific field of study is directly related to the duties and responsibilities of the particular position.

in a specific specialty or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position that is the subject of this petition. Accordingly, the petitioner has not satisfied 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 requires a petitioner to establish that a bachelor's degree, in a specific specialty, 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 (quoting *Hird/Blaker Corp. v. Sava*, 712 F. Supp. at 1102). 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.

The petitioner's submission of an excerpt from the 1998/1999 Industry Report on Professional and Scientific Personnel Compensation, likewise does not establish an industry-wide requirement for at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty for a market research analyst position. As noted above, this document is not current and moreover lacks substantive information regarding specific educational requirements for the proffered position.

Accordingly, based upon a complete review of the record, the petitioner has not established that at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty is the norm for entry into positions that are (1) parallel to the proffered position; and, (2) located in organizations similar to the petitioner. For the reasons discussed above, the petitioner has not satisfied the first alternative prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2).

The petitioner also failed to 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." The petitioner in this matter provided an overview of the duties of the proffered position. Thus, it is not possible to ascertain what the beneficiary will actually do on a routine basis. Asserting the proffered position is complex is insufficient. 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'r 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm'r 1972)). That is, the petitioner fails to credibly demonstrate exactly what the beneficiary will do on a day-to-day basis such that complexity or uniqueness can even be determined. The petitioner fails to sufficiently develop relative complexity or uniqueness as an aspect of the proffered position of market research analyst. Furthermore, counsel acknowledges on appeal that the beneficiary as a market research analyst will perform job duties which are the same or similar to those job duties ordinarily performed by

other market research analysts. Thus, counsel appears to acknowledge that the proffered position is no more complex or unique than a market research analyst position that does not require a bachelor's degree in a specific discipline in order to competently perform the duties of the position.

The evidence of record does not establish that this position is significantly different from other market research analyst positions such that it refutes the *Handbook's* information to the effect that there is a spectrum of preferred degrees acceptable for these positions. In other words, the record lacks sufficiently detailed information to distinguish the proffered position as unique from or more complex than positions that can be performed by persons without at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent. Consequently, as the petitioner fails to demonstrate how the proffered position of market research analyst is so complex or unique relative to other market research analyst positions that do not require at least a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent for entry into the occupation in the United States, 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).

Turning to the third criterion, counsel and the petitioner indicate that the petitioner had not previously employed anyone, other than the beneficiary in an intern position, to perform the duties of the proffered position. Accordingly, the petitioner's recruiting and hiring history cannot be examined. We also observe that while a petitioner may believe or otherwise assert that a proffered position requires a degree in a specific specialty, 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 degree requirement is only symbolic and 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").

Finally, the petitioner has not satisfied the fourth criterion of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), which is reserved for positions with specific duties so specialized and complex that their performance requires knowledge that is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent. Again, relative specialization and complexity have not been sufficiently developed by the petitioner as an aspect of the proffered position. In other words, the proposed duties have not been described with sufficient specificity to show that they are more specialized and complex than a market research analyst position that is not usually associated with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent.

In addition to the lack of sufficient specificity to distinguish the proffered position from other market research analyst positions for which a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is not required to perform their duties, the petitioner has designated the

proffered position as a Level II position on the submitted LCA, indicating that it is a position for an employee who has a good understanding of the occupation but who will only perform moderately complex tasks that require limited judgment. Both on its own terms and also in comparison with the two higher wage-levels that can be designated in an LCA, by submitting an LCA certified for a wage-level II, the petitioner effectively attests that the proposed duties are of moderate complexity as compared to others within the same occupational category. This fact is materially inconsistent with the level of complexity required by this criterion.

The *Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance* issued by DOL states the following with regard to Level II wage rates:

**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.

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).

The AAO notes the relatively low level of complexity that the 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 . . . .

*Id.*

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.

*Id.*

Therefore, it is not credible that the position is one with specialized and complex duties, as such a higher-level position would be classified as a Level IV position, requiring a significantly higher prevailing wage.<sup>5</sup> 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).

Upon review of the totality of the record, 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. The appeal will be dismissed and the petition denied for this reason.

In visa petition proceedings, it is the petitioner's burden to establish eligibility for the immigration benefit sought. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361; *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.

---

<sup>5</sup> 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).

As noted above, the petitioner has offered the beneficiary a wage of \$23.37 per hour, which satisfied the Level II prevailing wage for a market research analyst in the Los Angeles-Long Beach-Glendale, CA Metropolitan Division at the time the LCA was certified. U.S. Dep't of Labor, Foreign Labor Certification Data Center, Online Wage Library, FLC Quick Search, "Market Research Analysts and Marketing Specialists," <http://flcdatacenter.com/OesQuickResults.aspx?code=13-1161&area=31084&year=12&source=1> (last visited Jan. 24, 2014). However, in order to offer employment to the beneficiary at a Level III (experienced) prevailing wage, the wage was \$30.64 per hour, and the Level IV (fully competent) prevailing wage was \$37.92 per hour. *Id.*