(b)(6)

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

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

DATE: JUL 0 8 2015

PETITION RECEIPT #:

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:

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:

Enclosed is the non-precedent decision of the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) for your case.

If you believe we incorrectly decided your case, you may file a motion requesting us to reconsider our decision and/or reopen the proceeding. The requirements for motions are located at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. Motions must be filed on a Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B) within 33 days of the date of this decision. The Form I-290B web page (www.uscis.gov/i-290b) contains the latest information on fee, filing location, and other requirements. Please do not mail any motions directly to the AAO.

Thank you,

Ron Rosenberg
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Vermont Service Center, denied the petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

I. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On the Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker (Form I-129), the petitioner describes itself as a parking company, with six employees, that was established in In order to employ the beneficiary in what it designates as a "market analyst, parking" position, the petitioner seeks to classify him as a nonimmigrant worker in a specialty occupation pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b).

The Director denied the petition, concluding that the petitioner did not establish that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation in accordance with the applicable statutory and regulatory provisions.

The record of proceeding contains: (1) the petitioner's Form I-129 and supporting documentation; (2) the Director's request for evidence (RFE); (3) the petitioner's response to the RFE; (4) the Director's decision; and (5) the Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B) and supporting documentation. We reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing our decision.[1]

For the reasons that will be discussed below, we agree with the Director that the petitioner has not established eligibility for the benefit sought. Accordingly, the Director's decision will not be disturbed.

II. SPECIALTY OCCUPATION

To meet its burden of proof in establishing the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation, the petitioner must establish that the employment it is offering to the beneficiary meets the applicable statutory and regulatory requirements.

A. Legal Framework

Section 214(i)(l) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(l), 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.

---

[1] We conduct appellate review on a *de novo* basis. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004).

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 meet one of the following criteria:

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

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

As such and consonant with section 214(i)(1) of the Act and the regulation at 8 C.F.R.

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

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

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

B. Proffered Position

The petitioner states that the beneficiary will be employed as a part-time market analyst to revise its marketing strategy for parking lots. In the support letter, the petitioner provided a description of the proffered position and stated that typically the knowledge needed for the position would be "best acquired through studies leading to a Bachelor's degree or its equivalent in Marketing, Business Administration or similar field."

In response to the RFE, the petitioner provided a revised job description with the approximate percentage of time that the beneficiary would spend on each job duty. The petitioner stated that the beneficiary would perform the following job duties:

1. Perform market research to explore viable options to increase revenue, reduce expenses and increase profitability.
   10%

2. Review [the petitioner's] budget, expected revenue and parking revenue statistics, and analyze how these numbers compare to alternative pricing structures for parking. Determine which parking pricing system will maximize our profits and ensure the best services to our patrons. Recommend appropriate modifications to our pricing structures and plans, as necessary.
   15%

3. Study advertising and promotional materials of our competitors in the parking lot & vehicle storage markets and analyze parking data, pricing structures, annual reports and marketing programs of competitor parking lot chains.
   15%

4. Analyze parking customers' patterns to determine which marketing schemes, such as discount incentive programs etc., would attract most customers, be cost effective and increase our profits.
   15%

5. Use established market research techniques to forecast trends in the parking industry.
   10%

6. Develop a comprehensive marketing plan based on their research and projects, with a view towards increasing our customer base. Periodically gather and review the actual data throughout the year, to see if results are in line with expectations. Advise management of any variances, and recommend modifications to the plan, as necessary to maximize customer base and profitability.
   20%

7. Review costs of possible additional parking lot locations and determine whether acquiring those lots would increase our marketability and be in line with our new sophisticated branding.
   5%

8. Recommend specific means to improve our business development and marketing strategies. Present ideas and reports to President and other professionals at the firm and answer questions about the marketing plan.
   10%

According to the petitioner, the position requires at least a bachelor's degree in marketing, business administration or similar field, or its equivalent. The petitioner further reported in the RFE

response that the beneficiary will provide services for its own parking lots, as well as for other parking lots for other companies that are owned by its president.[2]

C. Analysis

To demonstrate that a job requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge as required by section 214(i)(1) of the Act, a petitioner must establish that the position requires the attainment of a bachelor's or higher degree in a specialized field of study, or its equivalent. As discussed 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. Thus, as a preliminary matter, we note that the petitioner's claim that a bachelor's degree in "business administration" is a sufficient minimum requirement for entry into the proffered position is inadequate to establish that the proposed position qualifies as a specialty occupation. 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.[3]

A petitioner must demonstrate that the 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

---

[2] When a beneficiary is scheduled to perform work for multiple employers, each employer must submit a separate Form I-129 petition for the portion of the beneficiary's time to be spent performing duties for that employer. A United States employer seeking to classify a beneficiary an H-1B nonimmigrant worker must file a petition on Form I-129, as provided in the form instructions. 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(A). If the beneficiary will perform services for more than one employer, each employer must file a separate petition with USCIS as provided in the form instructions. 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(C).

[3] Specifically, the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit explained in *Royal Siam* that:

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

Id.

establish the position as a specialty occupation. *Cf. Matter of Michael Hertz Associates*, 19 I&N Dec. 558 (Comm'r 1988).

Nevertheless, for the purpose of performing a comprehensive analysis of whether the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation, we now turn to the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

> *A baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position*

We will first discuss the record of proceeding in relation to the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(*1*), which requires that a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position.

USCIS 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 that it addresses. The petitioner stated in the Labor Condition Application (LCA) that the proffered position falls under the occupational category "Marketing Research Analysts and Marketing Specialists."[4]

We reviewed the chapter of the *Handbook* entitled "Market Research Analysts," including the sections regarding the typical duties and requirements for this occupational category.[5] The subchapter of the *Handbook* entitled "How to Become a Market Research Analyst" states the following about this occupational category:

> **Education**
>
> Market research analysts typically need a bachelor's degree in market research or a related field. Many have degrees in fields such as statistics, math, and computer science. Others have backgrounds in business administration, the social sciences, or communications.

---

[4] On the LCA, the petitioner reports as the employer rather than

[5] The *Handbook*, which is available in printed form, may also be accessed on the Internet, at http://www.stats.bls.gov/oco/. Our references to the *Handbook* are to the 2014 – 2015 edition available online. We hereby incorporate into the record of proceeding the chapter of the *Handbook* regarding "Market Research Analysts."

The occupational category designated by a petitioner is considered as an aspect in establishing the general tasks and responsibilities of a proffered position, and USCIS regularly reviews the *Handbook* on the duties and educational requirements of the wide variety of occupations that it addresses. However, to satisfy the first criterion, the burden of proof remains on the petitioner to submit sufficient evidence to support a finding that its particular position would normally have a minimum, specialty degree requirement or its equivalent for entry.

> 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.
>
> **Other Experience**
>
> Most market research analysts can benefit from internships or work experience in business, marketing, or sales. Work experience in other positions that require analyzing data, writing reports, or surveying or collecting data can also be helpful in finding a market research position.
>
> **Licenses, Certifications, and Registrations**
>
> Certification is voluntary, but analysts may pursue certification to demonstrate a level of professional competency. The Marketing Research Association offers the Professional Researcher Certification (PRC) for market research analysts. Candidates qualify based on experience and knowledge; they must pass an exam, be a member of a professional organization, and have at least 3 years working in opinion and marketing research.

U.S. Dep't of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2014-15 ed., Market Research Analysts, on the Internet at http://www.bls.gov/ooh/business-and-financial/market-research-analysts.htm#tab-4 (last visited July 7, 2015).

The *Handbook* reports that market research analysts have degrees and backgrounds in a wide-variety of disparate fields. That is, while the *Handbook* states that employees typically need a bachelor's degree in market research or a related field, it continues by specifying that many market research analysts have degrees in fields such as statistics, math, or computer science. According to the *Handbook*, other market research analysts have backgrounds in fields such as business administration, the social sciences, or communications. This passage of the *Handbook* identifies various courses as essential to this occupation, including statistics, research methods, and marketing. It further states that courses in communications and social sciences (such as economics, psychology, and sociology) are also important. Therefore, although the *Handbook* reports that market research analysts typically need an advanced degree, it also indicates that degrees and backgrounds in various fields are acceptable for jobs in this occupation – including computer science and the social sciences, as well as statistics and communications.

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 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.[6] Section 214(i)(1)(B) of the Act (emphasis added).

The *Handbook* also states that "others have a background in business administration." Without more, this statement does not support the assertion that a bachelor's degree or higher in a specific specialty (or its equivalent) is normally the minimum requirement for entry. *See Royal Siam Corp. v. Chertoff*, 484 F.3d 147. As discussed, 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. Therefore, the *Handbook*'s recognition that a general, non-specialty "background" in business administration is sufficient for entry into the occupation strongly suggests that a bachelor's degree *in a specific specialty* is not normally the minimum entry requirement for this occupation.

The narrative of the *Handbook* further reports that some employees obtain professional certification to demonstrate a level of professional competency. It continues by outlining the requirements for market research analysts to achieve the Professional Researcher Certification (PRC), and states that candidates qualify based upon their experience and knowledge. According to the *Handbook*, the credential is granted by the Marketing Research Association to those who pass an exam and have at least three years of experience working in opinion and market research.[7]

We reviewed the Marketing Research Association's Internet site, which confirms the accuracy of the *Handbook's* statement regarding the requirements for professional certification (i.e., passage of an exam and three years of relevant industry experience), and further specifies that the "Education" necessary to apply for professional certification is "12 industry-related education hours within the

---

[6] 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, we do 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. 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.

[7] The Marketing Research Association website states that the association was founded in 1957 and is the leading and largest association of opinion and marketing research professions. For additional information, see http://www.marketingresearch.org/information (last visited July 7, 2015).

two preceding years." The Market Research Association website provides the following information about the Professional Researcher Certification program:

> The Professional Researcher Certification program (PRC) is designed to recognize the qualifications and expertise of marketing and opinion research professionals. The goal of PRC is to encourage high standards within the survey profession to raise competency, establish an objective measure of an individual's knowledge and proficiency and to encourage professional development. Achieving and maintaining PRC validates the knowledge of the market research industry and puts researchers in a select group of like-minded professionals.
>
> * * *
>
> Because PRC indicates to the public your ability to conduct marketing research, the PRC Board requires [a candidate] to have experience in the survey and opinion process. Three years of relevant experience is required. . . . A total of 12 industry-related education hours within the two preceding years are required at time of application. Conferences, seminars, webinars, etc., must be added to [the candidate's] record.
>
> * * *
>
> The benefits of a Certification program are both industry-wide and individual. For the individual, it is a means of differentiating oneself, a "badge" of competence in the given areas and an assurance that the individual is current in knowledge and experience. For the profession/industry as a whole, it provides a vehicle for developing a pool of well-trained, competent marketing researchers, thereby improving both perceived and substantive standards.

Market Res. Ass'n, http://marketingresearch.org/prc-faq (last visited July 7, 2015).

The Market Research Association emphasizes that the credentialing program recognizes the qualifications and expertise of marketing and opinion research professionals, encourages high standards within the profession, and establishes an objective measure of an individual's knowledge and proficiency. According to the association's website, the credential indicates to the public an individual's ability to conduct market research. The narrative continues by stating that the credential provides a vehicle for developing a pool of well-trained, competent marketing researchers, thereby improving both perceived and substantive standards. The website does not indicate that the market research analyst positions have any particular academic requirements for entry, nor does it indicate that these positions require any particular level of education to be identified as qualified and possessing a level of expertise/competence. Instead, the Market Research Association highlights the importance of professional experience and industry-related professional courses (through conferences, seminars, and webinars).

On appeal, the petitioner references the O*NET OnLine Summary Report for the occupational category "Market Research Analysts and Marketing Specialists." We reviewed the Summary Report in its entirety. However, upon review, we find that it is insufficient to establish that the position qualifies as a specialty occupation normally requiring at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. The Summary Report for market research analysts and marketing specialists has a designation of Job Zone 4. This indicates that a position requires considerable preparation. It does not, however, demonstrate that a bachelor's degree in any *specific specialty* is required, and does not, therefore, demonstrate that a position so designated is in a specialty occupation as defined in section 214(i)(1) of the Act and 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). The O*NET OnLine Help Center provides a discussion of the Job Zone 4 designation and explains that this zone signifies only that most, but not all of the occupations within it, require a bachelor's degree. *See* O*NET OnLine Help Center at http://www.onetonline.org/help/online/zones. Further, the Help Center discussion confirms that a designation of Job Zone 4 does not indicate any requirements for particular majors or academic concentrations. Therefore, despite the petitioner's assertion to the contrary, the O*NET Summary Report is not probative evidence that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation.

The petitioner also states that the occupational category "Market Research Analysts and Marketing Specialists" has a Specialized Vocational Preparation (SVP) Range of "7.0 to < 8.0." The assignment of SVP "7.0 to < 8.0" is also not indicative of a specialty occupation. Section II of the *Dictionary of Occupational Titles* (DOT's) Appendix C, Components of the Definition Trailer, addresses the SVP rating system and reads:

> II. SPECIFIC VOCATIONAL PREPARATION (SVP)
>
> Specific Vocational Preparation is defined as the amount of lapsed time required by a typical worker to learn the techniques, acquire the information, and develop the facility needed for average performance in a specific job-worker situation.
>
> This training may be acquired in a school, work, military, institutional, or vocational environment. It does not include the orientation time required of a fully qualified worker to become accustomed to the special conditions of any new job. Specific vocational training includes: vocational education, apprenticeship training, in-plant training, on-the-job training, and essential experience in other jobs.
>
> Specific vocational training includes training given in any of the following circumstances:
>
> a. Vocational education (high school; commercial or shop training; technical school; art school; and that part of college training which is organized around a specific vocational objective);
>
> b. Apprenticeship training (for apprenticeable jobs only);

c. In-plant training (organized classroom study provided by an employer);

d. On-the-job training (serving as learner or trainee on the job under the instruction of a qualified worker);

e. Essential experience in other jobs (serving in less responsible jobs which lead to the higher grade job or serving in other jobs which qualify).

The following is an explanation of the various levels of specific vocational preparation:

Level	Time
1	Short demonstration only
2	Anything beyond short demonstration up to and including 1 month
3	Over 1 month up to and including 3 months
4	Over 3 months up to and including 6 months
5	Over 6 months up to and including 1 year
6	Over 1 year up to and including 2 years
7	Over 2 years up to and including 4 years
8	Over 4 years up to and including 10 years
9	Over 10 years

Note: The levels of this scale are mutually exclusive and do not overlap.

An SVP rating of "7.0 to < 8.0" indicates "[o]ver 2 years up to and including 4 years." This does not indicate that at least a four-year bachelor's degree is required for an occupational category that has been assigned such a rating or, more importantly, that such a degree must be in a specific specialty directly related to the occupation. Rather, the SVP rating simply indicates that the occupation requires over 2 years up to and including 4 years of training of the wide variety of forms of preparation described above, including experiential training. Accordingly, the DOT does not indicate that at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty (or its equivalent) is normally the minimum requirement for entry into these positions. Although the petitioner references the DOT, it does not establish its relevancy to establish the current educational requirements for entry into the occupation. Therefore, the DOT is also not probative evidence to establish that the proffered position is a specialty occupation.

Thus, the *Handbook* and the Market Research Association website, as well as the documentation referenced by the petitioner (O*NET OnLine Summary Report and SVP), do not support the claim that the occupational category "Market Research Analysts" is one for which normally the minimum requirement for entry is a baccalaureate degree (or higher) in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.[8]

---

[8] When the *Handbook* does not support the proposition that a proffered position is one that meets the statutory and regulatory provisions of a specialty occupation, it is incumbent upon the petitioner to provide persuasive evidence that the proffered position more likely than not satisfies this or one of the other three

Even if it did (which it does not), to satisfy the first criterion, the petitioner must provide evidence to support a finding that the particular position proffered would normally have such a minimum, specialty degree requirement or its equivalent.[9]

In the instant case, the duties and requirements of the position as described in the record of proceeding do not indicate that this particular position proffered by the petitioner is one for which a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally the minimum requirement for entry. Thus, the petitioner has not satisfied the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(*1*).

The requirement of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations

Next, we will review the record regarding the first of the two alternative prongs of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(*2*). This prong alternatively calls for a petitioner to establish that a requirement of a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is common for positions that are identifiable as being (1) in the petitioner's industry, (2) parallel to the proffered position, and also (3) located in organizations that are similar to the petitioner.

---

criteria, notwithstanding the absence of the *Handbook*'s support on the issue. It is the petitioner's responsibility to provide probative evidence (e.g., documentation from other objection, authoritative sources) that supports a finding that the particular position in question qualifies as a specialty occupation. Whenever more than one authoritative source exists, an adjudicator will consider and weigh all of the evidence presented to determine whether the particular position qualifies as a specialty occupation.

[9] With regard to the duties, the petitioner designated the proffered position on the LCA under the occupational category "Market Research Analysts and Marketing Specialists" as a Level I (entry) position. The "Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance" issued by DOL) provides a description of the wage levels. A Level I wage rate is described by DOL as follows:

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

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.

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

As previously discussed, the petitioner has not established that its proffered position is one for which the *Handbook* (or other authoritative source) reports a standard industry-wide requirement for at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. Thus, we incorporate by reference the previous discussion on the matter. Also, there are no submissions from the industry's professional association indicating that it has made a degree a minimum entry requirement. Furthermore, the petitioner did not submit any letters or affidavits from similar firms or individuals in the petitioner's industry attesting that such firms "routinely employ and recruit only degreed individuals." Nor is there any other evidence relevant to this prong. Thus, based upon a complete review of the record of proceeding, we find that the petitioner has not satisfied the first alternative prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(*2*).

The particular position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent

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

In support of its assertion that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation, the petitioner provided documentation regarding the proffered position and its business operations, including printouts from its website, a letter from its accountant, photographs, a one-page Internet Google search printout, computer screen shots, and tax returns for other business entities.

Upon review, we find that the petitioner has not sufficiently developed relative complexity or uniqueness as an aspect of the proffered position. For instance, the petitioner did not submit information relevant to a detailed course of study leading to a specialty degree and did not establish how such a curriculum is necessary to perform the duties it may assert are so complex and unique. While a few related courses may be beneficial in performing certain duties of the position, the petitioner has not demonstrated how an established curriculum of such courses leading to a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is required to perform the duties of the proffered position. The description of the duties does not specifically identify any tasks that are so complex or unique that only a specifically degreed individual could perform them. The record does not establish which of the duties, if any, of the proffered position would be so

complex or unique as to be distinguishable from those of similar but non-degreed or non-specialty degreed employment.

This is further evidenced by the LCA submitted by the petitioner in support of the instant petition. As previously mentioned, the LCA indicates a wage level at a Level I (entry) wage, which is the lowest of four assignable wage levels. The wage-level of the proffered position indicates that (relative to other positions falling under this occupational category) the beneficiary is only required to have a basic understanding of the occupation; that he will be expected to perform routine tasks that require limited, if any, exercise of judgment; that he will be closely supervised and his work closely monitored and reviewed for accuracy; and that he will receive specific instructions on required tasks and expected results. DOL guidance indicates that a Level I designation is appropriate for a research fellow, a worker in training, or an internship. This designation suggests that the beneficiary will serve in a low-level position relative to others within the occupational category.

Without further evidence, it is not credible that the petitioner's proffered position is complex or unique as such a position falling under this occupational category would likely be classified at a higher-level, such as a Level III (experienced) or Level IV (fully competent) position, requiring a significantly higher prevailing wage.[10] For example, a Level IV (fully competent) position is designated by DOL for employees who "use advanced skills and diversified knowledge to solve unusual and complex problems."[11] The evidence of record does not establish that this position is significantly different from other positions in the occupational category such that it refutes the *Handbook's* information that a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is not required for the proffered position.

The petitioner claims that the beneficiary is well qualified for the position, and references his qualifications. However, the test to establish a position as a specialty occupation is not the education or experience of a proposed beneficiary, but whether the position itself requires at least a

---

[10] The issue here is that the petitioner's designation of this position as a Level I, entry-level position undermines its claim that the position is particularly complex, specialized, or unique compared to other positions *within the same occupation*. Nevertheless, it is important to note that a Level I wage-designation does not preclude a proffered position from classification as a specialty occupation. In certain occupations (doctors or lawyers, for example), an entry-level position would still require a minimum of a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, for entry. Similarly, however, a Level IV wage-designation would not reflect that an occupation qualifies as a specialty occupation if that higher-level position does not have an entry requirement of at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. That is, a position's wage level designation may be a consideration but is not a substitute for a determination of whether a proffered position meets the requirements of section 214(i)(1) of the Act.

[11] For additional information regarding wage levels as defined by DOL, 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.

bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. The petitioner has not satisfied the second alternative prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(*2*).

The employer normally requires a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, for the position

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

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

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

In response to the RFE, the petitioner states that it has not advertised for the proffered position and that it is a new position. Upon review of the record of proceeding, the petitioner has not established a prior history of recruiting and hiring for the proffered position persons with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.

The petitioner has not provided probative evidence to establish that it normally requires at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, for the proffered position. Thus, the petitioner has not satisfied the third criterion of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

The 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 in a specific specialty, or its equivalent

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

The petitioner claims that the nature of the specific duties of the position in the context of its business operations is so specialized and complex that the knowledge required to perform them is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. We reviewed the petitioner's statements and documentation regarding the proffered position and its business operations. However, relative specialization and complexity have not been sufficiently developed by the petitioner as an aspect of the proffered position. That is, the petitioner has not established that the job duties are more specialized and complex than positions that are not usually associated with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.

We further incorporate our earlier discussion and analysis regarding the duties of the proffered position, and the designation of the proffered position in the LCA as a Level I position (out of four assignable wage-levels) relative to others within the occupational category. Hence, without more, the position is one not likely distinguishable by relatively specialized and complex duties. That is, without further evidence, the petitioner has not demonstrated that its proffered position is one with specialized and complex duties as such a position would likely be classified at a higher-level, such as a Level III (experienced) or Level IV (fully competent) position, requiring a substantially higher prevailing wage.[12]

Although the petitioner asserts that the nature of the specific duties is specialized and complex, the record lacks sufficient evidence to support this claim. Thus, the petitioner has submitted inadequate probative evidence to satisfy the criterion of the regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(*4*).

---

[12] As previously discussed, a Level IV (fully competent) position is designated by DOL for employees who "use advanced skills and diversified knowledge to solve unusual and complex problems" and requires a significantly higher wage.

For the reasons related in the preceding discussion, the petitioner has not established 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.

III. BEYOND THE DECISION OF THE DIRECTOR

A beneficiary's credentials to perform a particular job are relevant only when the job is found to be a specialty occupation. As discussed in this decision, the proffered position does not require a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. Therefore, we need not and will not address the beneficiary's qualifications further.

IV. CONCLUSION AND ORDER

In visa petition proceedings, it is the petitioner's burden to establish eligibility for the immigration benefit sought. Section 291 of the Act, 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.