FACT SHEET

AI Visibility in South East Queensland Legal Services (2026)

Agreement between AI platforms on which South East Queensland law firms to name was low, and the firms they named consistently were more likely to show four observable signals.

Published: Wednesday 4 November 2026, by Felicity Jane Digital
Author: Jane Cluff CPM PAMI
Full report: felicityjane.com.au/research/ai-visibility-seq-legal-services-2026/
Registered method: osf.io/wcvbk (registered 3 August 2026, before any data was collected)
Post-registration notes: osf.io/c63dk

What the study did

- **Platforms:** ChatGPT, Perplexity, Claude and Google AI Overviews
- **Questions:** nine, three practice areas in each of three South East Queensland locations
- **Runs:** 10 per question on each platform between 10 August and 22 September 2026: 361 recorded runs across the four platforms, including one replacement run
- **Named consistently:** a platform named the firm in at least 7 of that platform's 10 runs of a question (7 of 9 for one question's AI Overviews)
- **Consistent group:** 74 firm and question pairs, covering 63 firms
- **Comparison group:** 45 firms, selected at random from listings no platform named for that question, 5 for each question
- **Population:** 805 Google Business Profile listings. Firms without a disclosed street address were excluded, so the population is not a census of Queensland law firms.

What the study found

Signal	Consistent group	Comparison firms
QLS Find a Solicitor listing	76% (95% interval 65% to 84%)	40% (27% to 55%)
Structured data on the website (FAQPage, LocalBusiness or LegalService, or Person)	62% (51% to 72%)	31% (20% to 46%)
Google Business Profile scoring 4 or 5 of 5	43% (33% to 55%)	24% (14% to 39%)
Website post within 90 days, firms with a dated post	74%, 37 of 50 firms (60% to 84%)	48%, 15 of 31 firms (32% to 65%)

- The QLS directory difference ran in the same direction in all nine practice area and location combinations.
- **Agreement between platforms was low.** Of the 74 firm and question pairs named consistently, just over half (38) reached the threshold on one platform only. Seven reached it on all four.
- **Review count**, recorded for commercial litigation only, did not follow this pattern. The median was 34.5 reviews for the 24 consistent firms against 60 for the 15 comparison firms, an exploratory observation.

Units: the first three rows count firm and question pairs (74) in the consistent group. The post row counts firms with a dated post, as the report does. Comparison figures count firms.

Methodology review

Dr Karen Sutherland reviewed Version 1 of the methodology in July 2026. Her review was of the methodology only. The study is an exploratory, observational study designed to generate hypotheses rather than establish causal or confirmatory conclusions.

Limits

- These are associations in a small exploratory study. They do not show that any signal causes a firm to be named.
- One researcher, with a commercial interest, collected and coded all the data.
- Google results are the AI Overview as first displayed. Perplexity was queried through a signed-in study account.
- An AI assistant, Claude (Anthropic), helped transcribe data and draft study documents (report section 4.11).
- Several rules were set after results were seen. Every change is recorded in 54 post-registration amendments (report sections 6.2 and 8).
- Apart from ten firms listed by website domain in the registration as examples of organic search results, no firm is identified.

Disclosure

Felicity Jane Digital is a marketing agency that provides search and AI-visibility services to law firms. Several of the signals the study measures, including structured data, Google Business Profile completeness and website content, are areas in which the agency sells services. Section 9 of the report sets out this interest.

Interviews

Jane Cluff is available for interview by arrangement from 5 November.

Media contact: Jane Cluff, 0427 046 918, jane@felicityjane.com.au