

WHITE PAPER

# AI Visibility in Australian Legal Services

What 100 search and AI attempts mean for  
Australian law firms

---

## PART 1

# The result in one page

People now ask search and AI tools to suggest lawyers before visiting a law firm's website. The answer can shape the shortlist, frame the evidence and influence who receives the first call.

We tested 25 questions across ChatGPT, Google Search, Google AI Mode and Bing Copilot Search. The 100 attempts covered family law, criminal law, wills and estates, and commercial disputes in five cities, plus national trust questions.

**Relevant experience was easy to discuss. Practitioner verification and jurisdiction were much harder to complete.**

|                                      |                               |                                                    |                                         |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| <b>100</b><br>search and AI attempts | <b>73</b><br>material answers | <b>31/73</b><br>offering practitioner verification | <b>18/73</b><br>preserving jurisdiction |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|

## How to read these findings

- > Twenty-seven incomplete or non-material attempts remain in the denominator and are excluded from answer-quality rates.
- > We measured Presence, Evidence, Accuracy and Journey. We did not rank or endorse firms.
- > Named-firm claims are not published as accuracy findings.

## PART 1

# The firm website is still the evidence layer

There were 57 usable local firm-discovery answers. Forty-two linked directly to at least one law-firm website.

|                                                   |                                             |                                                              |
|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>42/57</b><br>local answers linking a firm site | <b>61/73</b><br>answers with a visible link | <b>46/73</b><br>answers with an identifiable official source |
|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|

## What law firms should take from this

- > A practice-area page should state the matter, jurisdiction, process, likely team, scope boundaries and next step.
- > Practitioner names, roles, locations and practice areas should agree across profiles and structured data.
- > Directories can support discovery, but they do not replace a current first-party page or official register.
- > Experience examples should be relevant and supportable without promising an outcome or breaching confidentiality.

**If an answer engine sends a prospective client to your site, the page should resolve the decision instead of forcing another search.**

## PART 1

# Verification stopped one step short

Answers frequently described experience, fees and team structure. Fewer completed the practitioner-status and jurisdiction checks needed to make that shortlist safer to use.

| What we checked                   | Result   | Why it matters                                                   |
|-----------------------------------|----------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Relevant experience qualified     | 63 of 73 | The answer addressed matter fit                                  |
| Practitioner verification offered | 31 of 73 | The reader was told how to check practising status               |
| Jurisdiction adequately preserved | 18 of 73 | The answer kept the applicable state, territory or court context |
| Safe and actionable journey       | 12 of 73 | The answer joined the safeguards into a usable next step         |

## Use the right kind of proof

- > A current practising certificate establishes authority to practise subject to its category and conditions.
- > Accredited specialisation, professional membership, awards, reviews and case results answer different questions.
- > The applicable official register depends on the practitioner and jurisdiction.
- > A past result or testimonial does not guarantee a similar outcome.

**Put the official verification path beside the practitioner claim and explain what the reader should check.**

## PART 1

# Decision evidence was uneven

A useful shortlist should help a person compare more than names and ratings. We looked for relevant experience, fees, conflicts, who would handle the matter and possible urgency.

|                                               |                                            |                                |                                                        |
|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>63/73</b><br>qualified relevant experience | <b>61/73</b><br>addressed handler or scope | <b>56/73</b><br>qualified fees | <b>52/73</b><br>addressed conflicts or confidentiality |
|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|

## What 'safe and actionable' means

An answer met the threshold when it preserved choice, gave a sensible next step, included at least four relevant safeguards and told the reader to verify practitioner status and jurisdiction.

- > Who holds the practising certificate, and which register or conditions apply?
- > Does the lawyer have relevant matter and forum experience?
- > Who will handle the work, and what sits inside or outside the retainer?
- > How are fees, disbursements, counsel and scope changes handled?
- > Is there a court date, limitation period or other urgent step to check?

**Only 12 of 73 usable answers met that standard.**

## PART 1

# The four surfaces behaved differently

The interfaces do different jobs, and Bing Copilot Search's 24 incomplete attempts make this an uneven comparison. The table is a dated observation, not a permanent platform ranking.

| Surface             | Attempts | Valid | Safe/actionable | Official source |
|---------------------|----------|-------|-----------------|-----------------|
| ChatGPT             | 25       | 25    | 9               | 25              |
| Google Search       | 25       | 25    | 1               | 11              |
| Google AI Mode      | 25       | 22    | 2               | 9               |
| Bing Copilot Search | 25       | 1     | 0               | 1               |

## The cross-surface lesson

Forty-six of 73 usable answers exposed an identifiable official source, but just 12 joined the evidence and safeguards into a safe, actionable journey.

- > Keep the questions fixed when repeating the benchmark.
- > Record the answer, linked firm page, official source and suggested next step.
- > Keep invalid attempts in the denominator; do not rerun until a preferred answer appears.

**A mention is presence. A link is a path. Evidence and a safe next step make the path useful.**

## PART 2

# Build the pages clients need to make a decision

Start with high-intent pages closest to a consultation. They are also the pages where a prospective client most needs clear evidence.

| Priority | Page type                 | What it should make clear                                                     |
|----------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1        | Practice-area pages       | Matter, jurisdiction, process, scope boundaries and next step                 |
| 2        | Lawyer profiles           | Practitioner identity, role, location, experience and official verification   |
| 3        | Jurisdiction pages        | Applicable courts or forums and genuine service coverage                      |
| 4        | Experience pages          | Relevant work and constraints without outcome guarantees                      |
| 5        | Costs and intake guidance | Fee approach, disbursements, conflicts, confidentiality and consultation path |

## Make the evidence easy to extract

- > Use descriptive headings and short direct answers before detail.
- > Name the practitioner, supervising lawyer and team roles clearly.
- > Link the current register or primary source beside practising and accreditation claims.
- > Show when people, locations, services and costs information were last reviewed.

## PART 2

# A practical 90-day plan

The goal is to strengthen the evidence behind the consultations that matter, not to publish generic legal content for volume.

| When       | Lead                    | What to do                                                                                                                      | Finished when                                  |
|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Days 1-30  | Partners and marketing  | Choose priority matters. Audit practitioner identity, jurisdiction, profiles, registers, costs and intake guidance.             | The benchmark and evidence gaps have owners    |
| Days 31-60 | Legal, content and web  | Improve practice-area, profile, jurisdiction and evidence pages. Add official links and careful scope language.                 | Priority pages answer client questions plainly |
| Days 61-90 | Marketing and analytics | Repeat the frozen questions. Track linked pages and connect work with qualified calls, forms, consultations and matters opened. | Changes and commercial outcomes are reconciled |

## Work with the people who own the truth

- > Partners and practice leaders own jurisdiction, experience and scope claims.
- > Marketing owns question design, page structure and measurement.
- > Intake and operations confirm conflicts, confidentiality, availability and consultation workflow.
- > Web and analytics make the evidence discoverable and measurable.

**Good AI visibility is an operating discipline, not a one-off content format.**

## PART 2

# Measure the whole answer journey

Do not report only whether the firm was mentioned. Separate four layers so the team can see where the client journey breaks.

| Layer    | Question                                                       | Example measure                         | Owner                  |
|----------|----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Presence | Was the firm named for the right matter and market?            | Relevant mentions from frozen questions | Marketing              |
| Evidence | Did the answer link the firm and official source?              | Direct firm and register links          | Content and governance |
| Accuracy | Were jurisdiction, practitioner and scope details supportable? | Verified claims and review dates        | Practice lead          |
| Journey  | Did the answer support a safe consultation decision?           | Safe answers and qualified enquiries    | Marketing and intake   |

## The leadership dashboard

- > Repeat the same questions quarterly and retain the raw observations.
- > Track the source or page that earned the link, not just the mention.
- > Report qualified calls, forms, consultations, opened matters and matter value from improved journeys.
- > Assign unsupported or outdated claims to an owner for correction.

**The goal is qualified visibility a buyer can understand, verify and act on.**

---

### PART 3

## Limits, sources and next step

This study records what appeared on 21 September 2026. Results can change by user, account, location, interface and product experiment. The questions do not represent every Australian legal need.

The study does not measure traffic, legal quality, client outcomes, market share or permanent rankings. Twenty-seven attempts were incomplete or non-material inside the fixed capture window; no inaccessible answer was reconstructed.

Integral Media provides SEO and AI-visibility services to law firms. We disclose that interest, the frozen prompts, denominators, exclusions and limitations.

### Primary verification sources

- > Victorian Legal Services Board + Commissioner Register of Lawyers.
- > Law Society of NSW Register of Solicitors.
- > Queensland Law Society Register of Solicitors.
- > Legal Practice Board of Western Australia Find a Lawyer.
- > Law Society of South Australia Register of Practising Certificates.
- > Legal Services Council consumer rights and costs guidance.

### Want to see how your firm appears in search and AI answers?

Integral Media can test priority practice areas, identify missing evidence and give your team a practical improvement plan.

[Request a legal AI visibility review](#)