ORIGINAL GROWTH FRIDAY RESEARCH

Southern California Professional Services Discoverability Benchmark

Findings brief

Public buyer-verification evidence across 150 law, consulting and dental firms in Los Angeles and Orange counties.

150 firms reviewed	**3** professional sectors
2 Southern California counties	**8** buyer-verification signals

Research lead and author

Daniel Harman, Founder and CEO, Growth Friday

Evidence date: October 14, 2026 | Version 1.0

The benchmark at a glance

The sample contains 50 law firms, 50 consulting firms and 50 dental practices, split evenly between Los Angeles and Orange counties. Firms entered through fixed service-and-location searches, so the results describe visible firms in a query-selected convenience sample rather than the whole market.

Clear sampled service focus	150/150	100.0%
Named relevant professional	138/150	92.0%
Clear location facts	148/150	98.7%
Qualifying proof present	128/150	85.3%
Clear contact route	133/150	88.7%
Dedicated service page	137/150	91.3%
Substantive educational content	127/150	84.7%
Independent corroborating source	136/150	90.7%

Main finding

Services were easy to find. Proof boundaries were not.

All sampled firms addressed the service used to find them. Qualifying proof appeared on 128 sites, and 124 explained what the evidence concerned. Only 15 proof-bearing sites stated a material limitation in the inspected evidence.

What the sector cuts show

The sector figures are descriptive comparisons within the sample. They do not rank sectors or estimate the prevalence of these features across every firm.

Named relevant professional	49/50	44/50	45/50
Qualifying proof	47/50	41/50	40/50
Clear contact route	49/50	37/50	47/50
Dedicated service page	48/50	46/50	43/50
Substantive education	49/50	39/50	39/50
Independent corroboration	48/50	41/50	47/50

Law firms

The sampled law firms most consistently connected professionals and educational guidance to the service. The clearer opportunity was proof interpretation: 47 displayed qualifying proof while seven included a material limitation in the inspected evidence.

Consulting firms

The consulting sample made services clear, but the validation path was less consistent. Forty-four named a relevant professional, 41 displayed qualifying proof and 37 supplied a clear contact route.

Dental practices

The dental sample generally made clinicians and contact routes visible. Forty practices displayed qualifying proof; 38 explained its scope, 34 included a useful time boundary and four stated a material limitation.

How to interpret proof

A result becomes easier to evaluate when the buyer can see its subject, scope, period, attribution and limitations. The benchmark recorded these elements separately.

128/150

proof present

124/128

scope explained

104/128

time boundary

15/128

material limitation

A practical evidence record

Situation

Who or what the example concerns, at a level permitted for publication.

Scope

The work, service or treatment connected to the evidence.

Result

What changed, completed or was observed.

Period and source

The measurement window and the system or record behind the statement.

Attribution

Material contributions from the client, patient, team or outside conditions.

Boundary

What another buyer should avoid inferring, including any non-guarantee or individual-variation context.

Method and evidence boundaries

The first 30 records formed a calibrated pilot. Sixty fixed service-and-location queries then selected two additional eligible firm-owned organic results per query family. The remaining 120 records received a firm-owned evidence pass, targeted rechecks, a dedicated-page search and independent-source corroboration.

Quality control

Rechecks covered every positive proof limitation, every Tier 1 source, every missing dedicated service page and a deterministic 10% sample of the remaining expansion records. Website rates use all firms in the stated group. Proof-context rates use only records with qualifying proof.

Limits

• This is a query-selected convenience sample, not a census, ranking or market-prevalence estimate.

• A no means qualifying evidence was not found in the constrained review. It does not prove that the evidence is absent from the entire site or web.

• The study does not assess professional quality, competence, compliance, outcomes, leads, revenue, market share or causation.

• Controlled AI observations remain limited to the separately documented original 30-firm pilot.

Suggested citation

> Harman, Daniel. “Southern California Professional Services Discoverability Benchmark.” Growth Friday, October 14, 2026. https://www.growthfriday.com/research/southern-california-professional-services-discoverability-benchmark

Download the complete aggregate CSV, JSON summary and methodology from the public benchmark page. When citing a statistic, include its numerator, denominator and applicable group.