



**ANDREW HEDLEY, DIRECTOR, HEDLEY CONSULTING**

## Consensus is not a synonym for unanimity

There is much talk about the importance of achieving partner consensus on the big decisions that will define a firm's future direction.

Consensus is a worthy objective and one which, as research shows unequivocally, is likely to lead to a more cohesive firm. There is less clarity, however, over what consensus means in practice and how it should be reached.

What is clear is that consensus should not be a synonym for unanimity – firms have, for too long, been forced to the point of making the decision of least offence or of taking the lowest common denominator option by this misconception.

Consensus is perhaps best viewed as reaching a state of acceptance that a particular decision represents the best option for the business, albeit that it may have negative implications for some, including perhaps oneself.

What consensus means in practice differs according to the nature of the firm, but what is clear is that endorsement by the key stakeholders is essential for

any strategy to have a fighting chance of success.

In a ten-partner firm, this may mean that consensus requires all to be comfortable with the direction that the firm is taking, even if the result is a dilution of its efficacy.

In a 300-partner firm, the dynamic is quite different. Most partners in large firms are operating in something much closer to an employee-shareholder relationship than an owner-manager one.

Consensus in this context is a more political construct – securing the majority needed to carry sway and ensuring that the key powerbrokers are engaged and committed.

However, the traits underpinning a consensus-driven approach are the same in all firms.

These traits include clear communication, a sense of engagement and a feeling that one's voice can be heard (even if ultimately the direction taken by the firm is not that which has been personally voiced). It is about respect and giving partners an opportunity to

interact with the senior management team and inform its thinking.

Both academic research and anecdotal evidence suggest that firms that adopt a consensual approach to decision making tend to perform better in the longer term.

This is not to say that, on occasion, the leadership team cannot act unilaterally on big agenda items in order to avert a crisis or capitalise on a time-sensitive opportunity.

Rather, the overriding philosophy of the firm should be centred on building a common sense of purpose and direction.

Contrast this with a management style that is dictatorial, where partners are informed after the event and where important developments are relayed by the media.

Stated in these terms, it is clear which approach will deliver the longer term benefits, shared vision and unified partner group which is so important to the development of a successful twenty-first century firm. **mp**

**ANDREW.HEDLEY@HEDLEYCONSULTING.COM**

### THE EDITORIAL BOARD



**IAN JEFFERY**  
Managing Partner  
Lewis Silkin



**JULIOUS P. SMITH, JR**  
Chairman Emeritus  
Williams Mullen



**MALCOLM SHELTON-AGAR**  
Chief Operating Officer  
Allen & Gledhill



**MICHAEL SHAW**  
Managing Partner  
Cobbetts



**NEIL MAY**  
Executive Manager  
Hogan Lovells



**STEPHEN DENYER**  
Global Markets Partner  
Allen & Overy



**TIM ASPINALL**  
Managing Partner  
DMH Stallard



**DEEPAK MALHOTRA**  
Director of Strategy & Transformation  
Fusion Universal



**OZ BENAMRAM**  
Chief Knowledge Officer  
White & Case



**JEFFREY J. BERARDI**  
Chief Marketing Officer  
K&L Gates



**PAUL BRENT**  
Marketing Director  
Boyes Turner



**JILL KING**  
Former HR Director  
Linklaters



**JO LARBIE**  
HR Director  
Bircham Dyson Bell



**NEIL DAVISON**  
Head of IT  
Farrer & Co



**BEVERLY LANDAIS**  
CEO  
Devereux Chambers



**ANDREW HEDLEY**  
Director  
Hedley Consulting