RECONCEPTUALIZING WORKFORCE SUSTAINABILITY THROUGH MULTILEVEL GOVERNANCE & NETWORK LEADERSHIP

DANA-MARIE RAMJIT, PHD
UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY

JUNE 1, 2025

Dana-Marie Ramjit, PhD
University of Calgary

Reconceptualizing Workforce Sustainability Through Multilevel Governance & Network Leadership

Introduction

The contemporary workforce is increasingly shaped by technological acceleration, demographic change, and evolving employment configurations. These are not merely operational challenges but constitutive pressures that unsettle the foundations of workforce governance. The widespread diffusion of digital technologies demands continuous upskilling and organizational adaptability, yet many institutions remain ill-equipped to respond to the pace of innovation, resulting in widening skill gaps that threaten long-term competitiveness (Givan, 2024; Hurman & Tserklevych, 2020). At the same time, the hybridization of work, blending in-person and remote modalities, has complicated managerial structures, introducing asymmetries in employee engagement, communication, and cohesion (Tancred et al., 2024).

Overlaying these structural dynamics are demographic and sociocultural shifts that further fragment the governance landscape. Increasing workforce diversity, while a potential source of creativity and resilience, demands tailored strategies for inclusion and cohesion (Kuhlmann et al., 2021). The aging of the labor force introduces additional layers of complexity, requiring policies that simultaneously address productivity, phased retirement, and long-term health management (Debelak et al., 2024). Compounding these factors, employees are increasingly vocal in articulating expectations for work-life balance, career development, and value-aligned organizational culture, forces that compel continuous recalibration of organizational models (López, 2021).

In the face of these transformations, traditional human resource management frameworks, predicated on centralized authority and bureaucratic control, have revealed their structural inadequacies. As Zhao and Li (2023) note, such models lack the capacity to respond flexibly to the demands of globalized labor markets and decentralized work environments. Their inability to support agile retraining mechanisms or implement adaptive governance structures has been critically featured in both public and organizational discourse (Kurhayadi, 2025; Phillips-Wren, 2009). What emerges instead is the need for a framework capable of integrating across institutional scales and actor categories, a design not of uniform control but of negotiated coordination.

The Allied Health Workforce Redesign Initiative in Queensland, Australia, offers a compelling illustration. Developed through collaboration across multiple levels of government and health service entities, the initiative successfully redefined professional roles to address workforce shortages and enhance service delivery capacity (Nancarrow et al., 2013). Its efficacy rested not only in structural integration but in the exercise of network leadership, an embedded form of leadership that facilitated inter-agency communication, nurtured stakeholder trust, and aligned divergent priorities to achieve systemic transformation (Reyes & Escalona, 2024). Parallel analyses reinforce that intersectoral collaboration, underpinned by such leadership, can enhance recruitment and retention strategies while ensuring workforce skills remain responsive to evolving labor market demands (Saptarini & Mustika, 2023; Snegireva et al., 2024).

Against this backdrop, collaborative governance emerges as a critical answer for aligning workforce strategies with the realities of contemporary labor systems. This paper contends that sustaining workforce effectiveness in increasingly complex organizational environments dictates

a departure from conventional HRM approaches. In their place, a multilevel governance framework, activated through network leadership, reconceptualizes workforce sustainability as a relational, adaptive, and multi-actor process. Rather than offering linear solutions to bounded problems, this model offers a dynamic field of coordination capable of addressing structural volatility, institutional interdependence, and strategic complexity. It is within this new paradigm that scholars, policymakers, and organizational leaders can develop more responsive, resilient, and comprehensive approaches to workforce development.

Multilevel Governance

Governance in complex systems is increasingly characterized not by singular lines of authority, but by overlapping fields of negotiation and coordination among interdependent actors situated across territorial and institutional tiers. Multilevel governance, as conceptualized by Hooghe and Marks (2023), reflects this structural multiplicity: a system in which decision-making authority is dispersed among supranational, national, regional, and local entities, and exercised in continual interplay with private stakeholders. This model does not merely decentralize power, it rearticulates it through layered forms of deliberation, where policy coherence is achieved not by fiat but by convergence across actors with differing mandates and spatial reach (Piattoni, 2023).

Functionally, this model displaces the logics of hierarchical governance in favor of mechanisms oriented toward inclusivity, openness, and iterative alignment. Formal institutions are interlaced with informal networks, enabling governance processes that cross-cut sectoral boundaries and jurisdictional limits (Benz & Hood, 2009). Such a shift signals more than institutional reform; it reflects a broader paradigmatic movement toward relational accountability and stakeholder integration, particularly in fields marked by policy interdependence, such as environmental regulation, health, and social equity (French & Goodman, 2011; Homsy & Warner, 2018).

Yet institutional design alone does not confer functionality. The distributed nature of multilevel governance requires more than structural adaptability, it requires leadership attuned to both the horizontality and verticality of coordination. Leadership in this context must mediate competing interests, broker shared priorities, and foster trust across organizational boundaries (Jones, 2014; Schwarz et al., 2020). In this context, network leadership does not simply complement other qualities, it becomes essential for effective functioning. When authority is dispersed and policy success relies on alignment across actors, leadership must be anchored in relationships, shaped by context, and intentionally distributed.

Key illustrative cases reinforce this claim. In the Netherlands, municipal responses to intra-EU mobility have demonstrated the capacity of local governments to align localized interventions with both national and supranational policy agendas, producing governance outcomes that are both coherent and context-sensitive (Scholten et al., 2017). Similarly, California's CALFED water planning initiative shows how informal, multi-agency collaboration can manage resource allocation in real time while accommodating the divergent needs of environmental, agricultural, and urban constituencies (Booher & Innes, 2010). In each case, structural design alone proved insufficient, what enabled successful coordination was the presence of relational leadership that animated the system's latent capacity.

These dynamics are mirrored in the evolution of public sector human resource management, where the shift from administrative control to strategic planning is increasingly evident. Local governments that integrate workforce needs assessment with targeted training programs tend to demonstrate greater resilience in managing labor complexities (French &

Goodman, 2011; Goodman & Atkinson, 2013). In such contexts, workforce planning is not simply a managerial function, it is a governance challenge, demanding cross-level integration and participatory leadership.

The healthcare sector brings these abstract concepts into concrete practice. Where multilevel governance structures facilitate coordination between educational institutions, health ministries, and local authorities, training programs become not only more efficient but more responsive to community needs, yielding a workforce that is both competent and adaptable (Hastings et al., 2014; Cometto et al., 2019). Yet such responsiveness remains fragile in the absence of robust intersectoral coordination. For example, barriers to rural and Indigenous health worker recruitment, including geographic isolation, institutional bias, and limited access to training, persist precisely because policy is often fragmented across tiers of governance (Deravin et al., 2017). Targeted interventions, such as student engagement in service design and delivery, offer promising models for long-term workforce sustainability by embedding local ownership and strengthening relational infrastructure (Dyson et al., 2014).

These examples converge on a broader insight: that multilevel governance is not merely a structural condition; it is a dynamic system of interaction. To function, it must be animated by leadership capable of traversing institutional divides, negotiating asymmetries, and embedding iterative learning. In this way, network leadership serves as the functional expression of multilevel governance, enabling it to move from structural potential to operational reality. Through the relational initiation of distributed systems, governance complexity is rendered not as a liability but as an asset, mobilized toward the coordinated pursuit of sustainable workforce solutions (Rees et al., 2023).

Network Leadership

The reconceptualizing of governance in complex systems requires a corresponding transformation in how leadership is theorized and enacted. In settings where authority is dispersed and outcomes are co-produced across institutional, sectoral, and territorial boundaries, traditional models of leadership, anchored in hierarchical control and positional authority, prove structurally inadequate (Koçak, 2019). It is within this landscape that network leadership emerges, not as a derivative adaptation, but as a fundamental reconstitution of leadership practice.

Network leadership reframes authority as emerging from relationships rather than being derived from formal roles (Whitehead & Peckham, 2022). It mobilizes interorganizational linkages to activate buried capacities, orchestrate distributed expertise, and align actors across diverse entities (Strasser et al., 2022). The efficacy of this model is most visible in policy domains where coordination is not optional but existential. For instance, in the implementation of cancer care interventions, effective integration across governance levels has depended less on top-down mandates than on phased stakeholder engagement, relational trust-building, and iterative alignment (Yano et al., 2012).

Rather than pursue uniformity through command, network leaders navigate complexity. They curate spaces of encounter, among policymakers, practitioners, and civil society actors, not to resolve difference, but to render it productive. Through this approach, they encourage shared visioning and meaningful dialogue, shaping a governance culture where collaboration is not a means to an end but a defining principle (Uster et al., 2019; Chen et al., 2022). By prioritizing alignment over assimilation, this approach extends the epistemic horizons of policymaking, embracing multiple forms of expertise and strengthening the system's capacity to adapt (Lewis et al., 2017).

In multilevel governance contexts, network leadership operates not as an add-on, but as an essential prerequisite. It allows distributed systems to achieve coordinated outcomes without collapsing into fragmentation (Harris et. al., 2021). By facilitating decentralization and anchoring decisions in localized realities, network leadership shifts governance mere compliance to a situated, contextually responsive practice. Human resource professionals, educational institutions, and policymakers become co-constructors of workforce strategies, responsive not only to macroeconomic pressures but to demographic variation and institutional heterogeneity (Xu et al., 2021; Spanos et al., 2024).

More significantly, network leadership challenges the rigidity of traditional governance models by implanting systems of adaptive learning. Through feedback-rich, iterative cycles of engagement, organizations are encouraged to experiment, co-design, and reconfigure workforce strategies in ways that mirror the contingencies of their environments (Silvia & McGuire, 2010; Beeson, 2025). These systems do not merely react to disruption, they internalize it, transforming volatility into a source of resilience. The European Skills Agenda, a supranational initiative, illustrates how network leadership animates multilevel governance structures. By bringing together EU institutions, national authorities, private actors, and vocational training providers, the Agenda facilitates strategic coordination of skills policy in response to labor market transformation. What enables this convergence is not regulatory order, but the capacity of leaders to negotiate shared goals, resolve loopholes, and institutionalize cross-sectoral cooperation (European Commission, 2020).

In this design, the merging of network leadership and multilevel governance does not simply resolve governance complexity, it redeploys it as a generative capacity. When rooted in relationships and reflexivity, this fusion creates a space in which strategy, structure, and agency are no longer siloed but interwoven. (Huettermann et al., 2024). The result is not just a more responsive system, but a fundamentally different architecture of workforce governance: one capable of evolving in tandem with the global conditions it seeks to shape

Conclusion

The current gap between workforce development and labor market complexity reflects a deeper structural incongruity, one rooted in governance models that are increasingly misaligned with the fluid, networked, and interdependent dynamics of modern labor systems. Traditional HRM paradigms are limited not simply by rigidity but by their inability to respond to multifaceted demands driven by distributed agency, cross-sectoral alignment, and dynamic skill flows. In this context, workforce governance must be reimagined as an ongoing process of institutional realignment, one that is multilevel, relational, and iterative.

Multilevel governance is not merely a vertical delegation of authority but a negotiated reconfiguration of power across overlapping spheres of influence. Its effectiveness, however, is contingent upon leadership that can navigate the intersections of institutional fragmentation, stakeholder diversity, and temporal volatility. Here, network leadership becomes indispensable; it does not serve as a peripheral asset but operates as the catalyst that transforms theoretical coordination into tangible mechanisms of alignment, adaptability, and strategic coherence.

The convergence of multilevel governance and network leadership does not simplify complexity; rather, it recalibrates the nature of the challenge, from one of mere control to one focused on capacity building and continuous calibration across decision-making sites. Distributed leadership networks expose the fault lines between institutional inertia and adaptive responsiveness, reframing workforce sustainability as a function of institutional learning and

interorganizational trust. This shift demands more than technical adjustments; it calls for a fundamental reconceptualization of governance mechanisms, leadership practices, and the modes of engagement between public and private institutions in the co-production of workforce solutions.

Institutions that resist this recalibration risk not only lagging, but also aggravating the very vulnerabilities they intend to address. In contrast, those that successfully integrate network leadership with multilevel governance can harness complexity as a dynamic asset, thus generating more responsive, equitable, and sustainable workforce outcomes that transcend conventional sectoral and territorial boundaries.

References

Barbazza, E., & Tello, J. E. (2014). A review of health governance: definitions, dimensions and tools to govern. *Health policy (Amsterdam, Netherlands)*, *116*(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthpol.2014.01.007

Beeson, J. (2025). *Network Leadership: Promoting a Healthier World through the Power of Networks*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Benz, A., & Hood, C. (2009). Decentralization and Governance: A Comparative Perspective. In: *The International Encyclopedia of Public Policy and Administration*.

Blenner, L. N., & Ohmer, M. L. (2021). Community Partnerships and Experiential Learning: Investing in the Next Generation of a Diverse, Qualified Public Health Workforce. *Pedagogy in Health Promotion*, 7(2), 121-134. doi:10.1177/23733799211046974.

Booher, D. E., & Innes, J. E. (2010). Governance for Resilience: CALFED as a Complex Adaptive Network for Resource Management. *Ecology and Society*, 15(3). https://doi.org/10.5751/es-03404-150335

Cometto, G., Nartey, E., Zapata, T., Kanda, M., Md, Y., Narayan, K., Pritasari, K., Irufa, A., Lamichhane, R., De Silva, D., & Noree, T. (2019). Analysing public sector institutional capacity for health workforce governance in the South-East Asia region of WHO. *Human Resources for Health*, *17*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12960-019-0385-1

Chen, L., Yu, G., & Fu, B. (2022). Observing leadership as and in networks: a multilevel investigation of shared leadership, discrete emotions, and knowledge behaviors. *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, Volume 15, 2315-2330. https://doi.org/10.2147/prbm.s376432

Deravin, L., Francis, K., & Anderson, J. (2017). Choosing a nursing career: Building an indigenous nursing workforce. *Journal of Hospital Administration*, *6*(5), 27. https://doi.org/10.5430/jha.v6n5p27

Debelak, K., Grah, B., & Penger, S. (2024). Ageing Workforce's Impact on Modern Organizations: How to Extend Working Lives?. *ENTRENOVA - ENTerprise Research InNOVAtion*, *9*(1), 166–180. https://doi.org/10.54820/entrenova-2023-0016

Dyson, K., Kruger, E., & Tennant, M. (2014). A decade of experience evolving visiting dental services in partnership with rural remote Aboriginal communities. *Australian dental journal*, *59*(2), 187–192. https://doi.org/10.1111/adj.12162

European Skills Agenda. (2025, March 11). Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion. https://employment-social-affairs.ec.europa.eu/policies-and-activities/skills-and-qualifications/european-skills-agenda_en

French, R. & Goodman, J. (2011). Local Government Human Resource Management: Past, Present, and Future: Revisiting Hays and Kearney's Anticipated Changes a Decade Later. *Politics & Policy*, 39(4), 575-601. doi:10.1111/j.1747-1346.2011.00312.x.

Givan, M. (2024). Navigating the Hybrid Workforce: Challenges and Strategies in Modern HR Management. *Journal of Economic Business and Accounting*, 7(3), 9687. doi:10.31539/costing.v7i3.9687.

Goodman, J., & Atkinson, T. (2013). Determinants of Local Government Workforce Planning. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 43(1), 93-114. doi:10.1177/0275074013486179.

Harris, A., Azorín, C., & Jones, M. (2021). Network leadership: a new educational imperative? *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 26(5), 919–935. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2021.1919320

Huettermann, H., & Boer, K. (2024). Power to the People—And then? A Multilevel Leadership Perspective on Organizational Decentralization. *Human Resource Management*, 63(1), 97 112. doi:10.1002/hrm.22203.

Hastings, S., Fogarty, J., & Hatch, J. (2014). Exploring the relationship between governance mechanisms in healthcare and health workforce outcomes: A systematic review. BMC *Health Services Research*, 14(1), 479. doi:10.1186/1472-6963-14-479.

Hooghe, L., Marks, G., & Schakel, A. H. (2023). 12. *Multilevel governance* (pp. 214–232). Oxford University. https://doi.org/10.1093/hepl/9780192846051.003.0012

Hurman, O., & Tserklevych, V. (2020). Investing In Personality Development As The Most Valuable Asset Of Long-Term Competitiveness Of The Enterprise. *Innovative Economy,* 5–6, 73–82. https://doi.org/10.37332/2309 1533.2020.5-6.10

Jones, S. (2014). Distributed leadership: a critical analysis. *Leadership,* 10(2), 129-141. https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715011433525

Koçak, R. D. (2019). Leadership Without Hierarchy And Authority: Lateral Leadership. *International Journal of Social Inquiry*, 12(2), 657–680. https://doi.org/10.37093/ijsi.659023

Kurhayadi, K. (2025). Evaluating the readiness of public institutions for AI-Driven decision making: A framework for adaptive governance. *Edelweiss Applied Science and \ Technology*, 9(4), 1569–1580. https://doi.org/10.55214/25768484.v9i4.6335

Kuhlmann, E., Brînzac, M., Burau, V., Correia, T., & Ungureanu, M. (2021). Health workforce protection and preparedness during the COVID-19 pandemic: a tool for the rapid assessment of EU health systems. *European Journal of Public Health*, *31*(Supplement_4), iv14–iv20. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckab152

Lewis, J. M., Ricard, L. M., & Klijn, E. H. (2017). How innovation drivers, networking and leadership shape public sector innovation capacity. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 84(2), 288-307. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852317694085 (Original work published 2018)

Nancarrow, S. A., Roots, A., Grace, S., Moran, A. M., & Vanniekerk-Lyons, K. (2013). Implementing large-scale workforce change: learning from 55 pilot sites of allied health workforce redesign in Queensland, Australia. *Human Resources for Health*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/1478-4491-11-66

Piattoni, S. (2023). Policy change and innovation in multilevel governance. Regional Studies, 57(10), 2116–2117. https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2023.2204735

Phillips-Wren, G. (2009). Adaptive Decision Support for Dynamic Environments (pp. 235–243). *Springer berlin heidelberg*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-00909-9_23

Rees, C., et al. (2023). Are Sustainable Health Workforces Possible? Issues and a Possible Remedy. *Sustainability*, 15(4), 3596. doi:10.3390/su15043596.

Reyes, K. G., & Escalona, A. (2024). Inter-agency coordination during public events in City Mall Kalibo, Aklan. *Industry and Academic Research Review*, 5(1), 120–127. https://doi.org/10.53378/iarr.924.124

Saptarini, S., & Mustika, D. (2023). Workforce Agility and Adaptive Performance in Government Institutions: The Mediating Role of Work Engagement. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Kewirausahaan*, 25(1), 55-62. doi:10.9744/jmk.25.1.55-62.

Schwarz, G., Eva, N., & Newman, A. (2020). Can public leadership increase public service motivation and job performance?. *Public Administration Review*, 80(4), 543-554. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13182

Scholten, P., van den Broek, A., & Koster, H. (2017). Multilevel governance from below: How Dutch cities respond to intra-EU mobility. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 43(11), 1785-1804. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2017.1341707.

Snegireva, Y., Ananchenkova, P., & Korduban, E. (2024). Intersectoral Collaboration in Healthcare: an Overview of International Practices. *City Healthcare,* 5(2), 165–171. https://doi.org/10.47619/2713-2617.zm.2024.v.5i2;165-171

Silvia, C. and McGuire, M. (2010). Leading public sector networks: an empirical examination of integrative leadership behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(2), 264-277. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.01.006

Spanos, S., Leask, E., Patel, R., Datyner, M., Loh, E., & Braithwaite, J. (2024). Healthcare leaders navigating complexity: a scoping review of key trends in future roles and competencies. *BMC Medical Education*, *24*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-024-05689-4

Strasser, T., de Kraker, J., & Kemp, R. (2022). Network leadership for transformative capacity development: roles, practices and challenges. *Global Sustainability*, *5*, Article e11. https://doi.org/10.1017/sus.2022.6

Tancred, T., Falkenbach, M., Raven, J., & Caffrey, M. (2024). How can intersectoral collaboration and action help improve the education, recruitment, and retention of the health and care workforce? A scoping review. *The International journal of health planning and management*, *39*(3), 757–780. https://doi.org/10.1002/hpm.3773

Uster, A., Vashdi, D. R., & Beeri, I. (2019). From organizational leadership to lead organizations—the future of leadership in interorganizational networks. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 12(4), 79-81. https://doi.org/10.1002/jls.21617

Whitehead, J., & Peckham, M. (2022). *Network Leadership*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003092582

Xu, N., Ghahremani, H., Lemoine, G. J., & Tesluk, P. E. (2021). Emergence of shared leadership networks in teams: An adaptive process perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *33*(6), 101588. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2021.101588

Yano, E. M., Green, L. W., Glanz, K., Ayanian, J. Z., Mittman, B. S., Chollette, V., … & Rubenstein, L. V. (2012). Implementation and spread of interventions into the multilevel context of routine practice and policy: implications for the cancer care continuum. *JNCI Monographs*, 2012(44), 86-99. https://doi.org/10.1093/jncimonographs/lgs004

Zhao, R., Li, L. Pressure, state, and response: configurational analysis of organizational resilience in tourism businesses following the COVID-19 pandemic crisis. *Humanit Soc Sci Commun* 10, 370 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01788-7