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Introduction
In policy debates the third sector has been perceived as having multiple positive roles in providing services, solving and identifying the needs of communities, tackling complex social issues, promoting voluntarism, campaigning for social change and building strong communities (Billis, 2010, 10; Van Til, 2000). These expectations and recent changes, such as increasing service provision role in the third sector have also received research attention over the past several years (see e.g. Alapuro, 2010; Kankainen, et al. 2009; Ruuskanen, et al. 2013; Saikkonen, 2013). Traditionally, Finnish associations have been interest-based and have had a representative role in the decision-making system. When compared internationally, Finland has had a rather unique system of corporatism and nonstatism, whereby the state encourages collective action but at the same time the civil society is somewhat autonomous (see Schofer & Fourcade-Gourinchas, 2001). Moreover, associations have been in the main voluntarily run and the proportion of paid employees in third sector organizations has been relatively low (Salamon & Anheir, 1998; Saikkonen, 2013; Alapuro & Stenius, 2010). Nowadays, associations are increasingly expected to move into service provision due to the changes in the service provision system and tightening budgets in municipalities. At the same time, commitment to associations is nowadays decreasing and participation is taking more individualistic and non-political forms. (Alapuro, 2010, 315-316; Ruuskanen, et al. 2013, 23; Sivesind & Selle, 2010, 96-99; Helder & Pikkala, 1999.) Within this context, concerns have been raised that associations are becoming little more than extensions of the public sector or private sector, and are thus losing their own identity and their role of advocacy and interest representation (see on the Finnish context e.g. Möttönen & Niemelä, 2005, 86). These issues have also long been raised in international scholarship on civic participation, where less commitment to voluntary organizations and decreasing voluntarism is feared to have problematic implications for democratic politics (Verba, et al. 1995; Rosenstone & Hansen, 1993; Putnam, 2000; Skocpol, 2003).

From the point of view of a functioning democracy, it is important that different groups in the society have mechanisms to make their own voices heard and have influence on collective decisions and judgements (Mouffe, 2000 & 2013; Warren, 2000, 61). In the relevant literature concerns have been raised on how increasing immigration will affect liberal democracies if immigrants continue organizing along closed ethnic lines and forming their own closed communities, which is feared to lead to a segregation of society (see eg. Putnam, 2007). The problems of such isolated communities have been documented lately in many societies. However, previous research on migrant associations shows that migrants’ organizing patterns are very varied and multi-faceted, and depend on the context and opportunities in the country of settlement (see eg. Koopmans et al., 2005; Jacobs & Tillie, 2004; Morales & Ramiro, 2011; Bocagni & Pilati, 2015; Eggert, 2011; Bloemraad & Ramakrishnan, 2008; Yurdakul, 2006; Pennnema & Tillie, 2001). In the context of rising numbers of newcomer migrants entering Europe, the issue of migrants’ inclusion in European societies, including their civic and political participation, is a burning one. Europe-wide there has been an increase in the number of asylum applications since the year 2012, peaking in 2015 with around 1.3 million asylum applications (Eurostat, 2016). At the same time, migration has become a heated political topic and throughout Europe one can witness the rise of extreme right parties in politics, and the mobilization of xenophobic, racist and Islamophobic groups in civil society.

This has created an extremely complex situation whereby newcomers face increasing hostility, resulting in mistrust between migrant communities and...
native populations. In the current public discussion, integration of migrants refers to a large extent to assimilation of the culture and ‘habits’ of the receiving society without any regard for participation in the society. On the other hand, discussions on the integration of migrants center around labor market issues and integration is often equated with simply having a job – even if low-paid and precarious. In this article, a novel approach to integration is taken by understanding integration as a process of mutual dual trust-building between native Finns and migrants, in which civil society may have an important role. Moreover, integration is perceived as a two-way process in which not only migrants adjust, but Finnish society changes due to the increasing involvement of migrants in the public sphere.

The importance of understanding immigrants’ civic and political participation relates to the integration issue. It is essential to find out whether migrants’ organizing and participation will revitalize the civic ideals and participation of Western democracies, or whether migrants’ lack of recognition and problematic access to resources will continue and add to the political stratification in the future (ibid., 35). To a large extent, the political potential, meaning here the advocacy role of migrant associations, depends on their visibility, which in turn relates to the organizational capacity and resources that these associations have on hand and that allow them to function. This article analyses, through a longitudinal case study on two well-established migrant organizations in Finland, what their identity is, how it has changed and what has contributed to their capacity to function. The analysis is conducted in the context of the Finnish third sector and its recent move towards hybridization. The article will respond to the question of whether, in the process of cooperating more with the public sector, migrant organizations can still carry out their advocacy function.

**Third sector hybridization as a theoretical framework**

The concept of hybridization relates to the discussion on the changing role of the third sector vis-à-vis the public sector and the private sector. In these discussions, new expectations from the third sector, and their consequences, are raised.

There are many different approaches to identifying and analyzing hybridization. First is an approach that analyses the position of hybrid organizations which lie between different sectors (Billis, 2010, 56; Demone & Gibelman, 1989). The second approach stems from the idea that all three sectors (private, public and third) are different in nature and are based on different logics of functioning (Billis, 2010, 56–57), but still have dynamic relations with each other. Seen from this perspective, hybrid organizations have elements from other sectors, but still remain attached to their root sector. Third sector organizations become hybrid mainly due to changes in the public and private sectors (Rhodes & Donnelly-Cox, 2014, 1635). The third approach claims that hybridization has replaced altogether the separate sectors, and that the system of welfare service production is by nature hybrid (Billis, 2010, 56).

In this line of thinking the third sector is replaced by something called the third space, which is characterized by care and a voluntary ethos (Van Til, 2000; Brandsen et al., 2005). The main reason this kind of hybrid form of welfare production appears is change at the state level: privatization of services, decentralization, and liberating markets regarding public services (Brandsen & Karre, 2008, 2).

In the relevant research literature on the third sector and hybridity, concerns have been raised that increasing pressures on the third sector to become service providers have resulted in the third sector losing its originality and its democratic role in interest representation and advocacy (Haugh & Kitson, 2007 in Billis, 2010, 10). In this article, the hybridization in organizations is analyzed as a process in which organization leaders and their networks have a significant role. The article aims at analyzing the consequences of increasing hybridity in the third sector in terms of the advocacy and interest representation role of organizations.

In order to do this, it is essential to consider the ownership issue in hybrid organizations (Billis, 2010, 53-54). David Billis (2010, 53-54) argues that in associations, compared to public and private sector organizations “the gap between formal, active and principle owners may be small”. But even in small associations, differentiation between formal, active and principle owners can be made. Formal owners are those members who “stay in the shadows”, active owners are members who are active on a committee or a board for example, and principal owners are “a core group of principal owners ‘who everybody knows’ and who are ‘the key players in the defining moments of the group’s history”. Analyzing the hybridization process of organizations through the relations between principal owners, referred to here as leaders, and public sector officials at the micro-level, it is possible to grasp the essential issue of how well third sector organizations have been able to retain their original mission. In the coming chapters, two organizations that have developed ongoing working relations with Finnish authorities and have developed organizational capacity so that they are well established organizations with paid staff and their own venues are analyzed with the help of the concept of hybridization – with a specific focus on the ownership issue through considering the leaders’ role in building relations with public sector officials.

**Context in which the organizations operate**

**Recent Changes in the Finnish Third Sector**

Traditionally, the Finnish third sector has been defined as a Nordic welfare state-model which is characterized by consensus and collaboration between the state and civil society. It has a hierarchical organizational structure of associations from central organizations to leagues and local associations, a relatively low level of service provision and a relatively high share of voluntary work in organizations (Salamon & Anheier, 1998). In Finland, civil society has traditionally had an important role in the political decision-making system. In this kind of corporate model, the state encourages collective organization as a channel for interest aggregation and political participation, by providing support for nationwide and democratically-run associations, so that public institutions can interact and negotiate with them (Schofer & Fourcade-Gourinchas, 2001).

This civil society-state relationship has been experiencing changes since the severe recession of the early 1990s. In the 1990s, due to the recession, services provided by the state started to be transferred to the third sector. During this time a New Public Management ideal also started to be implemented in state administration, leading to different models of private-public partnerships and the process of privatization of services. In this process the third sector has become characterized by service provision as part of the public service provision (as a partner), for-profit activities, which however are not based on profit distribution (instead profits are to be used to develop the organization), the hiring of paid staff to carry out organizations’ activities (paid staff organizing voluntary work) and as having the role of hiring those people who cannot work full time in...
general labor markets, such as the disabled. All this has led to the creation of different kinds of organizational forms, such as social enterprises and corporations. (Möttönen & Niemelä, 2005.)

Finnish Migrant Organizations in the third sector

Following the increasing immigration in Finland since the 1990s, immigrants have been active in setting up their own voluntary associations and thus have become new actors in the Finnish third sector, contributing to diversification of the Finnish civil society. Often the role of immigrant associations has been seen in maintaining their culture and language of origin as “tools” for implementing multicultural policies. However, immigrants’ participation in the third sector in Finland is varied and not limited to the maintenance of the language and culture of origin. People of migrant origin in Finland are active in different kinds of associations, ranging from women’s, youth and sport associations to development cooperation organizations and advocacy networks and organizations set up and run by native Finns. (Pyrykkönen, 2007; Pirkkalainen, 2013.)

The representative body concerning ethnic relations in Finland, the Advisory Board for Ethnic Relations working under the auspices of the Ministry of Justice, also functions on the basis of associations. This Advisory Board engages in dialogue with ethnic, cultural and religious minorities, immigrants, public authorities, NGOs and political parties. It brings together migration experts from local, regional and national levels, including public officials, politicians and civil society representatives. On the current board there are representatives from the largest ethnic groups in Finland: Russian, Somali, Kurdish and Afghan associations (ETNO website).

Since the implementation of the first Act of Integration (1999/493) immigrant associations have been seen as actors in the field of integration policies and measures. This first Act of Integration highlighted the role of immigrants’ own networks in the process of integration into Finnish society. The Act of Integration was amended in 2011 (L1386/2010) and the participation and belonging of immigrants in Finnish society were defined as the key aims of the law. It was also highlighted that cooperation with associations in the third sector in integration measures is important. Following the amended Act of Integration the State’s Integration Programme (Ministry of Employment and the Economy, 2012) highlighted the important role of immigrants’ own associations as partners in integration programs, and also recognized associations themselves as important “spaces” to achieve integration (ibid., 20).

The overall context of the Finnish third sector, and specific policies within the immigrant integration field, has opened up new opportunities for migrant organizations to work with authorities. In this way, migrant organizations have the potential to develop their activities and become well established, and can afford to hire paid staff to carry out their activities. In this regard there are opportunities for the employment of immigrants as well as an increased political advocacy role of associations. However, critical issues in these hybridization processes remain: if migrant associations become only contractors of public sector integration measures, the advocacy role may be diminished and associations may only become an extended “hand” of official integration policies. This kind of collaboration between the public and third sectors may then fail to contribute to the integration of migrants. This article, through a case study analysis of two migrant organizations which have managed to develop activities to the professional level and collaborate with the public sector, aims to point out critical points that need to be taken into consideration in the future when aiming to ensure the strong, authentic existence of migrant associations in the third sector.

Data and Methods

In this article, a case study method is used and two large migrant organizations have been selected as cases. These two organizations represent still rare cases of migrant origin organizations which have managed to establish themselves in the Finnish third sector, and have a trusted relationship with different authorities, have paid staff and their own office venue. Thus these cases are not representative of all migrant organizations in Finland – a field which comprises a wide variety of different forms of organizing and represents different interests. In general, most migrant organizations in Finland are small and voluntarily run, and many suffer from lack of resources affecting negatively their (political) visibility (see eg. Tillikainen & Mohamed, 2013). However, some organizations, such as the two analyzed in this article, have managed to transform themselves into well-functioning groups within the Finnish third sector. It is important to understand what is behind the processes whereby organizations become established, secure resources and take different collaborative forms with the public and/or private sector; and what the different power relations between authorities and associations are. Such an understanding allows us to be more aware of whose voice is heard in the organizations and whose interests they serve. Thus, in this article, reasons for focusing only on two organizations as case studies relate to the fact that it is possible to conduct more in-depth analysis at the micro level on relations between leaders and authorities to find out whose voice is heard in organizations. Second, it is feasible to follow organizations in different time periods, in other words to focus on processes from the longitudinal perspective. (See Yin, 2003, 40-42, Aalton & Heilmann, 2009.)

Following the principles of the case study method, different empirical data have been collected for the purpose of the analysis in this article (Yin, 2003, 97). The main data for the analysis consists of nine thematic interviews with organizations’ leaders, their partners in the public sector, the funding institution and a native Finnish organization supporting migrant organizations. All of the interviews were conducted in Finnish, as all the interviewees were fluent in the language. The interviews were recorded with the interviewees’ consent and later all recorded interviews were transcribed.

In order to strengthen the longitudinal perspective of the case study method, organization leaders were interviewed on two occasions: first in the year 2009 when the leaders were doing their work in organizations voluntarily and had a daytime job outside the organizations, and second in the year 2014 when both of the organization leaders were working as executive directors and were being remunerated as such. The interviews in 2014 were conducted with officials in the cities of Vantaa and Helsinki from the Youth and Multicultural services with whom organizations work, and with the funding body the Finnish Slot Machine Association (RAY) and an organization providing mentoring to migrant associations (Järjestöhautomo). In addition to all the interviews, text material on organizations has been collected from websites and reports which were provided by authorities and organizations, and this has been used as secondary material to back up the analysis of the interviews.

During the writing process of this article, the necessary
Ethical principles and procedures have been recognized and dealt with, in particular in regard to the rights of individuals to privacy, personal data protection, and protection from emotional, physical or any other kind of harm (Fontana & Frey, 2000, 15). The writing process also honored the requirement of informed consent and dialogue with research subjects. As part of the interviews, the interviewees were asked for permission to write about cases by using the names of the organizations. However, it was agreed that the names of individuals would not be mentioned in the texts. The article draft was sent for a round of comments to all interviewed individuals before publishing, and their consent for publishing was requested.

Analysis of the interviews was performed in the light of the longitudinal approach and the focus was put on the organizations’ trajectories and issues that had contributed to hybridization of the organizations. In this analysis the views of the leaders and their collaboration partners in the cities were examined. Themes relating to hybridization in terms of organizations’ set-up, funding, activities, ownership and networks were identified in interviews, and analyzed with the help of the concept of hybridization, following the theorizations of David Billis (2010). The analysis of the migrant organizations, third sector hybridization and its relation to integration of newcomer migrants was similarly based on themes arising from the interviews. The data collection benefitted greatly from having one researcher who had a migrant background, as this contributed to the trust-building between researchers and interviewees. Analysis also benefitted from a dialogue between the three authors having different backgrounds: one with a migrant background and the others being native Finns, thus experiencing the Finnish third sector from different perspectives.

**Analysis of Trajectories: Cases R3 and Kanava Organizations towards Hybridization**

Here in the analysis section the first aim is to describe the process of organizational development of two case organizations from voluntary based peer-support groups into well-functioning organizations and to analyze the factors that have contributed to development processes. The analysis in this regard centers around the theme of trust-building at the micro level between associations’ leaders and authorities, which enables the analysis to tackle the issue of ownership in case organizations. The second aim is to analyze how the hybridization process of organizations has affected their role and to what extent those organizations have influenced the development processes. The analysis in this regard centers on themes relating to hybridization in terms of organizations’ set-up, funding, activities, ownership and networks.

**Hybridization Process of Organizations: Multifaceted Trust-building**

“R3 The immigrant youth support association” was founded in 2003 by a young Somali male, who got the idea of setting up an association when studying in high school where he witnessed considerable problems of other young migrant students. This motivated him to start helping them as a peer, as he described:

> This [idea to form an association] started at the student housing complex, in which I lived. Then I noticed that the other immigrant youths were not doing well, that they had problems and that they would be kicked out from the flats because they did everything apart from study. Then I started thinking of ways to help those youths, so that things didn’t get worse. Then I got the idea to set up the association that could help the youths. (Representative of R3 organization, interviewed in Helsinki on 2009)

Kanava Youth ry, another case organization was established in 1990s and similar to R3 was started more as an informal peer support group, which later on was formalized into a registered association (ry). The idea to start the activities of Kanava grew from a concern about Somali youth marginalization and gang formation. It started in collaboration with mosques, Somali youths themselves, and teachers in schools where there were Somali pupils. Both organizations analyzed in this article have roots in active individual leaders who initially had a trusted, legitimate position among the ethnic community in Finland through links relating to Somalia. In one case, trust was formed through a leader’s regional affiliation with a certain region of Somalia/Somaliland, and in another case through the position of other leaders in a mosque in Finland. From this grassroots position, leaders started looking for resources from outside, from Finnish authorities.

In the case of Kanava, they worked for a few years as a non-formalized group, and finally registered their association in 1998. Registration was related to the fact that the authorities, who had seen the efficient work Kanava was doing among migrant youth, asked them to become registered so that they could support financially their work. A leader of Kanava, one of the establishers, described their start as follows:

> I was one of the establishers of the association. I was young at that time and we did not know where to go in Finland, we did not know about youth work, activities, and most of us were in the same school in Helsinki. We wanted to spend time together and do something. Then we went to see a Finnish organization, the Finnish Red Cross and told them that we want to organize something, and asked how to do it. A person in that organization then directed us to the youth work section of the city of Helsinki. We then found the Youth Department in Helsinki from which we have received support. (Representative of Kanava Youth, interviewed in Helsinki, on September, 2014)

What was (and still is) common between both of the case organizations, is the strong motivation and commitment of the leaders based on the concern about youth marginalization and gender equality beyond borders. Both organizations have activities for youths in Finland and in Somalia/ Somaliland. The Youth Department at the city of Helsinki, collaborating with Kanava Youth, described this effort of leaders as the key factor behind the organizations’ success:

> The most important thing about Kanava from its start has been that they had a strong motivation and they wanted to make the organization work. They also had a strong vision of what they wanted to do. They came to us with this enthusiasm, vision and motivation, slowly we got to know each other and we have supported them along the way. They had ambitions, and this has paid off: now they have a very good center for activities - that is awesome. I think many may wonder how that is possible. But it is possible because they have worked hard, had motivation, visions, ambition and they have networked well. (Official working in Youth Department, city of Helsinki, interviewed on September, 2014)

In both of the associations, those people who were setting up associations are still in the leadership position of the organizations.
organizations. Thus it is rather easy in these associations to distinguish those who have established associations and are now in a leadership position; they are people who everybody knows and continue to be key players in defining the direction of the associations (Billis, 2010, 53-54). In both associations, having their status as registered voluntary associations forming certain administrative structures, they have a board consisting of active members of associations who are responsible for overall decision-making. In addition, there is a wide range of regular members of associations. These members “stay in the shadows” regarding the ownership and decision-making of the associations (ibid.).

In addition to the efforts of leaders as the principle owners of associations, networks are essential in making organizations work in the long run. In both case organizations, even before formal registration, created links and networks with authorities working on migrant youth issues had already been created. After formal registration, project funding became possible for both of the associations. After the first smaller project funding, both organizations gathered administrative experience and were trusted by the funders to handle the funds well. This, after some years, led to the situation where both of the organizations received major funding from different sources (cities and the Slot Machine Association) and were able to hire staff with these resources: in the case of R3, this turning point happened in 2010 and in the case of Kanava in 2005.

Increasing hybridization in terms of resourcing third sector organizations to become service providers means that the third sector becomes a sector for paid jobs. Traditionally in Finland the third sector has been mostly based on voluntary work and its role as an employment provider has been very minimal (see section 3.1). However, this is slowly changing, as these two organizations’ examples indicate.

The reality in the third sector, however, is that many paid jobs are based on temporary projects, which makes them precarious. It is challenging for voluntary associations to reach the point of receiving stable funding. For both of the case organizations it has taken much time, effort and commitment to reach this point, and one of the key points in acquiring resources is gaining access to the support systems from the administrative point of view, and the building of trusted relations with authorities – something which develops slowly and through inter-personal communication via leaders and authorities. The leader of the R3 organization describes the process as follows:

It is difficult for many associations to get funding at the beginning. But I believe that when you get the first funding, deal with it well and you get good feedback from funding institution, this also affects other funding institutions. Our aim from the beginning has been to lean towards the city authorities; this was our starting point. Now we get strong support from the city (of Vantaa) and we can apply for funds for all kinds of projects. In general, the trust towards the migrant organizations has been low, but now they (city authorities) trust us, and listen to us and our ideas. This point was reached when we proved that we deal with administration and funds well, we use external audits, and we have always used the funds properly for activities they have been declared; this is an important point. (R3 leader, interviewed in Vantaa, on September, 2014)

What has also contributed to the development of administrative capacity of R3 is their active participation in the association mentoring project run by one native Finnish NGO. R3 has taken part in training since 2009, and in the mentoring process the organization has been supported in realizing its own vision. This support structure has importantly affected the organizations’ capacity to access major funding. In the case of Kanava, administrative capacity has developed through close contacts with the Youth Department in the city of Helsinki, more specifically, the civil society support section. The leader of Kanava-organization describes their relations as follows:

The Youth department of the city of Helsinki was the first place we went to, and was where we got the idea of how to carry out youth work. People there have guided us, they have understood us and have had an attitude that they genuinely want to help us. It has been essential for us to have this kind of trusted contact that you can go to and request help, and go if you are struggling with something. We have this trusted relationship with them, and we can also talk about difficult issues. We can tell them our thoughts and we can also propose initiatives to them; they will listen to us. They are not only funding us, but also allowing us to be involved in their processes and inviting us to different kinds of hearings, prior to decision-making about youth issues. (Representative of Kanava youth, interviewed in Helsinki, on September, 2014)

The city authorities’ willingness to support migrants’ associations reflects to some extent the participatory agenda of the society. There is an increasing tendency of the public sector to reach out to the third sector in service provision, for example, even in the case of Finland where traditionally the public sector has carried the full responsibility for all service provision (see section 3.1). Partly, this has to do with the tightening budgets of municipalities, which makes them more open to looking for alternative ways of providing services. Previous research has also stated that there are other, more ideologically related reasons beyond the financial issues that have contributed to increasing collaboration between the public sector and the third sector. Third sector input in service provision is sometimes seen as guaranteeing the quality of services and as increasing citizens’ options. The third sector is generally perceived as being more flexible towards the changes in the context it works in compared to the public sector. Specific expertise, customer-friendly services and direct access to certain groups are generally seen as strengths of the third sector (Wijkström, 2011, 40; Saukkonen, 2013, 24).

Regarding the organizations analyzed here, the public sector strongly perceives and appreciates their capability to provide services to groups which would be difficult for the authorities to reach. Both of the organizations work with migrant youth doing a wide range of activities to help prevent marginalization of migrant youths and to facilitate their access to the labor market. Both case organizations have paid specific attention from the beginning to reaching out to migrant youths at grassroots levels in localities they work in by doing street patrolling, which has significantly contributed to the creation of trust in the organization by migrant youth, as has been argued by the leader of the Kanava organization:

Street patrolling was very important at the beginning, when we started in the 1990s. It created a lot of contacts with those youths who needed help, and it was an important way of creating trust with them. (Representative of Kanava Youth, interviewed in Helsinki on September, 2014)

In addition to street patrolling, both organizations have continuously paid attention to creating contacts with youths
and also giving them a say on associations’ activities. The leader of the R3 organization described this as follows:

It is important for organizations that they see what’s going on in youth society, and to give opportunities to those young people themselves who want to develop new ideas and activities. So creating contact and trusted relations with young people is very important, and one of the keys to our work. (R3 leader, interviewed in Vantaa on September, 2014)

An openness and inclusiveness of organizations to many linguistic and ethnic groups have in part contributed to the trust between authorities and case organizations. Both case organizations state very clearly that they are not ethnically-based organizations, although leadership in both organizations is in the hands of one ethnic group, ie. Somalis, and in particular at the beginning, both organizations’ activities were targeted at the Somali community in Finland. Both organizations identify themselves as Finnish organizations, also regarding the language used during their daily work. The leader of the R3 organization described their situation as follows:

One important thing in building trust is to be open. We are working openly and everyone can come and see our activities. We have invited people from the city council to see our activities. We also want to create a large model of working not focusing only on a certain ethnic group, but all people. For example, we have native Finns working in our organization; we have Roma people working here. So we don’t want to limit the activities to those of just a migrant organization. (R3 leader, interviewed on September, 2014)

Furthermore, the Kanava organization today has a wider range of members than just Somalis; Turkish, Ethiopians, Oromos and native Finns are also part of the organization’s activities, such as sport. They identify themselves as a Finnish youth organization, as stated by the leader of Kanava in an interview conducted in 2014: “even though we have migrant background, we are purely a youth organization based in Helsinki, and our official language is Finnish”. Both case organizations have come a long way, from voluntary-based informal gatherings, to well-established youth organizations in the Finnish third sector, employing paid staff to run activities and enjoying close working relations with authorities and case organizations. Both case organizations have received and continue to receive support from city authorities, which value the work of associations and understand the importance of a vibrant civil society. In this regard, both of the organizations have been “lucky” to find such a support system, because in Finland there is no coherent system or strategies for public authorities on how to cooperate with civil society. Thus the collaboration forms really vary from city to city and from sector to sector, and also depend on the values and insights of the individual officials working in the public sector (Pirkkalainen, 2015, 68). In the case of Kanava, close contacts have been developed with the Youth Department in the city of Helsinki, more specifically, the civil society support section. An official working in the section describes the work of the section and relations with Kanava as well as the uniqueness of their department as follows:

We have a very different way of working with associations compared with many other public sector actors in Helsinki. In a lot of places cooperation with civil society means that on the basis of proposals they either grant or won’t grant funding, but there is no other contact. That’s why there are so many misunderstandings between associations and the public sector, especially concerning migrant associations. But we have a different situation; our way of working, our office, the Civil Society Support Section, is founded to support civil society. So we don’t do things ourselves but mainly support others who do them. The relationship with Kanava is a good example – they have come here so many times and we have discussed what is needed when they apply for funding, what kind of papers are needed, and why, so most of our cooperation has been and continues to be conversation. After discussions, we have looked together at what kind of support they would actually need. (Official working in Youth Department, city of Helsinki, interviewed on September, 2014)

Implications of Hybridization: What Happens to the Advocacy Function of Organizations?

Interesting questions arise in the case of the two hybrid organizations, R3 and Kanava, which have close working relations with city authorities and receive funding from them: Has this hybridization changed the original vision and mission of the organizations? As organizations have started doing activities supported by the city authorities, have they lost their independence and thus the chance to engage in advocacy work? These are the issues dealt with in this section based on the empirical data, focusing in particular on the issue of ownership in associations.

Both case organizations have received and continue to receive support from city authorities, which value the work of associations and understand the importance of a vibrant civil society. In this regard, both of the organizations have been “lucky” to find such a support system, because in Finland there is no coherent system or strategies for public authorities on how to cooperate with civil society. Thus the collaboration forms really vary from city to city and from sector to sector, and also depend on the values and insights of the individual officials working in the public sector (Pirkkalainen, 2015, 68). In the case of Kanava, close contacts have been developed with the Youth Department in the city of Helsinki, more specifically, the civil society support section. An official working in the section describes the work of the section and relations with Kanava as well as the uniqueness of their department as follows:

We have a very different way of working with associations compared with many other public sector actors in Helsinki. In a lot of places cooperation with civil society means that on the basis of proposals they either grant or won’t grant funding, but there is no other contact. That’s why there are so many misunderstandings between associations and the public sector, especially concerning migrant associations. But we have a different situation; our way of working, our office, the Civil Society Support Section, is founded to support civil society. So we don’t do things ourselves but mainly support others who do them. The relationship with Kanava is a good example – they have come here so many times and we have discussed what is needed when they apply for funding, what kind of papers are needed, and why, so most of our cooperation has been and continues to be conversation. After discussions, we have looked together at what kind of support they would actually need. (Official working in Youth Department, city of Helsinki, interviewed on September, 2014)

In the case of R3, the youth services in Vantaa also perceive the work of associations to be very important, want to support
civil society, and are continuously looking for new forms of collaboration with the civil society actors. Authorities in the youth services value the association’s capability to reach out to groups of people that would otherwise be difficult to reach for public authorities, such as migrant youth. The authorities want to maintain the originality of the associations and plan the collaboration from this perspective. In the case of collaboration with R3, the support has been given to activities that the association strives to implement, as was expressed by an official working in the youth services section of Vantaa:

R3 is our collaboration partner. ‘Service provider’ is too technical a term. I am a bit concerned about the service provision approach that associations are given responsibilities that don’t belong to them. Of course then, when the association itself wants it, this is okay, but we cannot force them into that role. We are working on the same thing with R3 and we constitute resources for each other. The role of the municipality cannot be such that it directs civil society from the top, but the civil society associations need an autonomous role. Their aims can be different from municipalities’ aims; otherwise, this society would never have developed, if all associations did the same thing as the municipality. Associations can see better the needs of the people, and we can develop from that perspective. Associations have the role of identifying problems, and then together we can see what can be done to solve them. (Official working at the youth services section, city of Vantaa, interviewed on September, 2014).

In the case of associations receiving support from the city authorities and arranging a wide range of activities for migrant youths, and where associations are not advocacy or interest representation groups by nature, it is interesting to analyze what kind of political/democratic role they might have.

These two organizations are not viewed by the authorities or the organizations themselves as representative of collective ethnic organizations, even if the leadership of both organizations is in the hands of people from the same ethnic group, i.e. Somalis. For example, none of the case organizations, despite their visibility, is part of the Advisory Board for Ethnic Relations (see section 3.2). These two organizations have instead used a wider basis for organizing and direct their activities towards migrant youths in general, without any focus on ethnicity or specific languages, as described in the previous section.

Despite the lack of advocacy as an official aim of the organizations, both of the organizations, via their leaders, have a role of advocacy in the Finnish society in the sense that both organizations aim to keep the issues relating to migrant youth, such as anti-racism, anti-discrimination, anti-marginalization on the agenda. In this regard, these two migrant youth organizations can be seen as actors in “the politics of presence” when they voice out concerns of the migrant youth, “bring them recognition as a group, and to raise their plight as a political issue” (Rosanvallon, 2011, 192). Previous studies on immigrant organizations also claim that even organizations not formed officially for political purposes can have an important role in political processes, through advocacy or by bringing policy information to administrative agencies or elected officials’ attention (Bloemraad, 2006; Bloemraad & Ramakrishnan, 2008; de Graauw, 2008; Boccagni & Pilati, 2015).

Kanava ry and R3 ry’s mechanisms for keeping the issue of migrant youths on the agenda vary from concrete project work tackling issues that migrant youths face, to adopting a direct advocacy role where organizations and their leaders make initiatives to authorities and are invited to take part in decision-making processes at the city level. This is how the leader of R3 described their role when asked “Do you feel that your organization has a role in advocacy?”

Yes, I would say that in our organization we want to make change in society. But the problem is that we are “swallowed” by the projects. We do a lot of work with migrant youths, to make them part of this society, so we concentrate on working in the field. Needless to say there is some sort of advocacy involved when working at this level, too. To help migrant youths and make them part of this society means changing the society. (R3 leader interviewed in Vantaa on September, 2014)

Kanava ry perceives its role directly as an advocacy group due to its ability to propose initiatives to authorities, as described by the leader of the organization:

Yes, we dare to voice our opinions and make initiatives to authorities; through this we can advocate changes. We feel that we are a strong youth organization in Helsinki and also have a role in advocacy. We also try to influence the authorities, and to influence more widely society about issues relating to migrant youth, and to work against racism and marginalization and radicalization. (Representative of Kanava youth, interviewed in Helsinki on September, 2014).

Similar to what Bills argues (2010, 59-62), in these organizations that have their establishments as leaders, even the stable hybridization of the organization does not jeopardize the initial vision and ideology of the association. According to Bills (ibid., 62) in hybrid third sector organizations “paid staff may also be part of the active membership by similarly (to other active members) demonstrating their genuine commitment to the organizational purposes through their freely given and un-coerced contributions to the operations and governance of the organization”. This means that in practice, paid staff may provide some other resources or undertake voluntary work as well, as has been the clear case with both of the organizations (see below).

In both of these organizations close collaboration with city authorities allows them to remain independent and to have their own voice. Following the line of thinking suggested by Mark Warren (2000), associations, when they become partners with the public sector or private sector can still have a democratic function and maintain their originality. For Warren (2000, 57) civil society is a sphere in “which associative relations are dominant”, and distinctive, but related to the spheres of the state (mediated by legal coercion) and markets, which are mediated by money. Associative relations are characterized by voluntarism, where the binding force is “chosen normative allegiance rather than other kinds of force” (ibid., 98). Thus, both of the case study organizations’ leaders are the carriers of associative relations (ibid., 57). Even though they currently get paid by their respective organizations, they are driven by other motives than money and power, mainly by voluntarism and commitment to the goals of the organizations and voluntary work in addition to paid work, as stated by the Executive director of the Kanava organization:

I am currently working as paid executive director, but I still do not see Kanava as a service provider. In addition to paid work, we all here do voluntary work. It is the voluntary nature of the work, the non-profit nature that motivates me.
If you work in a firm, you have certain tasks and office hours and then you go home when you have done your tasks. But this (work) lives with me all the time. Now I go home after the working day, but if I am being called by someone who needs help, or if I see someone needing help, I go and help. So I don’t really have office hours here. (Representative of Kanava youth, interviewed in Helsinki on September, 2014)

Similarly, the Executive director of R3 finds the utmost motivation for the work comes not from money or power, but “from the heart”, as he stated:

This job means a lot to me, it’s a job I love, it’s in my heart. Even if now I get paid for this, it is a job I have done and continue to do with all my heart. Now that I get paid I can do more and work more with our clients, to help them, and I can develop more the work of the organization (R3 leader interviewed in Vantaa on September, 2014).

Conclusions and practical implications

This article asked what implications hybridization of the third sector have on the role of organizations as the voice of immigrants, which is an essential aspect of the integration process of migrants into the new society. Through using a longitudinal case study method, two migrant youth organizations in Finland were analyzed in order to find out how and through what mechanisms they have reached organizational capacity and legitimacy in Finnish society. By analyzing the organizations’ hybridization processes, the aim was to find out whose voice is heard in these organizations in the context of increased collaboration with public authorities. In Finland, the official integration policies emphasize the important role of migrants’ own organizations in the integration process. A topical question is the role that migrant organizations should, and will, be taking in the processes of integration into the host society. Concerns have been raised that due to hybridization of the third sector, migrant organizations will become mere contractors implementing public sector integration measures without having the possibility to speak out about their own genuine issues and concerns. If the hybridization of the third sector means outsourcing services only to the private sector based on financial competitiveness or outsourcing to large professional Finnish NGOs, smaller migrant organizations may be left out and marginalized. Thus, in order to improve the visibility of migrant associations, there needs to be a sensitive approach by the authorities towards migrant associations; something similar to what was described in this article on case organizations. Moreover, in order for migrant associations to be able to carry out a political incorporation role for migrants, the autonomy to represent authentic voices of migrants has to be guaranteed. In increasing hybridization of the third sector, there is a danger that migrant associations may become just an integral element of the functioning democracy.

In the cases of the two organizations analyzed in this article, the process towards hybridization leans towards the process of trust-building, in which leaders of organizations have a key role. First at the setting phase of organization, trust was created among “the migrants’ own community”, ie. Somali youth. From this point on, organizations slowly built trust with authorities working in city administration, as well as with other migrant youths in the local areas the organizations worked in.

The reasons behind the increasing hybridization of the organizations relate on the first hand to the structural context in Finland: as the state and cities are under economic pressure, the third sector is expected to fill the gaps and direct activities towards service provision. Moreover, Finnish integration policies emphasize participation and the role of migrants’ own associations. In these cases, both organizations provide services to migrant youth groups, many of which would otherwise be unreachable by the authorities. Therefore, the authorities value the work of these kinds of organizations that have legitimacy among the groups they claim to represent.

It is argued here that increasing visibility also brings higher political visibility to associations, which is essential in the process of immigrant integration into European society. In other words, because of the organizational capacity and support from the public sector, organizations have gained visibility and a legitimized position in the society and can thus carry out (an implicit) political role. Both organizations analyzed in this article have a role in advocacy in terms of keeping the migrant youth issues on the agenda through their leaders and their trusted collaboration relations with authorities. These organizations are examples of cases where the authorities have supported associations in realizing their own vision. In other words, in these cases, ownership of organizations and their activities has remained, despite the growing contracts with the public sector, in the hands of the associations’ leaders, in Billis’ terms the “principal owners”.

Third sector hybridization in the case of providing migrant associations with resources with which they can build strong organizations and implement activities may facilitate, in the best case, the trust-building role of migrant associations between native Finns and newcomer migrants, and may increase the political inclusion of migrants. It has been argued in this article that it is important to understand integration as a process of trust-building between native Finns and migrants, instead of relying on a rather technical understanding of integration as migrants entering labor markets or as migrants’ cultural assimilation. The integration of migrants into the Finnish society should be seen as a process in which the migrants themselves have a strong agency, and not as a process in which migrants are “objects” in the margins to be integrated. It is thus important to recognize the potential of migrants in contributing to the third sector and civic participation, which can have ramifications in wider democratic politics in terms of migrants bringing in new ways of engagement and bringing new issues to the agenda, and in so doing “reinvigorating the civic ideals of Western democracies” (Bloemraad and Ramakrishnan, 2008, 35).
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