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Introduction
The Australian Government, through the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT), invests millions of dollars to support sport organizations throughout the Asia Pacific region with the aim of developing sport capacity, building healthy and resilient communities, and delivering public diplomacy outcomes. Respective Australian National Sport Organizations (NSOs) employ a variety of staff to manage, develop and deliver these programs in partnership with the international sport federations. These staff have the dual role of being both expert in a particular sport (e.g. swimming) and designing programming that can deliver wider development outcomes (e.g., health, gender equity,) and public diplomacy benefits. This research aims to investigate how the program management and delivery staff embedded in the Australian NSOs conceptualize and manage their concurrent, and often conflicting, dual roles.

Role Conflict and Organisation Hybridity
To best address the research aim, a broad representation of Sport for Development (SFD) literature underpinned the theoretical foundations of this project (Hartmann & Kwauk, 2011; Kidd, 2008; Schulenkorf, Sherry & Rowe, 2016). More specifically, this paper builds on the growing body of research investigating organizational hybridity (Schulenkorf, 2016; Svensson, 2017; Svensson & Seifried, 2017) and management in SFD (MacIntosh, Couture & Spence, 2015; Thorpe and Chawansky, 2017; Welty Peachy, Musser, Shin & Cohen, 2017). We further explore potential tensions and role conflict for SFD managers by applying paradox theory (Schad, Lewis, Raisch & Smith, 2016; Smith, Besharove, Wessels & Chertok, 2012; Smith & Lewis, 2011). Overall, we argue that the examination of hybridity through a combination of different theoretical lenses enables a more comprehensive understanding of the complexities and at times mutually exclusive demands within and between SFD management roles (see Smith et al., 2012; Svensson, 2017).

Research Method
Over a two-month period in 2017, the research team engaged with managers of 14 sports within DFAT’s Pacific Sport Partnership and Asian Sports Partnership programs. A total of 17 managers shared their knowledge, understanding and experiences via telephone interviews, to 1) identify the scope and scale of their role in their organisation, 2) identify key skills, experience or qualifications required to undertake their role, 3) discuss the concept of dual/hybrid roles in their position, 4) discuss challenges in their role in balancing sport and development outcomes and needs of their employer (sport), funder (DFAT) and international partners, 5) discuss benefits and positive outcomes from their role, and 6) provide an opportunity to give advice to sport organizations, funders and potential program managers on how best to design roles to meet these unique requirements in the SFD environment. Interviews were recorded, transcribed and imported into the NVivo 11 qualitative data analysis software program. Analysis of data involved analysing, coding and grouping data into common themes using a combination of inductive and deductive coding. Resulting themes and sub-themes were organized relative to the following categories: role demographics and duties; key skills, experiences or qualifications; challenges; benefits; and recommendations.

Findings and Discussion
When asked to describe their role, the majority of program managers (11) highlighted that it encompassed both SFD and SD. Fewer (6) managers indicated that their roles were primarily focused on SFD. Similarly, when asked to elaborate on the day-to-day responsibilities, managers predominantly gave examples that combined SFD and SD (26). Key challenges identified by the managers were focused on the balancing act inherent in their roles and in their
work in the SFD context; managers noted that they were required to balance both sport (Sport Development) and development (Sport for Development) outcomes in their programming. In addition, the need to balance the needs of their employer (NSO), funder (DFAT) and international partners throughout the design and delivery of programs was identified as challenging. Challenges were heightened by working within resource-constrained environments, and across a wide variety of cultures in often complex social, cultural and economic contexts (e.g., low income and vulnerable nations). Interestingly, the managers consistently noted direct program benefits for all partners involved, and all clearly articulated that SFD and sport benefits do not have to be mutually exclusive. Managers recommended greater collaboration between organizations, local engagement and empowerment, and adherence to genuine development goals in their SFD activities. These recommendations have significant implications for local sport organisations, their international partners and funding bodies. We aim to critically discuss these in our presentation.