



This is a peer-reviewed, post-print (final draft post-refereeing) version of the following submitted document and is licensed under All Rights Reserved license:

Roberts, William M ORCID logoORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5736-5244> (2016) A Youth at Risk: Ethnography, Digital Wearable Technology and Citizenry in London. In: Changing Lives, Changing Worlds Conference. (Submitted)

EPrint URI: <https://eprints.glos.ac.uk/id/eprint/5036>

Disclaimer

The University of Gloucestershire has obtained warranties from all depositors as to their title in the material deposited and as to their right to deposit such material.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation or warranties of commercial utility, title, or fitness for a particular purpose or any other warranty, express or implied in respect of any material deposited.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation that the use of the materials will not infringe any patent, copyright, trademark or other property or proprietary rights.

The University of Gloucestershire accepts no liability for any infringement of intellectual property rights in any material deposited but will remove such material from public view pending investigation in the event of an allegation of any such infringement.

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR TEXT.

**A Youth at Risk: Ethnography, Digital Wearable Technology and Citizenry
in London (POSTER/VIDEO)**

Will Roberts*, Health, University of Bath

✉ adswmr@bath.ac.uk

This presentation locates sport coaching as a space within which 'hard to reach' young people are (re) engaged in society and using an ethnographic methodology that embraces digital wearable technology as a research tool, I seek to understand the way in which social corporate responsibility replaces government responsibility and the type of citizen this produces. Having established that coaching fulfils multiple roles and realities (Lyle, 2002; Jones, 2006; Cregan et al., 2007; Bush and Silk, 2010; Roberts et al., in press) it is important to ask more critical questions pertaining to how coaching is used as opposed to what it is or does. Physical Cultural Studies (PCS) (Andrews, 2008) offers an insight into the promise or inconvenient truth of kinesiology (sport coaching in this instance); whilst Bush and Silk (2010) offer the Physical Pedagogic Bricolage (PPB) as a more appropriate and useful nomenclature and critique of what it is that sport coaching does, is, and ought to be. If we embrace PPB then we can challenge the need to prove what it is that coaching is, and instead examine at this conjunctural (Grossberg, 2006) moment the more pertinent and contextual question of 'how it is that we seek to use coaching?' The research raises critical questions about the use of sport coaching in 'sport for development' projects, and the governance of sport and young people more wholly; importantly, though, it questions the notion of governmentality (Foucault, 1978; Rose, 2000) exerted by those tasked with engaging the 'hard to reach' (Crabbe, 2007).

***Participant presenting a poster as well.**