



Swarm
Dynamics

CROYDON SYSTEM CHANGE PROJECT

South Norwood Focus Group Research: Findings Report

June 2024

Croydon
System Change Project



swarmdynamics.org

CONTENTS

	PAGE
About this report	3
Summary of key findings	3
Method and sample	5
Expanded findings	8
Reactions to high level themes from virtual reality experience	14
Insights – barriers to positive change	15
Other ideas – solutions	16
Question on relevance of Borough of Culture program to system change/positive futures	17
Acknowledgements and use of this report	17

About this report

This report captures the learnings from focus group research that aimed to gain in-depth insights into what themes and ideas around systems change resonate with local communities in Croydon. The focus group research was a qualitative study with a very small sample of residents from South Norwood, that built upon surrounding engagement and audience research from the wider Croydon System Change Project led by Swarm Dynamics. The wider project included workshops with a diverse set of local action and civil society groups in Croydon in 2023, audience feedback at a public virtual reality arts exhibition during Borough of Culture, and an online citizen engagement platform - pickapath4croydon.online. The focus group was conducted in April-May 2024, with the following objectives:

- A. To gain insights into how members of the public in the South Norwood area responded and reacted to some of the key themes, messaging, and ideas about systemic change that had featured in the Pick A Path For Croydon virtual reality exhibition during Borough of Culture 23-24; and
- B. To understand and obtain ideas and views from members of the public in the South Norwood area, about what system change means for them, how they view priority changes, and barriers to deep change towards fairer, greener, fully inclusive futures.

Summary of Key Findings

- **BOTTOM UP TRANSFORMATIONS**

The majority of the 9 participants agreed with the notion that **ceding more decision making power to community groups was a part of the solution to achieving system change**. (“Power Shift”.) These participants expressed a clear belief that those who hold power for planning decisions are too disconnected from the realities of people, places and communities on the ground, and are thus unable to gauge either the social/environmental value of existing community assets, or assets that could be returned to community ownership, or the consequences of ‘development’ decisions, even when well-intended. **As an important caveat to this, the 2 participants who participated in the research via zoom, expressed the risk that existing marginalization of certain groups, people, and areas, could risk being replicated if system change only meant handing greater decision making power to the existing community groups and structures.** They stated that Council/local governments could become less accountable and ‘wash their hands’ of systemic problems if certain decisions were simply handed over to communities. The 2 participants that raised this caveat felt that an intermediary step is needed, where communities first work through a process of proactively

seeking to find and involve those whose voices have been marginalised, (both now and historically), before the second step of demanding greater autonomy and involvement in decision making with Council.

- **CHALLENGES OF RESEARCHING THE TOPIC OF ‘SYSTEM CHANGE’**
4 out of 9 participants expressed that they found it challenging to engage with abstract ideas around “systems” and system change. These participants instead engaged strongly with concrete examples and specific places, projects, and discrete issues. The other 5 participants (3 in person, plus the 2 online participants) were comfortable discussing broader, more theoretical or abstract notions of “systems” and displayed some pre-existing familiarity with either the word or surrounding concepts of systemic change. **The 2 online participants believed that there is not one system but several systems that require deep change, in order to reach the destination of radically fairer, inclusive, and greener/zero carbon futures.** When prompted by the facilitator whether they thought these various systems somehow connected or come together in a meta system with its own logic or patterns, these 2 responded “yes”.
- **AWARENESS OF CONSUMERISM VERSUS BROADER CAPITALISM**
Only one out of 9 participants used the word “capitalist structures” when describing the current dominant system, or barriers to change, but some other participants did refer to “consumerism” or “consumer culture” - which (might) be inferred as a “proxy” for the system logics of capitalism. Unsurprisingly, participants displayed greater familiarity and existing mental frames for the term “consumerism” than for “capitalism.”
- **PERCEPTIONS OF CURRENT GOAL OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT**
While not all participants answered the question asking for their one-line definition of the current goal of development in Croydon, those 4 that did regarded the goal of the current system as primarily to “use space to generate more income/revenue/money, and to streamline services for maximal efficiency” (or similar responses).
- **GREEN SPACES AND REWILDING**
The themes of rewilding Croydon, environmental protection, and of the need for more green spaces that are well maintained was one of the themes that resonated strongly with most of the face to face participants, but not as much with the 2 online participants. Issues of addressing systemic privilege and exclusion (specifically mentioning privilege deriving from race, class, gender, and religion/belief) were expressed as higher priorities, or with higher emotional charge, by at least 2 of the 3 participants who identified as of BME background.

- **SAFE, MULTI-PURPOSE SPACES**
The need for more safe, multi-purpose community spaces and leisure spaces was repeatedly raised by a majority of participants, as part the barrier and solutions to social isolation, segregation, and anti-social or criminal behaviour in Croydon.
- **LACK OF ACCESSIBLE INFORMATION CHANNELS**
Across all the mini groups, there was a clear belief that **information is not circulating or is not accessible in the ways it should be**, regarding opportunities, programmes for leisure, environmentally friendly living, and the fabric of community that exists in Croydon. Participants believed this contributes to high isolation, loneliness and anti-social behaviour.
- **PROBLEM OF RELIANCE ON VOLUNTEERS**
The maintenance of green and social spaces being left largely to volunteers, which are hard to sustain, was repeatedly mentioned as a barrier to system change.

Methodology

SAMPLE

The postcode of South Norwood was chosen due to being on the periphery of Croydon, and as being recognised for having significant economic deprivation. The original plan was to hold the focus groups at South Norwood Library - as a public, community space that may be under threat of closure. In the end, due to noise considerations, the face to face research was held at the Stanley Arts Centre near by. Recognising that citizens, particularly those in deprived areas, should not be expected to partake in consultation processes for free, all participants were paid an incentive of 25 pound to help cover their time in the 90 minute sessions. Budget constraints limited the size of our sample. The value of this initial research is qualitative, not quantitative, and the small sample and informal, versus statistical, approach to obtaining a representative sample are fully acknowledged as limitations to this first research. However, this type of research could dig into issues at a deeper level than a quantitative study.

All participants self-selected, following an announcement via the local community engagement app *Love South Norwood*, and via invigilator recruitment at the local Library of South Norwood, where the virtual reality experience about system change was exhibited in March-April 2024. Efforts were made to compose a balance set, having regards to basic demographics of gender, and to ethnicity in order to reflect the highly diverse profile of Croydon, and South Norwood specifically. Unfortunately due to last minute cancellations and re-bookings, and who did and did not show up on the

day, the final set of 9 participants were less diverse than hoped for, comprising only 1 male to 8 females, and with 3 out of 9 identifying as non-white ethnicity (plus another one participant who identified as white but non-British (European)). The face to face participants (7) did express and acknowledge that many of them felt they were “quite fortunate” in comparison with other people in Croydon and legitimately questioned the overall diversity of the sample. The online research participants (2), who identified as BME background, did not express this sense of being fortunate or privileged in Croydon, and their responses were often grounded in their lived experience as black or brown people in Croydon, including one who had moved to Croydon in the last few years.

Over half of the participants had not experienced the VR exhibition about system change that we ran at Museum of Croydon and South Norwood Library during Borough of Culture.



The face to face focus groups were held at Stanley Arts, South Norwood. Facilitator – Jessica Kyriacou

METHOD

Participants were intentionally not provided with any background information other than a weblink to the pickapath4croydon.online site, that contained brief framing about the Croydon System Change Project and an online version of 20 cards – the priority transformational ideas and themes for systemic change that emerged from the civil society group workshops last year. Only the following high-level definition of system change was provided: *rapid transformations to zero carbon futures based on well-being for all and full inclusivity*. To ensure ethical research conduct, all participants signed a consent form and agreed to the recording of responses in audio or written form. A facilitation journey with accompanying slide deck was carefully prepared, comprising open discussion and probing questions led by lead facilitator Jessica Kyriacou, mini group discussion exercises in pairs, and individual writing time. The journey and slide deck comprised the following main sections:

- **Imagination** – After scene setting and context, using some of the key thematics, ideas, and stories about project and places in Croydon to activate imaginations, invite reflection on possible differences between current and recent approaches to “urban development” and “progress” towards social and environmental goals. And to open up participants to thinking about radically different futures in Croydon.
- **Feedback and critique of the VR thematics** – probing to understand how participants reacted to key themes and ideas contained within the VR experience, and allowing critique or questioning of the direction and priorities for change it contained.
- **What matters most to you?** – generating personal priorities for systemic change based on participants lived experience in Croydon, and asking a central question to systems thinking: *What is the purpose of the existing system/systems, and what should be the purpose of the new system we want?*
- **Write your own proposal** – exercise in small groups, identifying the top goal of the current system/approach to development, thinking through ways to configure 4 axes of change: Purpose, Relationships, Power, Resources.
- **Feedback** – including a 5 minute written questionnaire.

Expanded Findings

Understandings and perceptions of the term 'system change'

At the start of the research, 3 out of the 7 face to face participants demonstrated an existing understanding of the term 'system change' that appeared similar to the one line definition we had provided in the description of the focus groups ("rapid transition to greener, fairer, and fully inclusive futures"). Another 2 (the online participants, identifying as BME) demonstrated understanding of the term system change that was also relevant – focussed on the need to address and remedy systemic privilege and its oppressive effects – privileges and 'othering' deriving from race, gender, faith, and historical marginalisation. The other 4 participants engaged more readily with tangible, discreet issue sets and specific projects, places. Some of these participants provided feedback that they would have preferred less abstract ideas of overarching systems and patterns of behaviour, influence, or policy. **However, after probing for participant's views about deeper root causes of challenges and problems, discussions did reveal that some of these 4 participants did hold some beliefs about system level drivers or root causes to problems. These included "consumerism" and the unbalanced degree of priority given to increasing business footfall or external investment at the heart of the current approach to 'development' in Croydon. As well as community breakdown and lack of accessible opportunities contributing to problems of crime and anti-social behaviour.**

Importantly, 1 out of the 9 participants challenged the basic assumption inherent to our research and project – that systemic change is necessary. This participant raised concern that existing community-led initiatives and events were under threat, and stressed that these provide a foundation for community needs such as well-being, connection and access to green spaces. **"Systemic change" was not a term or frame that resonated positively out the outset with this participant.** We hypothesise that this may have been a more widely held reaction if a larger or more diverse sample had been researched. At the same time however, it would be interesting to test, in future research, if this reaction to the assumption that systemic change is needed would have been different if a more elaborate definition had been provided by the facilitators. Or if the participant had first experienced the virtual reality exhibition – which specifically highlighted the positive things that are being lost from Croydon's distant and recent past as a key part of the communications approach.

Nevertheless, this points to an important point when communicating system change: There are different levels at which people are able to interact and 'get behind' the idea of systems change.

Different people have different temporal and topical reference points against which they measure the need for deep change. (For example, a collective or

political story of a brighter past, versus a lived experience of a better past, versus lived or anecdotal experiences of life and struggles in the present moment.) In the midst of rapid changes to work, technology, social fabric often driven by the logics of the current socio-economic paradigm, people's immediate reaction to the general proposition of 'deep' change may be welcoming or it may be reactionary/wary. This underscores the importance, as we tried to convey in the VR experience, of conveying in the top levels of any communication hierarchy, that system change encompasses bringing back positive things that have been or risk being lost, it includes pushing back on certain changes thrust upon communities and people, just as much as it includes finding "new" solutions to long standing social or environmental challenges, or rolling out of technologies or policy measures still perceived as 'new' such as solar power or low emissions zones. Tapping into collective 'nostalgia' can also become a powerful galvanising force in social and political narratives.

Issues with emotional charge:

Whilst many issues arose during the focus groups, there were clusters of issues that kept coming up and that the facilitators noted had emotional charge:

- **The need for more safe, green spaces was a high priority from all the face to face participants.** In the context of system change, the desire and need for green spaces in Croydon that are safe and open and accessible was of clear priority to most of the 7 face to face participants. Participants stressed that green spaces must be well maintained, not littered, and well lit in order to feel safe. The 2 online participants also stressed the need for safe, welcoming spaces, but did not raise 'green spaces' or environmental protection as often or with the same priority as social justice and inclusion issues. There was quite a lot of discussion about the public not having access to spaces that people can afford. South Norwood Country Park was mentioned as a large space but one that is not well maintained, which contributes to it not feeling safe. **When asked, the online participants indicated that in principle they would like to see a car free city centre, but that the way it is pedestrianised should give important consideration to accessibility – noting that some people cannot walk or walk far unassisted, therefore integration with improved public transport would be key.**
 - The facilitator encouraged people to also think about whether members of the community could maintain green spaces and what it takes for people to care about these spaces – fostering a sense of pride and a sense of community.

- There were clear views regarding volunteering. While it is a part of « active citizenship », in the context of current systems is too often a band aid as volunteers are hard to retain in the long run. In the system changes envisaged by participants, volunteering should not replace paid-for essential work.
- Modes of land ownership and land stewardship were seen as potentially relevant to how inclusive and safe public green spaces can be - collective use of green spaces was mentioned, e.g. community orchards where anyone can go in and tend to trees, pick fruit, as opposed to allotments that are more individualistic.
- A number of participants felt that having more multi purpose spaces in Croydon was part of the solution to increasing actual safety, as well as perception of safety. The positive example of Richmond Park was given as a green space that manages to have a mix of uses and activities.
- 4 of the face to face participants touched upon the economic justice aspects of green spaces - how green spaces are better kept in more affluent areas with more financial capital and connections to institutions. (Including areas where more people have the skills and time to write a funding application.) However, beyond the politics of green spaces, the distributional aspects of system change, i.e fundamentally shifting or changing how distribution of resources, income occurs was not raised in broader terms in either did not come in broader terms in the face to face groups.
- **Anti-social behaviour, and crime.** Anti-social behaviour is a large topic in Croydon. Regarding young people, the response and attitudes from the group were mixed. **Some of the participants stressed the importance of finding ways to give young people purpose.** Ideas and questions circulated regarding ways to transfer skills to young people as part of helping them find purpose. The responses of other participants (including 2 that identified as being parents) expressed their frustration with fly tipping, they had experience of reporting this to the council with no result. One participant gave the idea of combining police with sports as a solution to this – citing initiatives from other cities where revenue from football is reinvested into community spaces and for safety enhancing measures.
- **Welcoming spaces.** The importance of spaces that felt not only safe but also WELCOMING was a strong theme from the majority of participants. The second in person group group (4 participants) mentioned Kent House Road station as

always feeling welcoming even though there isn't much there. It is worth noting that this second group were all women, half of which identified as being mothers of toddlers or babies. The online participants also stressed that, at night, the only places to go or meet are pubs, and that many of these do not feel welcoming for women, or for people of non-white backgrounds.

- One participant said “short of policing, what can we do about anti-social behaviour / feeling safe in parks?” This was followed by a discussion about ‘tackling root causes of antisocial behaviour versus only addressing the symptoms.
 - Some participants stressed that harmful behaviour should be met with action
 - A couple participants liked the ‘Love Your Street’ app because of the way it provided an easy way to report issues – making active citizenship easy.
-
- **Thriving youth.** In relation to the theme of “Thrive” from the VR exhibition, there was group discussion about about young people and anti-social behaviour and how the lack of meaningful activities and welcoming spaces contributes to this. Key questions framed by the participants in this theme included: How might we encourage a duty of care through a stronger sense of belonging and ownership to help shift behaviour in local people ? And, how can we get those in power (Council) to recognise the full benefits of investing in community spaces, including for young people ahead of short term profit ?
 - There was a want for accessible community spaces tailored to different people - less homogenous spaces.
 - The skate park in Southbank Centre was highlighted as an example of an open, positive space for young people which is part of a much bigger complex that meets multiple people’s needs (multi-purpose spaces). I think there was mention of Harrington Road being a place that used to have a skate park but it’s not used for that anymore.
-
- **Public consultations not leading to change.** At least half of the face to face participants mentioned this, expressing feelings of apathy, and a lack of motivation to continue putting energy in. Related to this, was the clear sense that too much is landing on residents and communities – of community and civil society being stretched too far and unable to fill the cracks.
-
- **Consumerism, waste and environment** was also an emotive topic. A number of participants noted that too often, business interests, social issues and environmental issues work in juxtaposition or with tensions in the current

system, rather than reinforcing one another positively as they should. (See further for concrete example).

- **Social exclusion** and key groups/demographics not having a seat at the table. There was keen awareness in the face to face groups that system change (or, better futures more broadly) will only work if there is full social harmony – that we all matter. A majority of the face to face participants expressed to the facilitators that they felt they were ‘rather privileged’ and that what matters to them may not be representative of people in Croydon at large. However the 2 online participants (BME identifying) did not express this sense of privilege, and instead spoke about their lived experience as black or brown, and having experienced “othering” in spaces within Croydon.
- **Lack of accessible information as a barrier to inclusion and to system change.** Participants spoke about people’s awareness of what is available, problems of accessible information flows, and their ability to navigate the current system. It was noted that even when opportunities and accessible activities or programmes are available in Croydon, people don’t always even know what their hobbies are/ could be unless they begin trying something out - a writing group may be something lots of people enjoy but never thought of doing. Improved, community led information flows (but with support/funding from Council to keep that sustainable) was mentioned, along with the need for keeping the setting and activities as informal as possible.
 - Communications platforms were mentioned as important, to show people where the opportunities are. Whitgift Centre artist spaces were mentioned as somewhere that does this, as well as the South Norwood app.
 - Someone in the second group said there is a need for “spaces for *being* rather than *doing*” - informal, not serious, and low-key.
- **FREE spaces and activities not dependent on money** - strong theme from all the face to face participants. There was quite a lot of discussion about the public not having access to spaces that people can afford. South Norwood Country Park was mentioned as a large space but it isn’t maintained and doesn’t feel safe. This theme links well with the ‘THRIVE’ thematic from our virtual reality arts experience, that emphasised the importance of thriving cultural and social lives, as part of conviviality, and low carbon living, and alternative systems based on wellbeing for all instead of profit for the few.
 - On this theme, the facilitator encouraged the face to face participants, to think about whether members of the community could maintain green spaces and what it takes for people to care about these spaces – active citizenship and a sense of community.

- There was discussion about volunteers and how this is a band-aid as they are hard to retain, and also about how volunteering should not replace paid-for essential work.
- Collective use of green spaces and collective land use or stewardship structures were mentioned, including the community orchards where anyone can go in and tend to trees and pick fruit, as preferable to allotments which were perceived as more individualistic.
- 4 of the face to face participants discussed inequality and politics of green spaces - specifically how green spaces can be better maintained in affluent areas with more financial capital and better connections to institutions (e.g. people who can and have time to write a funding application.)

Other issues

- **Social connection, diversity and time poverty.** 5 or 6 participants spoke about how even where social or community spaces do exist they don't always represent the mix of cultures in the area. Participants understood the linkages between this issue and time poverty – which contributes to people, and certain groups in particular, not being 'part' of networks or groups, or not even having the time to find out what is available.
 - There was acknowledgement that some people are invested in the community and some aren't and people questioned what was driving that. 1 person asked “are there opportunities for me and do I feel safe turning up on my own?”
 - Harmony and inclusive spaces for all - not just a place to live but also a place to be yourself and to thrive.
 - “Sometimes there's a gap in friendly environments for certain types of people, e.g. lone females”, as opposed to overall unwelcoming spaces.
- **A collective sense of pride in Croydon.** Music and dance for people to bond was mentioned as something they would want and as something that could encourage solidarity, engagement and participation by a variety of people. People reminisced about the music scene Croydon used to offer. The example from the VR experience about the Grand Old Theatre helped to nudge thinking around what has been lost from Croydon's past or heritage that used to provide a sense of pride. Some of the participants (at least 2) were new to South Norwood (arriving from other countries in the last few years) and stressed that 'arriving in South Norwood' is a key moment in relation to pride & place.

- **Empowerment.** The need for empowering communities, residents and young people was repeatedly raised. One participant suggested using knowledge from carers, teachers and others (« the eyes and ears of the community ») to support and inform decision-making. Others also spoke about empowering volunteers and community groups/local community forums. Education, skill-development and purpose were some of the solutions considered.

Reactions to themes for systemic change in the virtual reality arts exhibition

Out of the 6 title thematics, both physical groups were most drawn to “*The Right to Healthy Nature*” and “*Return the Commons*”. Not all participants had experienced the VR exhibition prior to the focus group, and the facilitator noted there were difficulties remembering each of the VR rooms and the titles of each thematic may have influenced the choices of participants more than the contents (for example, participants raised many issues relevant to Power Shift, but did not choose this thematic in the written exercises). We presuppose that the VR themes participants selected were those that were easy to remember and/or for which participants had existing mental « frames ». Responses may have been quite different if participants had been asked just after having experienced all 6 themed rooms in the virtual reality experience.

The other VR thematics that received some attention or interest were “*Interdependence and Autonomy*” - partly because people were familiar with the concrete example of the ‘Library of Things’, and the theme of “*Radical care.*”

To the written question ‘were we trying to achieve the right thing’ with the broad ideas and themes for change in the VR exhibition, a majority of participants who answered this indicated either “yes” or “yes to an extent” – noting that there are many barriers, both financial, practical, and also the challenge of shifting negative mindsets.

Insights into barriers to achieving radically fairer, greener, inclusive Croydon

In the written exercises, and in the feedback forms, a number of participants indicated the tensions and difference between ‘progress’ versus development from the perspective of citizens. One noted that the purpose of the current built environment in Croydon is ‘transactional/functional’ – places to buy things and places to sleep, but that ‘all the doors are closed’.

1 participant wrote “capitalist structures” to the 4 pillars exercise, the question of how does “power” need to be reconfigured to help Croydon achieve system change. This participant also wrote that a re-evaluation was needed of Council spending and investment. For the pillar of “purpose” 1 participant wrote about the need for a shift away from “profit-based cultures” to investment in greener spaces and community outreach.”

At least 5 out of 9 participants raised or agreed with the notion that there are not enough or not effective communication channels for people to find out about opportunities, programmes, of where the fabric of communities can be found in Croydon. At least 2 participants stated that unless they had taken extensive time to walk around their area by foot, and if they had not been a mother, able to tap into the mum’s networks, they would never have found out what is going on in Croydon. This linked with the need for a sense of “belonging” that was raised by a participant and resonated with several others. The first face to face group gave a lot of discussion time to the problem that people have to « go out of their way » to find about what is available, where there are communities - it’s coming from top down rather than the other way around because people don’t have time. **The participants in the first group made their own connections between accessibility of information about community and opportunities and the topics of time poverty and the theme of « radical care » from the VR rooms.**

Participants also spoke about behaviour of different actors within Croydon - and **why those who are considered to “hold the power” too often make short-term decisions, and the harmfulness of consumerism/ throwaway culture in driving quick wins and easy profit. The first group felt solidarity around longer-term initiatives that pay off - such as investing in green spaces, community spaces and wellbeing.**

Other ideas for solutions

Some pithy quotes from the written responses are as follows:

“Developers need to be accountable to the community”

“Planning teams need to cede power”

“We really need a clear shared goal. We had hoped the town regeneration plan might do this but we have been let down”.

Regarding specific ideas for advancing system change, one participant mentioned the need for Croydon to establish a **“pathway for small businesses”** - this came up during discussion of the potential in Croydon but how hard it is, administratively, to set up a small business. It was noted that South Norwood is actually predominantly

independently owned businesses/ shops and this was expressed as a positive for community wealth and sustainability.

One participant gave the interesting example of football-police partnerships that exist in other places, with a portion of football revenues being reinvested into the community. **Using sport as a tool to bring people together and reduce crime. Based on existing partnerships between the Met Police and Netball England to tackle crime and build community, using Crystal Palace Club and the talent that exists there.**

Another participant spoke about Council rejecting plans to extend housing unless it reduces carbon emissions as a great way of enforcing positive decision making. There was an insightful idea here that **developers should be fully accountable for their impacts on the environment and the community, as an idea for shifting the system.**

One of the participants was from a Commonwealth country (India) and the input from this participant provided useful contrast and reminder that human systems are always designed by people and can be redesigned in quite different ways – the status quo of today need not be the status quo of tomorrow !

Supplementary findings – survey question on relevance of broader Borough of Culture to topic of system change/positive futures

We attempted to gain basic insight into whether the Broader Borough of Culture programme was felt to be relevant to these issues that mattered to participants, concerning system change, and/or transformation towards fairer, greener, more inclusive futures. This was attempted via inclusion of a question in the feedback survey, but unfortunately, the question “on a scale of 1 to 3, to what extent did you see similarities between today’s workshop and the wider Borough of Culture programme?” was not answered by the majority of participants. As most participants either left this blank or wrote “I don’t know,” we are unable to draw any meaningful data from this question. This may indicate that the participants did not feel they had sufficient knowledge of the spread of events and programming within Borough of Culture, or it might simply indicate that the question was not formulated in the right way, as the focus group only had a tangential arts component for those participants that had not experienced the VR arts exhibition that formed part of the wider conversation about system change.

Acknowledgements and use of this report

Research design and facilitation was led by Jessica Kyriacou, contracted by registered charity Swarm Dynamics, with support from Isabella Coin. Online facilitation and drafting of this report was led by David Holyoake, with text input and cross check by facilitator Jessica Kyriacou. Funding for the Croydon System Change Project, including this smaller focus group component, was generously provided by Arts Council England and Lush Charity Pot.

After publication on our charity website swarmdynamics.org this report will be shared with civil servants along with a summary report of the broader findings of the Croydon System Change Project. The findings will be shared and hopefully discussed with the Place Making team of Croydon Council, shared with the team of Director of Culture, Kristian Aspell, as well as the Mayor's team and other relevant departments. All learnings from the wider project, including this focus group, will help inform the future work of our charity, in communicating and understanding system change.

For more information visit:

swarmdynamics.org

<https://pickapath4croydon.online/>

croydonsystemchange.org