



GCERF

Preventing Violent Extremism
and Terrorism



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS



BUILDING TRUST IN REHABILITATION AND REINTEGRATION THROUGH PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

A PRACTITIONER GUIDE

MAY 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	3
Key lessons and recommendations for practice	3
1. Trust is shaped by both the messenger and the message	3
Recommendations for practice	4
2. Effective preparation of communities for R&R is rooted in communication focused on trust building	5
Recommendations for practice	6
Communications plan key principles	7
3. Transparency needs to be carefully calibrated to build trust and protect safety	7
Recommendations for practice	8
Communication planning checklist	9
End Notes	10

Authors:

Dr Gordon Clubb, University of Leeds

Emily Winterbotham, University of Leeds

Professor Mary-Beth Altier, New York University

Professor Graeme Davies, University of York

Dr Tarela Ike, Teeside University

Cover photo

Children are engaged in educational and recreational activities to support their learning and reintegration.

INTRODUCTION

Rehabilitation and Reintegration (R&R) programmes are a major tool for preventing violent extremism, reducing reoffending and supporting security in fragile contexts affected by violent extremism and conflict. Their success depends not only on programme design but whether they are supported by national authorities and understood, accepted, and trusted by the public and the communities where reintegration takes place.

Public mistrust, stigma towards returnees^[i], and misjudged transparency can undermine R&R efforts, fuel community resistance, and create risks for programme participants and wider security. Effective public communication is therefore key to successful R&R: shaping perceptions of security, building trust, and supporting sustainable reintegration outcomes.

This practitioner guide focuses on how communication can help build trust and transparency in R&R^[ii]. Drawing on insights from a community of practice seminar convened by the Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund (GCERF) and the University of Leeds in March 2026^[iii] and relevant literature, it sets out practical lessons and recommendations for R&R practitioners.

The guide complements existing work on strategic communications in R&R^[iv] focusing on trust-building measures. While grounded in experiences from the Philippines, Mali, Kosovo, Yemen and Kyrgyzstan, the findings have broader relevance.

KEY LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRACTICE



1. TRUST IS SHAPED BY BOTH THE MESSENGER AND THE MESSAGE

Be inclusive and involve stakeholders from different intervention areas

There is no single type of credible messenger^[v]. Credible messengers are context dependent and may include families, community mediators (including religious leaders), frontline practitioners (teachers, social workers, youth workers), local media actors, women's organisations, local authorities, and in some cases security actors^[vi]. Individuals who have disengaged from extremist groups may in certain situations^[vii] serve as credible messengers, where their involvement is carefully assessed and supported in line with relevant standards^[viii]. Families are often the first and most trusted communicators in R&R contexts. Their involvement can strengthen legitimacy and provide a bridge between returnees and communities.^[ix] Irrespective of the messenger, trust is reinforced when they share a consistent, coherent narrative.^[x] Unclear roles, weak coordination^[x] and poor communication damage trust and coherence.^[xi]

Work through existing social structures rather than around them

Effective R&R communication depends in part on engaging messengers with credibility in the community. Working through existing social structures strengthens the reach and legitimacy of communication efforts. Trust is often shaped by perceptions of competence, benevolence, and integrity. Messages delivered by locally trusted figures such as religious leaders or frontline practitioners can strengthen public confidence in R&R^[xii], while evidence of programme effectiveness and capable leadership reinforces belief in the process and its outcomes.^[xiii]

Address underlying concerns, not just the choice of messenger

The influence of the messenger is not consistent across contexts. Public attitudes towards R&R are often shaped more strongly by perceptions of the reintegrating individual, particularly whether they committed an offence (as in the case of children) or the nature of their offence and the extent to which their involvement was voluntary.^[xiv]

Credible messengers can strengthen communication efforts, but they cannot compensate for unresolved concerns about risk, fairness, and accountability. R&R programme's communication strategies should therefore combine both credible messengers with clear, context-sensitive messaging that responds directly to public and community concerns and expectations.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRACTICE

- Work through existing social and community structures to reinforce legitimacy.
- Engage locally credible messengers. Avoid over-reliance on a single group.
- Ensure selected actors are aware of and practice their mandate and develop a shared overarching narrative to reinforce credibility.^[xv]
- Include family centred engagement and provide ongoing guidance and support to help families communicate safely and effectively.^[xvi]
- Co-designed communication strategies that combine messenger selection with clear, transparent and coordinated messaging addressing community concerns around risk, justice and accountability.
- Recognise that perceptions of the individual case (e.g. offence, willingness to reintegrate, radicalisation pathway) may outweigh messenger effects.



2. EFFECTIVE PREPARATION OF COMMUNITIES FOR R&R IS ROOTED IN COMMUNICATION FOCUSED ON TRUST BUILDING

Stigma reduction and community acceptance are central to R&R

Stigma is one of the biggest barriers to reintegration. Communication helps prepare and sensitise communities by sharing information about R&R, shaping perceptions and expectations, and alleviating fears and concerns in advance of reintegration.^[xvii]

Communication plans should anticipate backlash risks (threats to returnees and community mistrust or grievance) and identify mitigation approaches such as dialogue, community engagement, referral to protection mechanisms and managing expectations to reduce say-do gaps.^[xviii]

R&R requires sustained dialogue^[xix] and early community engagement prior to reintegration is critical.^[xx] Such communications typically convey the purpose and importance of R&R and, where appropriate, relevant information about returnees (e.g. they were children who were abducted, levels of culpability). Communicating security rationales for R&R can help counter public fears and political resistance.^[xxi] Gender sensitive approaches are also important given that women returnees often face unique stigma and fear losing custody of children.^[xxii]

Signals of change from returnees can help reduce stigma and build public trust

Messages that signal change, repentance, or disengagement from violent extremist groups can play an important role in fostering public support and reducing stigma in R&R contexts. Where context-sensitive, enabling returnees to demonstrate change may help strengthen community acceptance and support reintegration.

These signals may include expressions of remorse, anonymised success stories, participation in rehabilitation, deradicalisation or community service programmes (e.g. volunteer work, infrastructure rehabilitation, debris cleaning that improves environmental conditions visibly and practically), clear disavowals of previous group affiliation, aiding state security forces, and endorsements from community elites or credible figures^[xxiii]. Communicating clearly about this work is imperative to facilitate R&R including ensuring implementation at the scale that is required. This often requires structured support, including confidence-building, communication training, and providing safe spaces for returnees to reflect on and articulate their experiences and trauma.

Returnee communication is therefore an important component of broader trust-building efforts. Trust between returnees and frontline actors is described as the primary determinant of progress in rehabilitation and reintegration^[xxiv] requiring clear, credible pre return communication that counters rumours and reduces fear.^[xxv]

Community context can influence support for R&R

There is evidence that the traits of those in the community can influence their willingness to support R&R. Those with ethnocentric, conservative, or authoritarian views are less likely to support R&R.^[xxvi] Younger individuals and possibly those with higher levels of education and trust in policing or criminal justice institutions are more likely to support violent extremist R&R^[xxvii]. Local extremist groups may tap into existing social divisions and exploit returnee cases to inflame tensions.^[xxviii]

Communication plans should therefore be sensitive to this local makeup and may need to target these biases and tailor messaging to local attitudes and trust levels, not just provide information.^[xxix] Similarly, different types of returnees (men, women and children) are perceived differently and require tailored messaging.^[xxx]

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRACTICE

- Communication should not be an afterthought – planning a communications strategy is the first step.
- Communication strategies should work with credible messengers at the outset to design context specific messaging, adopting a clear focus on building trust and managing stigma from the outset.
- Engage communities early and continuously to identify risks, concerns and potential sources of resistance prior to reintegration.
- Manage expectations “up and down” to avoid say–do gaps.^[xxxi]
- Tailor communication approaches to local social dynamics, including differing levels of trust, political attitudes, and perceptions of risk.
- Integrate returnee-focused communication approaches that are safe, voluntary, and supported through structured preparation.
- Women and children require age-, gender-, and trauma-informed communication.^[xxxii]
- Link communication efforts to broader institutional approaches that address security, justice, and community confidence simultaneously.

COMMUNICATIONS PLAN KEY PRINCIPLES

The following principles should guide the design and delivery of communication strategies for R&R:

- Explain the reintegration process, acknowledge challenges or past mistakes and mitigating actions; and avoid unrealistic promises.
- Reduce stigma and fear by framing rehabilitation as a security-enhancing and community stabilising process, and engaging communities early rather than presenting rehabilitation and safety as competing goals.^[xxxiii]
- Produce non-stigmatising, inclusive and gender sensitive language guidance^[xxxiv] (including do-not-use labels); align narratives to community healing and social cohesion rather than solely “extremism” frames and key messages clear, accessible and non-technical.
- Build shared ownership of the process. Avoid importing narratives but instead co-create with local communities and ensure they are adapted to the local context.
- Map the media landscape, engage proactively with journalists and build trusted, transparent relationships to support accurate, balanced coverage and prevent sensationalism.^[xxxv]
- Evaluate: integrate baseline metrics and audience segmentation to measure attitudinal change.^[xxxvi]



3. TRANSPARENCY NEEDS TO BE CAREFULLY CALIBRATED TO BUILD TRUST AND PROTECT SAFETY

Transparency is important but must be balanced with confidentiality and protection

Transparency can support trust-building in R&R when it is clearly defined and contextually appropriate. Its impact depends on how information is shared, with whom, and for what purpose.

Programme-level transparency around programme goals, limits, risks, realistic benefits, legal safeguards and accountability mechanisms can strengthen legitimacy, build credibility and prevent disillusionment.^[xxxvii] Individual-level confidentiality builds trust with returnees, protects safety and dignity and prevents stigma.^[xxxviii] Confidentiality should be understood as protection of personal identities, trauma narratives and sensitive individual trajectories, rather than blanket secrecy or invisibility. Misunderstanding this distinction can lead either to overexposure of participants or to perceptions of concealment, both of which can undermine trust.

Transparency effects are context-specific and require further research

The relationship between transparency and trust is not linear. In some contexts, insufficient transparency may generate suspicion and undermine confidence; in others, high disclosure may create risk including exposing participants to harm or weakening trust in programmes.^[xxxix] This variation underlines the need for evaluation and learning on how transparency functions across different R&R environments, particularly in public-facing communication.^[xi]

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRACTICE :

- Develop a clear organisational transparency framework defining what information can be shared, with whom, and under what conditions.
- Ensure coordination across implementing partners so that transparency approaches are consistent and coherent.
- Share programme-level information (rationale, objectives, safeguards, limits and, where appropriate, aggregated outcomes or community benefits).
- Clearly communicate complaints, grievance, and accountability mechanisms as part of building legitimacy.
- Protect individual identities, trauma narratives, and sensitive disclosures to prevent harm and reduce stigma.
- Treat confidentiality as protection of individuals, not concealment of programmes, and avoid practices that unintentionally generate speculation or exclusion.
- Continually evaluate the impact of transparency as part of public communications.

The **University of Leeds** is pioneering research on how frontline organisations and R&R practitioners can better build trust and support through transparent communication. Practitioners can contact the team for support to develop communications plans and toolkits. Join **here** for updates on the project outcomes, findings, and events.

The **Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund (GCERF)** invests in rehabilitation and reintegration programming across eleven countries with the objective of preventing recidivism and increasing community security. For more information about GCERF investment, click **here**.

COMMUNICATION PLANNING CHECKLIST



- Does your organisation have a framework for identifying credible messengers? Who do your stakeholders view as competent, benevolent and honest?

- Does your organisation have an onboarding plan and support system for messengers (training, mentoring, referral pathways, accountability mechanisms) and ongoing validation? Is there a communication plan that places trust building at the centre of objectives and includes early and gender sensitive community engagement to anticipate stigma, backlash risks, and concerns prior to reintegration?

- Do communications appropriately signal change and reintegration (e.g. anonymised success stories or messaging about rehabilitation, apology, and redemption where safe and context-appropriate) alongside structured support for returnees?

- Does your organisation ensure communication strategies are tailored to local social and political dynamics including differing levels of trust, perceptions of risk, and community composition?

- Does your organisation have a transparency guideline that specifies information-sharing processes and distinguishes programme-level transparency and individual confidentiality?

- Does your organisation have a shared narrative to avoid contradictory messaging?^[xii]

- Are journalists briefed on programme rationales and confidentiality boundaries?^[xiii]

- Can the public access basic, accurate information about the programme (aligned with communications strategy), if they want to (e.g. a brief statement on programme rationale and purpose)?

- Does your organisation monitor and evaluate the impact of communication approaches (including transparency and stigma reduction) as part of programme learning?^[xiiii]

- Does your organization clearly communicate how members of the community can get in touch (e.g. email, helpline, suggestions boxes) to submit observations, grievances, concerns or questions?

END NOTES

- [i] Returnees are defined as people formerly associated with terrorism and violent extremism, including those returning from conflict zones and individuals disengaging from terrorist and violent extremist groups, and their families.
- [ii] The paper was produced in the framework of a memorandum of understanding signed between GCERF and the University of Leeds in February 2026.
- [iii] The online seminar R&R series 1 – Building Trust Through Public Communication in Rehabilitation and Reintegration took place on March 12, 2026. We thank the speakers Kreshnik Gashi, Editor-in-Chief of Balkans Investigative Reporting Network (BIRN) – Kosovo; Amir Mukambetov, Project Manager – SOS Children’s Villages – Kyrgyzstan; Abdou Kola Bocoum, National Coordinator, Think Peace – Mali; Rohaniza Sumndad-Usman, Founder and Chief Peace Mission Keeper, Teach Peace Build Peace – The Philippines; and Mohammed Ali, Senior Project Manager, Resonate – Yemen, for their contributions.
- [iv] Avdimetaj, Teuta and Julie Coleman (2020), What EU Member States Can Learn from Kosovo’s Experience in Repatriating Former Foreign Fighters and Their Families, Clingendael Netherlands Institute of International Relations, The Hague; Ingram, H.J. (2023). Strategic Communications in FTF Repatriation & Reintegration: Guiding Principles for Policymakers & Practitioners. *Journal for Radicalization*, 37, Winter 2023/24; Doctor, A.C., Ingram, H.J., Margolin, D., Mines, A. and Vidino, L. (2023). Reintegration of Foreign Terrorist Fighter Families: A Framework of Best Practices for the U.S. National Counterterrorism Innovation, Technology, and Education Center. Available online: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/ncitereportsresearch/1>
- [v] Szkola, Jason, and Kwan-Lamar Blount-Hill. “A framework for understanding credibility: What makes credible messengers “Credible” in a New York city-based sample of gun violence intervention programs?.” *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 52, no. 2 (2025): 294–312.
- [vi] Global Solutions Exchange (2017). 10 Steps to Strengthening Rehabilitation and Reintegration Efforts for Terrorism Offenders, Returning Foreign Terrorist Fighters, and Victims of Violent Extremism”, International Civil Society Action Network, Washington, D.C.; Hedayah, Countering FTF Recruitment: Counter-Messaging and the Role of Disillusioned Former Fighters, <https://hedayahcenter.org/resources/countering-ftf-recruitment-counter-messaging-and-the-role-of-disillusioned-former-fighters/>
- [vii] Clubb, Gordon, Ryan Scrivens, and Didarul Islam, eds. *Former extremists: Preventing and countering violence*. Oxford University Press, 2024. Available on [Open Access](#)
- [viii] Clubb, Gordon, Katharina Sengfelder, Mary Beth Altier, Ryan Scrivens and Didarul Islam, Standards for Employing Formers in P/CVE, ICCT, November 2024, <11/Clubb%20et%20al.%2C%20Standards%20for%20Employing%20Formers%20in%20PCVE%202.pdf>
- [ix] Radicalisation Awareness Network, 2017, RAN Manual- Responses to returnees: Foreign terrorist fighters and their families. Available online: https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/system/files_en?file=2020-09/ran_br_a4_m10_en.pdf; Medarski F, Shikova N, and Vanchoski A. (2020), Enhancing the Understanding of Foreign Terrorist Fighters (FTF): Challenges for Rehabilitation, Resocialization and Reintegration of Returnees in the Republic of North Macedonia, Nexus Civil Concept i Institut za čovekovi prava, Skopje: May 2020; Holmer, Georgia, and Adrian Shtuni (2017), Returning Foreign Fighters and the Reintegration Imperative. Special Report. United Institute of Peace, Washington D.C.
- [x] Ingram, H.J. (2023). Strategic Communications in FTF R&R; Doctor, A.C., et al. (2023). Reintegration of FTF Families; RAN, 2017, Responses to returnees Wouterse, Lieke, and Gssime, Yasmine, 2020, “Local Communications for Returning FTFs”, Radicalisation Awareness Network, 8 June 2020. Available online: https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/default/files/what-wedo/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/about-ran/ran-local/docs/ran_local_conclusions_communication_26-25_5_2020_en.pdf
- [xi] Kosovar Center for Security Studies (2020), Unpacking Kosovo’s Response to Returnees from the War Zones in Syria and Iraq, Prishtina; Medarski F, et al. (2020), Enhancing the Understanding of FTFs.
- [xii] Blair, Graeme, Rebecca Littman, Elizabeth R Nugent, Rebecca Wolfe, Mohammed Bukar, Benjamin Crisman, Anthony Etim, Chad Hazlett, and Jiyoung Kim. 2021. “Trusted Authorities Can Change Minds and Shift Norms during Conflict.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 118(42):e2105570118; Revkin, Mara R., and Kristen Kao. 2023. “No Peace without Punishment? Reintegrating Islamic State “Collaborators” in Iraq.” *The American journal of comparative law* 71(4):989–1032
- [xiii] Altier, Mary Beth. 2023. “Criminal or Terrorist?: Fear, Bias, and Public Support for Prisoner Re-Entry Programs.” *Terrorism & Political Violence* 35(1):83–103; Kao, Kristen, Kristin Fabbe, and Michael Bang Petersen. 2023. “The Irredeemability of the Past: Determinants of Reconciliation and Revenge in Post-Conflict Settings.” Available at SSRN 4465543; Lobato, Roberto M, Álvaro Rodríguez-López, Josep García-Coll, Manuel Moyano, and Mario Sainz. 2024. “Attitudes Towards Terrorist Rehabilitation Programs: Psychological Mediating and Moderating Mechanisms.” *Psychology, Crime & Law* 30(9):994–1015.
- [xiv] Altier, Mary Beth. 2023. “Criminal or Terrorist?; Gelot, Linnéa, and Prabin B Khadka. 2025. “Social Reintegration of Former Al-Shabaab Militants: How Formal Channels Help Mitigate Threat Perceptions.” *Journal of Peace Research* 62(6):1820–1838.; Kao et al. 2023. “The Irredeemability of the Past; Lobato et al. Attitudes Towards Terrorist Rehabilitation Programs; Revkin and Kao, No Peace without Punishment.
- [xv] Ingram, H.J. (2023). Strategic Communications in FTF R&R; Azinović, Vlado (2020), Rehabilitation and Reintegration of Returning Foreign Terrorist Fighters (RFTFs) and Their Families in the Western Balkans, Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund, Geneva.
- [xvi] KCSS (2020), Unpacking Kosovo’s Response; Medarski F, et al. (2020), Enhancing the Understanding of FTFs; Wouterse and Gssime, 2020, “Local Communications for Returning FTFs”, RAN.

- [xvii] Wouterse and Gssime, 2020, "Local Communications for Returning FTFs", RAN.
- [xviii] Ingram, H.J. (2023). Strategic Communications in FTF R&R.
- [xix] Holmer and Shtuni (2017), Returning Foreign Fighters; Medarski et al. (2020), Enhancing the Understanding of Foreign Terrorist Fighters (FTF).
- [xx] Ike, Tarela Juliet, Dung E Jidong, Mileyebi L Ike, and Evangelyn E Ayobi. 2025. "Public Perceptions and Attitudes Towards Ex-Offenders and Their Reintegration in Nigeria: A Mixed-Method Study." *Criminology & Criminal Justice* 25(5):1362-1384; Willems, Rens, and Mathijs van Leeuwen. 2015. "Reconciling Reintegration: The Complexity of Economic and Social Reintegration of Ex-Combatants in Burundi." *Disasters* 39(2):316-338, Jeannie, E. Green, and Moriah Brier. 2013. "Promoting Recovery after War in Northern Uganda: Reducing Daily Stressors by Alleviating Poverty." *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma* 22:849-868; Baez, Sandra, Hernando Santamaría-García, and Agustín Ibáñez. 2019. "Disarming Ex-Combatants' Minds: Toward Situated Reintegration Process in Post-Conflict Colombia." *Frontiers in Psychology*; Richard, and Alpaslan Özerdem. 2013. "How to Assess Social Reintegration of Ex-Combatants." *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding* 7(4):453-475; Morgenstein, Jonathan. 2008. *Consolidating Disarmament: Lessons from Colombia's Reintegration Program for Demobilized Paramilitaries*. Monograph. Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace.
- [xxi] Dedeken, Chiara and Kevin Osborne (2021), Repatriating FTFs from Syria: Learning from the Western Balkans, Resolve Network – Policy Note, Washington D.C; Holmer and Shtuni (2017), Returning Foreign Fighters.
- [xxii] RAN, 2017, RAN Manual- Responses to returnees; Ingram, H.J. (2023). Strategic Communications in FTF R&R.
- [xxiii] Blair et al. "Trusted Authorities Can Change Minds and Shift Norms during Conflict"; Clubb, Gordon, Mary-Beth Altier, Yoshiharu Kobayashi, Graeme Davies, and Eliza Brownsord. 2024. "Combating the Terrorist Stigma: Communicating Rehabilitation and Reducing Barriers to Reintegration." *Terrorism and Political Violence*:1-18; Godefroidt, Amélie, and Arnim Langer. 2023. "What Drives Attitudes Towards the Reintegration of Former Fighters? Insights from a Conjoint Experiment in Nigeria." *Journal of Peace Research* 60(3):410-427; Kao et al. 2023. "The Irredeemability of the Past Revkin and Kao 2023.
- [xxiv] Azinović, Rehabilitation and Reintegration of RFTFs and Their Families in the Western Balkans.
- [xxv] Dedeken and Osborne, Repatriating FTFs from Syria.
- [xxvi] Altier, Mary Beth. 2023. "Criminal or Terrorist?"; Clubb et al, "Combating the Terrorist Stigma";
- [xxvii] Altier, Mary Beth. 2023. "Criminal or Terrorist?"; Clubb et al, "Combating the Terrorist Stigma"; Lobato et al, "Attitudes Towards Terrorist Rehabilitation Programs".
- [xxviii] Wouterse and Gssime, "Local Communications for Returning FTFs", RAN
- [xxix] Doctor et al; (2023). Reintegration of FTF Families.
- [xxx] Wouterse and Gssime, "Local Communications for Returning FTFs." RAN.
- [xxxi] Ingram, H.J. (2023). Strategic Communications in FTF R&R.
- [xxxii] Doctor et al; (2023). Reintegration of FTF Families; RAN, 2017, Responses to returnees; Ingram, H.J. (2023). Strategic Communications in FTF R&R.
- [xxxiii] Metodjeva, Asja (2021), 'Bring Them Back: Manage the Risk', Atlantic Initiative, Policy Paper No. 1, Sarajevo; Doctor et al. Reintegration of FTF Families.
- [xxxiv] Azinović, Rehabilitation and Reintegration of RFTFs, Geneva; Ingram, H.J. (2023). Strategic Communications in FTF R&R.
- [xxxv] Ingram, H.J. (2023). Strategic Communications in FTF R&R; Wouterse and Gssime, "Local Communications for Returning FTFs." RAN
- [xxxvi] Ingram, H.J. (2023). Strategic Communications in FTF R&R; Doctor et al. Reintegration of FTF Families.
- [xxxvii] RAN Manual 2017); Holmer and Shtuni (2017), Returning Foreign Fighters; Metodjeva, 'Bring Them Back: Manage the Risk.
- [xxxviii] RAN, Responses to returnees; KCSS (2020), Unpacking Kosovo's Response.
- [xxxix] Clubb, Gordon, Graeme Davies, and Yoshiharu Kobayashi. "Transparent Communication in Counter-Terrorism Policy: Does Transparency Increase Public Support and Trust in Terrorism Prevention Programmes?." *Terrorism and Political Violence* 37, no. 4 (2025): 531-549.
- [xl] Ingram, H.J. (2023). Strategic Communications in FTF R&R.
- [xli] Ingram, H.J. (2023). Strategic Communications in FTF R&R; Wouterse and Gssime, RAN 2020, "Local Communications for Returning FTFs."
- [xlii] Wouterse and Gssime, RAN 2020, "Local Communications for Returning FTFs."
- [xliii] Ingram, H.J. (2023). Strategic Communications in FTF R&R.