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ABSTRACT
Student–teacher relationships are highly important issues in education. Trust between these actors seems crucial in terms of forming a pedagogical alliance. Studies also suggest that educational systems dominated by test regimes may reduce trust in teachers. In this protocol, we describe a scoping review that will map research on students’ trust in schoolteachers. Specifically, we will examine what research designs have been applied, whether trust is studied as a result of a process or as a cause that affects other factors, and finally, whether student–teacher trust is studied in a micro perspective, organizational perspective, or a societal perspective. Ten databases will be searched, including ERIC, CINAHL, Web of Science, and Scandinavian scientific databases.
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Introduction

Background
The student–teacher relationship has become a major research field in recent decades (Katz et al., 2009; Skaalvik, 2011; Wang et al., 2020). In this scoping review project, we aim to investigate the student/pupil’s trust relationship with their schoolteacher. We will examine research methods, social scope, and whether trust/distrust is studied as an “effect” or a “cause” in social interactions.

We will argue that examining trust in teachers can benefit greatly from trust research on interpersonal relationships in a variety of different academic fields. Trust is extensively studied in fields like sociology (Grimen, 2009), health care (Conradsen, 2021, 2023; Skirbekk et al., 2011) and organizational research (Möllering, 2006, pp. 53–54). There are also a certain number of trust studies in the field of education. To our knowledge, only a few review papers and books have been published in this field, such as Niedlich et al. (2020), Forsyth et al. (2011), Leithwood (2021), Coady (2019), Shayo et al. (2021), and Khalfaoui (2021). A rapid review by Beltrano et al. (2021) may also be mentioned, though this paper focuses on trust in
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higher education, which is beyond our scope. None of these reviews have mapped the research methods, social scope or to what extent trust is studied as “effect” or “cause” in student–teacher relationships.

There is no common definition of trust in research. However, a much-used perspective is to define trust as a construct. One frequently used model is proposed by Hoy and Tschannen-Moran, who find that trust consists of the trustor’s sense of the trustee’s (1) benevolence, (2) reliability, (3) competence, (4) honesty, and (5) openness (Forsyth et al., 2011, p. 16ff; Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999). This definition will be used in this scoping review to include and exclude studies. Studies that focus on trust must use at least one of these facets to be included.

In terms of social scope, we will describe the field of trust in education from the micro-perspective (student–teacher trust in individual or class settings), meso perspective (student–teacher trust in a school setting), and macro perspective (student–teacher trust in a societal setting). These concepts are inspired by Bronfenbrenner’s ecological model (Bronfenbrenner, 1996).

From the micro perspective, several studies have found formative assessment to lead to numerous desirable outcomes, such as improved academic learning and better understanding (Gamlem & Smith, 2013; Hattie & Timperley, 2007). According to a study by Leighton and Busto Gómez, focusing on a pedagogical alliance through formative assessment may result in enhanced student trust in the instructor. It may also lead students to report greater well-being and enable teachers to identify more potential areas of confusion in students’ understanding of new content material (Leighton & Bustos Gómez, 2018). The systematic review paper of Khalfaoui et al. (2021) found in their study on multicultural classrooms for young children that a trustful relationship between the teacher and the students’ families was one out of eight factors that enhanced a positive classroom climate. In a multicultural classroom, students’ trust in peers can be enhanced by educators (Farini, 2012).

Student–teacher trust can also be explored by focusing on the school as an organizational body – the meso perspective. The concept of collective trust in school settings has been developed by Forsyth et al. based on numerous other studies. The concept of “collective trust” is based on expectations and attitudes between the faculty, parents, students, and principal, and also takes into account external factors. It may be defined as “The group’s consensus about the trustworthiness of another group becomes a shared belief” (Forsyth et al., 2011, p. 27). Amongst their findings was that students’ academic achievements were related to the level of collective trust (Forsyth et al., 2011, p. 88). Furthermore, there seems to be a positive relationship between students’ school trust and teachers’ collective learning processes (Jederlund & von Rosen, 2021). Management efforts seem to be able to modify organizational trust, and this affects tension and experienced discrimination. For students, trust-based relationships can reduce conflict and may also result in improved academic outcomes (Niedlich et al., 2020).
The degree of student trust in teachers and their perceptions of safety may significantly contribute to the students’ identification in school. This effect was stronger than factors like a free or reduced-price lunch, ethnicity, and school level, according to Mitchell et al. (2018). A Belgian study concluded there were four dimensions of trust in schools. First is the organizational dimension. This includes values, size, and other factors that affect the level of organizational trust in schools. Second, the socioeconomic context of schools strongly determines staff trust. Third, they found that trust in colleagues was higher in private than in public schools. Fourth, a high proportion of immigrant students seems to lower teachers’ trust in parents (Van Maele & Van Houtte, 2009). Leithwood’s review paper suggests that a trustful relationship among staff, students, and parents is one of the key factors for enabling equitable school leadership (Leithwood, 2021).

Niedlich et al.’s review paper reports that there are relatively few studies investigating societal trust and education from the macro perspective (Niedlich et al., 2020). These studies generally find a positive relationship between educational attainment and generalized trust. A Swedish study concluded that social trust may decline among adolescents if they experience victimization at school (Lundberg & Abdelzadeh, 2019). Engagement amongst rural multilingual families could be predicted by differentiated practices, relational trust between educators and families, and schools’ attention to geospatial variation (Coady, 2019). According to Niedlich et al., most studies on accountability approaches in educational systems take a critical perspective on this policy. These studies mostly find that test-based systems do not support improved educational performance and may even reduce trust between stakeholders in the educational system (Niedlich et al., 2020).

In this scoping review, we aim to describe what research methods are used in the field of students’ trust in teachers. In social sciences and education sciences, research methods have, since the late 1980s, often been described as either qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods (Creswell & Clark, 2018, p. 23). Möllering suggests a slightly different categorization in trust studies: qualitative, quantitative, and comparative (Möllering, 2006, p. 129). There are numerous ways to form such categories; for a scoping review, it can be useful to categorize the studies in a flexible style, meaning that the final categorization should, to some extent, be decided after the final inclusion of the papers.

As trust is a challenging concept to examine empirically, it should be studied with a variety of methods. “The general orientation should be to get away from measuring predefined variables and get closer to the respondents’ idiosyncratic experiences and interpretations” (Möllering, 2006, p. 152).

Trust can, according to a model presented by Möllering, be studied with four categories of what he describes as “stages of the causal chain”: preconditions, antecedents, manifestations, and consequences of trust (Möllering, 2006, p. 129). As our review aims to map paths for future research, this model – or a modification of it – can be useful to describe existing studies.
Aims
To direct future research on trust in the student–teacher relationship, a scoping literature review will be helpful for the research community and the field of education. We, therefore, wish to investigate the following:

What is the nature of studies on students’ trust or distrust in their teachers in terms of study design, “stage in the causal chain,” and the social perspective of the studies?

Research questions

a. On design: What is the frequency of the various designs used in the studies? Qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods? Observational or experimental?

b. On “stage in the causal chain:” How many studies investigate trust or distrust as a result of a process? What proportion of the studies investigates trust or distrust as a factor that affects other factors (such as academic skills, emotional support, etc.)?

c. On the level of analysis: how are trust or distrust in student–teacher relationship studies distributed in the following categories: (1) the micro perspective (e.g., classroom management), (2) the meso perspective (organizational), and (3) the macro perspective (societal)? How many studies are there in these categories?

d. On conclusions: What are the key findings of the studies?

e. On country/regions: In what countries or regions were the studies conducted?

Methodology

In this project, we will apply a scoping review approach. This is described as a relevant review method when the aim is relatively wide, and is also suitable for identifying the nature and extent of research (Grant & Booth, 2009, p. 95). Whereas a systematic review is applicable for informing decision-making on interventions, scoping reviews are appropriate to assess and understand the extent of the knowledge in a research field that is emerging, or identify, map, report, or discuss the characteristics or concepts in that field (Peters et al., 2020, p. 2121; Plch et al., 2023).

We will apply the template of the JBI Scoping Review Methodology Group as described by Peters et al. (2020) for the methods of the review and the protocol as such. This template suggests that a scoping review should describe (1) Inclusion criteria, (2) Search strategy, (3) Evidence screening and selection, (4) Data extraction, (5) Data analysis, and (6) Presentation of results. The Peters et al. description is in accordance with the PRISMA-ScR checklist of Tricco et al. (2018). This checklist will be applied in addition to the template. We will apply the PRISMA Flow Diagram as presented in Peter et al. (2015) chapter “Guidance for conducting systematic
scoping reviews” (Figure 1). The diagram will support a clear reporting of the process of arriving at the final included papers.

The protocol will be registered in the International Database of Education Systematic Reviews (IDESR). According to the guidelines of the database, review protocols cannot be registered ahead of a possible peer review of the protocol; therefore, we have not registered the project there yet (idesr.org).
Inclusion criteria

The JBI Scoping Review Methodology Group describes four types of criteria for inclusion: participants, concept, context, and evidence source (Peters et al., 2020).

Criteria for Inclusion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria type</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Students and teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>Students as trustors and teachers as trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Students of primary, secondary, or higher secondary education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence Sources</td>
<td>Empirical, peer-reviewed studies, no limitations on methods English and Scandinavian languages (Danish, Norwegian, Swedish) Date range 2000 and onwards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criteria of Exclusion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria type</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Kindergarten, higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>Studies not on students’ trust in teachers, but, e.g., students’ trust in schools, principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Activities in a non-school/recreational setting, such as non-school-related sports and religious activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence Sources</td>
<td>Not empirical studies Review papers Not English or Scandinavian language full-text Non peer-reviewed papers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Search strategy

Based on other review papers and advice from a specialized librarian, the following databases will be used to search for relevant papers in this review:

- Academic Search Elite
- CINAHL
- ERIC
- Oria (to include Scandinavian papers)
- Scopus
- SwePub (Swedish)
- Teacher Reference Center
- Tidsskrift.dk (Danish)
- Web of Science

A detailed description of each search string is outlined in the Appendix.

The searches will include keywords, abstracts, or title+abstract, depending on how the search engines are arranged.
Manual searches in research papers such as other review papers will also be performed.

We will include papers published from 2000 until the current date. As described in the Introduction, there were a number of relevant studies in the 1990s, but the societal preconditions for trust and education have altered significantly over the decades, so we find that a time span greater than this may weaken the outer validity/generalization of the review.

The following search terms will be applied:

- Trust* OR Distrust* (keyword)
- AND Student* OR Pupil* (title+abstract)
- AND Teacher* OR Educator* (title+abstract)
- NOT (Higher education OR University OR college) (title+abstract)

The exact search string for each database is presented in the Appendix.

The justification for searching for the keywords “trust” and “distrust” and for other concepts in the title and abstract is due to pilot searches. For instance, we found that many studies in educational research do not explicitly use either “student,” “pupil,” or “teacher” in their keywords. Furthermore, the word “trust” has multiple different meanings, like an arrangement or a company such as a “hospital trust.” “Trust” may also be mentioned in an abstract without actually being studied, such as qualitative studies that touch upon “a sense of safety, relationships, trust, and more.”

Data will be managed in the following way: We will download records from the databases as ris-files (research information systems), including as much information as possible, such as abstracts. These files will be uploaded to the web-based Rayyan application (rayyan.ai). The EndNote citation manager will be used if modifications to the ris-files are needed.

Evidence screening and selection
All three researchers will be involved in the screening process. First, the titles and abstracts will be assessed by at least two researchers individually, “blind” to each other. Then we will discuss the cases where we do not agree and reach a decision. The Rayyan application allows this process to be performed in a structured manner. See Figure 4 Timeline for a description of the roles of each researcher.

In the full text screening phase, a similar approach will be applied. In this phase as well, at least two researchers will screen the papers in full text and assess them for eligibility.

Data extraction
Guido Möllering suggests a model that describes six heuristics of trust research and categories in these heuristics (Figure 2). According to this concept, trust research can be described by (1) centrality of trust, (2) stages of the causal chain, (3) level of
analysis, (4) aim of investigation, (5) viewpoint of operationalization, and (6) methods of fieldwork (Möllering, 2006, p. 129). We will apply three of these in the present scoping review; the methods of fieldwork, stages of the causal chain (trust as a “cause” or “manifestation,” or trust as a “result”), and the level of analysis (micro, meso, or macro).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heuristics</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centrality of trust</td>
<td>Central, Peripheral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage of causal chain</td>
<td>Preconditions, Antecedents, Manifestations, Consequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of analysis</td>
<td>Micro, Meso, Macro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aim of investigation</td>
<td>Explorative, Descriptive, Predictive, Normative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewpoint of operationalization</td>
<td>Trustor, Trustee, Third party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method of fieldwork</td>
<td>Quantitative, Qualitative, Comparative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Heuristics for categorizing empirical work on trust.
(Möllering, 2006, p. 129).

In accordance with the JBI guidelines, we will present the extraction using a chart that includes the following:

1. Author(s)
2. Year of publication
3. Title
4. DOI
5. Country/state of the study
6. Design of the study
7. “Stage of the causal chain”
8. Social perspective (micro, meso, macro)
9. Key findings

A pilot extraction is presented in Figure 3. Two researchers will be involved in the extraction process for each record.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>DOI/URL</th>
<th>Country/region</th>
<th>RQ a: Design</th>
<th>RQ b: Stage</th>
<th>RQ c: Social</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smith &amp; Birney</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>The Organizational Trust of Elementary Schools and Dimensions of Student Bullying</td>
<td><a href="https://doi.org/10.1108/09513540510617427">https://doi.org/10.1108/09513540510617427</a></td>
<td>USA, Texas</td>
<td>Quantitative(?)</td>
<td>Precondition</td>
<td>Meso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Houtte</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>Students’ Autonomous and Controlled Motivation in Different School Contexts: The Role of Trust</td>
<td><a href="http://doi.org/10.1080/10564934.2022.2039069">http://doi.org/10.1080/10564934.2022.2039069</a></td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Antecedent</td>
<td>Meso</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Extraction (Pilot).

This process will take place in the Rayyan application and may have a different design than in this figure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Author Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Identify research questions</td>
<td>SC, EAO, HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>Develop search strings</td>
<td>SC, EAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pilot search strategy</td>
<td>SC, EAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Write and submit protocol</td>
<td>SC, HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Run searches</td>
<td>SC, EAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Study screening and selection</td>
<td>SC, EAO, HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–11</td>
<td>Data extraction and analysis</td>
<td>SC, EAO, HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–12</td>
<td>Summarizing and reporting results</td>
<td>SC, EAO, HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Prepare draft of manuscript</td>
<td>SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Amendments to manuscript</td>
<td>SC, EAO, HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Submit manuscript</td>
<td>SC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Timeline for scoping review.

Data analysis

Data will be deductively coded for the research questions using predefined categories, such as “stages of the causal chain.” RQ b. Coding will be inductive for the research questions where applicable, as suggested by Peters et al.: “Analysis of the data in scoping reviews should be pre-specified within the protocol to ensure transparency and justification of the chosen approach” (Peters et al., 2020, p. 2125).
Frequency data will be calculated for the research questions, such as the frequency of studies using qualitative, quantitative methods etc. We will not synthesize the conclusions of the included studies.

Rayyan will be applied for the coding process, and Microsoft Excel will be used to develop the table of findings.

All three researchers will be involved in the analysis stage, two for each record.

**Presentation of results**

In figures, tables, and text we will present:

1. The selection process, including a PRISMA flow diagram.
2. Key information related to each RQ.

(Peters et al., 2020, p. 2125)

**Discussion**

We expect to find a relatively large number of papers that, in various ways, are related to trust in education. A major challenge will be to select studies that operationalize trust and distrust in a way that is in accordance with our theoretical approach. As we are less concerned with, e.g., mere feelings of trust/distrust, a number of studies are expected to be excluded on that basis. Furthermore, although we have strived to make our search strings as targeted as possible, we expect to find a number of studies that are related to trust and distrust in education, but not in the student–teacher relationship.

We also expect not to find many papers on distrust.

**Relevance of the paper**

Our review paper will hopefully create a basis for further empirical studies on trust in student–teacher relationships. As Niedlich et al. (2020) pointed out, studies on parts of this field are scarce, especially studies on student–teacher relationships related to generalized trust in society.

As trust and distrust are regarded as core issues in social relations, we argue that empirical and theoretical work in this field should be highly interesting in education. As noted earlier, social relationships in schools are fundamental for student outcomes, teacher efficacy, and other beneficial factors.

Our focus on research methods, the stage of the causal chain, and the social horizon may be useful to the research community to advise future research efforts on the trust dimension in the field of the student–teacher relationship (RQ a-c).

We will use a number of databases for the search, and the fact that we include the Scandinavian languages may increase the relevance of the review for a Nordic audience. It should still be relevant for education in a great variety of societal contexts, especially because we have a specific focus on whether trust is studied with regard to societal perspectives (RQ c).
Strengths and limitations of the review

In the review, we will apply an approach with robust internal validity. Based on previous relevant review papers, we expect to find enough studies to provide reasonably high external validity. We will apply several high-quality search engines; we have consulted experienced advisors in the process of developing both the research questions and the search strings; and all three researchers will independently screen the papers that are identified. By using the Rayyan digital tool in the process, we will ensure a workflow that is both flexible and testable. To the extent it is relevant, we have applied the PRISMA statement to ensure internal validity and transparency (Page et al., 2021).

The findings may be at risk of having selection bias. By using search concepts that are as inclusive as possible, but still relevant, we hope to avoid this limitation. Usually, the major emphasis in review papers is on internal validity, and external validity/generalization cannot be guaranteed in advance. Such is the case in this review.

A limitation of this review is that it will not focus on forming a synthesis of the conclusions of the studies as such. In that sense, it may not be directly useful for advising practical education.

Author biographies

Stein Conradsen is an Associate Professor at the Department of Education at Volda University College, Volda, Norway. He teaches practical pedagogy and research methods, and supervises MA students in special education. The main focus of his research is on trust, especially trust in professional relationships, societal trust and the philosophy of trust.

Ester Alnes Osnes is an Assistant Professor at the Department of Education at Volda University College, Volda, Norway. Her teaching and supervision work encompasses practical pedagogy and mentoring. Osnes is interested in research on and the practice of mentoring, school organizations, education management and adapted education.

Helge Skirbekk is a full Professor at the Department of Nursing and Health Promotion at OsloMet University, Oslo, Norway. He teaches clinical communication, medical ethics, research methods and more. He has a broad research record, especially within medical sociology and has published numerous studies on trust in healthcare, both related to patient-professional trust, organizational trust and societal trust.

References


Trust in Schoolteachers


2. Appendix: Search strings

For the Scandinavian language search engines, an English translation is presented in italics. Please observe that in these languages words like “teacher” (lærer/lärare) and “student” (elev) do not have synonyms like “educator” and “pupil” in English.

2.1 Academic Search Elite

TI (student* OR pupil*) OR KW (student* OR pupil*) OR AB (student* OR pupil*)
AND TI (teacher* OR educator*) OR KW (teacher* OR educator*) OR AB (teacher* OR educator*)
AND TI (trust* OR mistrust* OR distrust*) OR KW (trust* OR mistrust* OR distrust*) OR AB (trust* OR mistrust* OR distrust*)
NOT KW (higher education OR college OR university)
Limiters – Peer Reviewed; Date Published: 20000101-20231231

2.2 CINAHL

TI (student* OR pupil*) OR SU (student* OR pupil*) OR AB (student* OR pupil*)
AND TI (teacher* OR educator*) OR SU (teacher* OR educator*) OR AB (teacher* OR educator*)
AND TI (trust* OR mistrust* OR distrust*) OR SU (trust* OR mistrust* OR distrust*) OR AB (trust* OR mistrust* OR distrust*)
NOT SU (higher education OR college OR university)
Limiters – Peer Reviewed; Date Published: 20000101-20231231

2.3 ERIC

TI (student* OR pupil*) OR KW (student* OR pupil*) OR AB (student* OR pupil*)
AND TI (teacher* OR educator*) OR KW (teacher* OR educator*) OR AB (teacher* OR educator*)
AND TI (trust* OR mistrust* OR distrust*) OR DE (trust* OR mistrust* OR distrust*) OR AB (trust* OR mistrust* OR distrust*)
NOT KW (higher education OR college OR university)
Limiters – Peer Reviewed; Date Published: 20000101-20231231; Education Level: Elementary Secondary Education, Grade 1, Grade 2, Grade 3, Grade 4, Grade 5, Grade 6, Grade 7, Grade 8, Grade 9, Grade 10, Grade 11, Grade 12, High School Equivalency Programs, High Schools, Junior High Schools, Middle Schools, Postsecondary Education, Primary Education, Secondary Education

2.4 Oria

tillit* (Tittel) ELLER tillit* (Emne) ELLER mistillit* (Tittel) ELLER mistillit* (Emne)
OG elev* (Alle felt)
OG lærer* (Alle felt)
Trust in Schoolteachers

English
trust* (Title) OR trust* (Keyword) OR distrust* (Title) OR distrust* (Keyword)
AND student* (All fields)
AND teacher* (All fields)

2.5 Scopus
TITLE-ABS-KEY (“trust” OR “distrust”)
AND (“student?” OR “pupil?”)
AND (“teacher?” OR “educator?”)
ANDNOT (“higher education” OR “university” OR “college”)

2.6 Swepub
1. tillit* elev* lärare*
2. förtroande* elev* lärare*
3. mistro* elev* lärare*

English
1. trust* student* teacher*
2. confidence* student* teacher* [“confidence” is here used as a Swedish synonym to “trust”]
3. distrust* student* teacher*

2.7 Teacher reference center
TI (student* OR pupil*) OR SU (student* OR pupil*) OR AB (student* OR pupil*)
AND TI (teacher* OR educator*) OR SU (teacher* OR educator*) OR AB (teacher* OR educator*)
AND TI (trust* OR mistrust* OR distrust*) OR SU (trust* OR mistrust* OR distrust*)
OR AB (trust* OR mistrust* OR distrust*)
NOT SU (higher education OR college OR university)
Limiters – Peer Reviewed; Date Published: 20000101-20231231

2.8 Tidsskrift.dk
1. tillit AND lærer AND elev
2. mistillit AND lærer AND elev

English
1. trust AND teacher AND student
2. distrust AND teacher AND student

2.9 Web of science
trust (Keyword plus) OR distrust (Keyword plus)
AND (student* OR pupil* (Topic))
AND (teacher* OR educator (Topic))
NOT (higher education OR universit* OR college* (KP))