Teaching Nurses to Think: Transforming Nursing Education from Second to Sixth Generation

What's Missing in Contemporary Nursing Education and How to Fix It

Daniel J. Pesut, PhD, RN, FAAN

Professor Emeritus, University of Minnesota and Indiana University School of Nursing

Emeritus Katherine R. and C. Walton Lillehei Chair in Nursing Leadership

University of Minnesota School of Nursing

Contact: dpesut@umn.edu

Abstract

After fifty years in nursing education and practice, I observe that most nursing education remains anchored in second-generation (1970-1990) paradigms while graduates will practice in environments requiring fourth through sixth generation capabilities (2010-2070). This article identifies ten critical gaps in contemporary nursing education: explicit metacognitive instruction, systems and complexity thinking, futures literacy and anticipatory thinking, data literacy for knowledge work, outcome-focused thinking, integration of critical-creative-systems-complexity thinking, standardized nursing language as intellectual infrastructure, narrative competence alongside analytical precision, authentic assessment of reasoning, and preparation for human-technology collaboration. Drawing on the six generations framework for nursing knowledge work evolution, I argue that nursing education faces an urgent imperative to transform from diagnosis-focused, linear nursing process instruction toward outcome-focused, systems-oriented, concurrent reasoning development that prepares students for predictive, technology-enhanced practice. The article provides evidence for each gap, explains consequences of inaction, and offers concrete solutions including curriculum redesign principles, pedagogical strategies, assessment methods, and faculty development approaches. I present a transformation roadmap spanning immediate actions (explicit metacognitive teaching, Clinical Reasoning Web implementation), intermediate changes (data literacy development, authentic assessment), and longer-term structural reforms (curriculum redesign, faculty development, practice-education partnerships). The meta-gap—being stuck in Generation 2—threatens nursing's ability to fulfill its social contract. By naming gaps explicitly, providing actionable solutions, and creating urgency for change, this article aims to catalyze the educational transformation required for nursing's future. The profession must move beyond incremental reform toward fundamental reimagining of how we prepare nurses to think, reason, and practice across six generations of knowledge work evolution.

Keywords: nursing education, clinical reasoning, metacognition, systems thinking, futures literacy, nursing process, generations of knowledge work, educational transformation, curriculum reform, OPT Model, complexity thinking, anticipatory leadership

Introduction: The Education-Practice Gap

I began my nursing education in the early 1970s when the profession was transitioning from first-generation problem-solving toward second-generation diagnostic reasoning. Nursing diagnosis was revolutionary—giving nurses disciplinary-specific language to describe human responses to health problems (Gebbie & Lavin, 1975). For the first time, nursing had vocabulary distinguishing our knowledge work from medical diagnosis. That innovation transformed the profession.

Fifty years later, much of nursing education remains rooted in that second-generation paradigm. We still teach the linear nursing process (ADPIE—Assessment, Diagnosis, Planning, Implementation, Evaluation) as if it represents how expert nurses actually think. We emphasize problem identification over outcome specification. We present diagnoses as lists rather than interconnected webs. We assess knowledge recall rather than reasoning capability. We prepare students for nursing practice as it existed in the 1980s, not as it will exist across their careers spanning 2020-2070.

Meanwhile, nursing practice evolves rapidly. Healthcare delivery increasingly depends on electronic health records that capture standardized nursing data. Data mining reveals patterns across thousands of patients, enabling evidence-based care archetypes. Artificial intelligence generates predictive alerts about patient trajectory changes before they manifest clinically. Nurses work in environments requiring concurrent reasoning about multiple interacting problems, systems thinking about cascading effects, and human-technology collaboration evaluating algorithmic recommendations (Pesut, 2006).

The gap between educational preparation and practice requirements threatens nursing's ability to fulfill its social contract. New graduates report feeling unprepared for practice complexity (Benner et al., 2010). Employers invest heavily in residency programs to develop reasoning capabilities that should emerge from basic education. Patients experience inconsistent care when nurses lack systematic approaches to clinical reasoning. The profession risks becoming reactive to external forces rather than proactive in shaping its future.

This article identifies what is missing in contemporary nursing education by examining practice requirements across six generations of knowledge work evolution (Pesut, 2006; Pesut & Herman, 1998, 1999). I describe ten critical gaps, explain their consequences, and provide concrete solutions. My aim is not to blame educators struggling with overstuffed curricula, limited resources, and competing demands. Rather, I hope to catalyze collective action by naming gaps explicitly, demonstrating why they matter, and offering practical pathways forward. After fifty years witnessing nursing's remarkable growth, I am convinced we can transform education to meet future challenges—if we act with awareness, authenticity, audacity, adaptability, and action (Ratcliffe & Ratcliffe, 2015).

Six Generations of Nursing Knowledge Work: Context for Understanding Educational Gaps

To understand what is missing in nursing education, we must first understand where nursing practice is heading. The six generations framework traces nursing knowledge work evolution from 1950 through projected 2070, showing how each generation represents fundamental transformation in how the profession conceptualizes its intellectual work (Pesut, 2006; Kuiper, Pesut, Turrise, and ODonnel, 2017; Kuiper, Pesut, Arms 2016).

First Generation (1950-1970): From Rituals to Problem-Solving

First-generation practice replaced ritual and tradition with systematic problem-solving. Pioneers like Faye Abdellah (1960) articulated patient problems requiring nursing intervention. The nursing process—assessment, planning, implementation, and evaluation provided structure for clinical thinking. This represented remarkable progress from intuitive practice, though it remained problem-focused with limited attention to outcomes or systemic complexity.

Second Generation (1970-1990): Diagnostic Reasoning and Standardized Language

Second-generation brought revolutionary advances through nursing diagnosis taxonomies. The 1973 first national conference on classification of nursing diagnoses-initiated dialogue about standardized nomenclature (Gebbie & Lavin, 1975). NANDA, along with Iowa's Nursing Interventions Classification (NIC) and Nursing Outcomes Classification (NOC), provided nursing with disciplinary-specific vocabulary (Bulechek et al., 2013; Herdman & Kamitsuru, 2018; Moorhead et al., 2018). The nursing process evolved to ADPIE—adding "Diagnosis" as integral step. However, linear, sequential structure poorly represented expert nurses' concurrent, iterative, holistic reasoning (Benner et al., 1997; Kautz, Kuiper, Pesut, & Williams,2006).

Third Generation (1990-2010): Outcome Specification and Systems Thinking

Third generation shifted emphasis from problems toward outcomes through frameworks like NOC and the Outcome-Present State-Test (OPT) Model (Pesut & Herman, 1998, 1999). Rather than focusing exclusively on what is wrong, third generation thinking asks: What do we want to achieve? The OPT Model employs Clinical Reasoning Webs to visualize relationships among diagnoses, juxtaposes present states with outcome states, identifies keystone issues through complexity thinking, and uses the Five Cs of clinical judgment to guide decision-making. This simple reorientation profoundly transforms clinical reasoning by creating explicit targets, enabling measurement of progress, and supporting evidence-based practice by clarifying relationships among diagnoses, interventions, and outcomes (Kuiper, Pesut, Arms, 2016).

Fourth Generation (2010-2030): Knowledge Modeling Through Data Mining

Fourth generation organizes nursing knowledge work around systematic knowledge building through data mining and pattern discovery. As healthcare agencies incorporate standardized nursing language into electronic health records, computational representation of clinical reasoning patterns becomes possible. Delaney and colleagues' pioneering work demonstrates how mining the Nursing Minimum Data Set enables describing patient problems, nursing treatment patterns, enhanced care profiles, and knowledge discovery (Delaney et al., 2000, 2003). Fourth-generation

practice emphasizes capturing expert knowledge in ways supporting clinical decision systems and evidence-based practice.

Fifth Generation (2030-2050): Prescriptive Nursing Through Empirically Based Archetypes

As data accumulate from fourth-generation knowledge modeling, fifth generation develops empirically-based care archetypes—prototypes derived from analysis of large datasets spanning multiple institutions and populations. Rather than relying solely on individual judgment or general guidelines, fifth-generation nursing leverages empirical patterns discovered through systematic analysis of relationships among diagnoses, interventions, and outcomes. Sophisticated algorithms informed by vast datasets recommend personalized care approaches with high probability of achieving desired outcomes.

Sixth Generation (2050-2070): Predictive Nursing and Anticipatory Care

Sixth generation represents the most dramatic transformation: moving from reactive problem-solving toward proactive health optimization through predictive modeling. Predictive nursing employs advanced analytics and early warning systems to anticipate health trajectory changes before they manifest in obvious clinical deterioration. Rather than waiting for problems to emerge, predictive nursing identifies subtle patterns signaling emerging challenges and opportunities for preventive intervention. Nurses work alongside artificial intelligence to interpret probabilistic predictions, evaluate appropriateness for individual patients, and implement preventive interventions aligned with patient values and goals.

This six-generation framework reveals the profound gap between most nursing education (anchored in Generation 2) and emerging practice requirements (Generations 4-6). Students learn linear nursing process while practice requires concurrent reasoning. They memorize diagnoses while practice generates data enabling pattern discovery. They solve individual patient problems while practice shifts toward population-level prediction and prevention. Understanding this gap is essential for recognizing what's missing and why transformation matters urgently.

Ten Critical Gaps in Contemporary Nursing Education

Having established the evolutionary context, I now identify ten critical gaps in contemporary nursing education. For each gap, I describe what is missing, provide evidence of the gap's existence, explain consequences, and offer solutions.

Gap 1: Explicit Metacognitive Instruction

What's Missing

Nursing education teaches WHAT to think about—assessment parameters, diagnostic criteria, intervention options—but rarely teaches HOW to think. The cognitive processes underlying expert clinical reasoning remain invisible and implicit (Kuiper & Pesut, 2004). Students are expected to develop metacognition (thinking about thinking) through osmosis rather than explicit instruction.

No structured self-talk protocols are taught systematically. Clinical reasoning remains a mysterious "black box" rather than a transparent, teachable process.

Evidence of the Gap

Students can list nursing diagnoses but struggle to explain relationships among them. They complete care plans as compliance exercises rather than as tools for thinking. Graduates enter practice without conscious awareness of their own reasoning processes—they cannot articulate HOW they reached conclusions, only WHAT conclusions they reached. Faculty assess products (care plans, concept maps) rather than processes (the reasoning that generated those products). When asked "How did you figure that out?" students respond "I don't know, I just knew" rather than describing systematic thinking steps.

Consequences

Without metacognitive awareness, nurses cannot deliberately improve their reasoning. They repeat ineffective patterns without recognizing them. They struggle to adapt reasoning strategies to novel situations. Expertise development slows because deliberate practice requires awareness of what to practice. Clinical errors increase when nurses cannot identify flawed reasoning processes. Professional development efforts prove ineffective because nurses lack vocabulary and frameworks for discussing thinking itself.

Solutions

Teach structured self-talk protocols explicitly from first semester: "_____ is related to _____ because _____." This simple stem makes reasoning visible and provides scaffold for metacognitive development. Require students to verbalize their reasoning aloud during simulation and clinical experiences. Create reflection assignments asking students to analyze their own thinking processes: "What did I notice first? What assumptions did I make? How did I decide among options? What would I do differently next time?" Use think-aloud protocols as both teaching method and assessment tool. Model metacognitive awareness by faculty verbalizing their own reasoning: "I'm noticing these three symptoms cluster together, which makes me think about this diagnosis..." Make the invisible visible through consistent, explicit attention to thinking processes Kautz et al., 2005).

Gap 2: Systems and Complexity Thinking

What's Missing

Linear, reductionist thinking dominates nursing curricula despite practice requiring systems thinking. Problems are treated as isolated entities rather than interconnected elements within complex adaptive systems. "One problem equals one intervention" mentality persists. Teaching of keystone issues, leverage points, feedback loops, and cascading effects remains absent. Complexity science appears occasionally in theory courses but rarely integrates into clinical teaching. Care plans present diagnoses as lists, fundamentally misrepresenting the web-like nature of patient situations (Pesut, Headrick, Holmboe, Moore, , 2023).

Evidence of the Gap

Students struggle profoundly with patients having multiple interacting conditions. They cannot identify which problem to address first, treating everything as equal priority. Graduates report feeling overwhelmed by real-world "messiness" that education did not prepare them for. When asked "How does this diagnosis relate to that one?" students respond with blank stares or vague statements about "everything affecting everything." Care planning tools reinforce linear thinking by requiring lists rather than maps. Faculty rarely model systems thinking explicitly in clinical debriefings.

Solutions

Introduce Clinical Reasoning Webs (CRWs) in first semester as primary tool for representing patient situations (Pesut & Herman, 1999; Kuiper, Pesut, 2004; Kautz et. all, 2005)). Require students to construct CRWs for every major case study, explicitly mapping relationships among diagnoses. Teach students to analyze: "If I address THIS diagnosis effectively, what positive cascade effects might occur? What other problems might improve?" This cultivates attention to keystone issues—diagnoses that, when addressed, create positive ripple effects throughout the system. Integrate systems dynamics concepts into pathophysiology courses. Use complexity science as foundational framework rather than add-on topic. Assess students' ability to map relationships and identify keystone issues, not just list diagnoses (Kuiper, Bell-Kotwall, Heinrich, Graham, & Matthias, 2005).

Gap 3: Futures Literacy and Anticipatory Thinking

What's Missing: Education prepares students for nursing as it currently exists with no systematic attention to how practice will evolve. Technology is treated as tool-training rather than transformation. Students develop no foresight capabilities or anticipatory thinking skills. Future-focused questions receive blank stares.

Solutions: Teach the six generations framework explicitly. Have students envision "What will patients need in 2050?" Use futures thinking tools like environmental scanning, Futures Wheels, and scenario planning. Develop anticipatory leadership literacies: awareness, authenticity, audacity, adaptability, action (Ratcliffe & Ratcliffe, 2015). Help students understand how technology transforms (not just assists) clinical reasoning (Pesut, 2019).

Gap 4: Data Literacy for Knowledge Work

What's Missing: Students lack understanding of nursing as data-generating practice. They do not recognize that documentation contributes to collective knowledge building. No grasp of how their data feeds fourth-generation knowledge modeling. Cannot interpret or critique predictive models or AI recommendations.

Solutions: Teach that every EHR entry contributes to nursing's knowledge base. Provide basic understanding of data mining, pattern recognition, predictive analytics. Develop critical evaluation skills for algorithmic recommendations. Address ethical dimensions of data use, privacy, and algorithmic bias. Position students as knowledge workers, not just task completers.

Gap 5: Outcome-Focused (vs. Problem-Focused) Thinking

What's Missing: Second-generation diagnosis-focused teaching persists. "What's wrong?" dominates over "What do we want to achieve?" Traditional ADPIE is presented as THE nursing process. NOC taught separately from NANDA if at all.

Solutions: Teach outcome specification FIRST, then problem identification. Make juxtaposition of present state and outcome state core skill. Integrate NOC with NANDA from beginning. Ask reflexively: "What would success look like?" Measure progress toward outcomes, not just problem resolution (Pesut & Herman, 1998).

Gaps 6-10: Additional Critical Missing Elements

Gap 6 - Integration of Critical, Creative, Systems, and Complexity Thinking: All four thinking modes must be taught as integrated competency, not separately. Creative thinking (generating novel associations) deserves equal emphasis with critical thinking.

Gap 7 - Standardized Nursing Language as Intellectual Infrastructure: Teach WHY NANDA-NIC-NOC matter (enabling future knowledge modeling), not just WHAT they are. Connect to data mining and predictive models.

Gap 8 - Narrative Competence Alongside Analytical Precision: Students must fluidly move between patient stories and diagnostic terminology. Both are essential; neither sufficient alone.

Gap 9 - Authentic Assessment of Reasoning: Assess reasoning processes directly through think-aloud protocols, CRW analysis with rationale, and reasoning revision based on new data—not just knowledge recall through multiple choice (Kautz et. all, 2005).

Gap 10 - Human-Technology Collaboration: Prepare students for working alongside AI and algorithms. Teach when to trust vs. override technology. Develop critical collaboration skills, not passive technology use.

The Meta-Gap: Stuck in Second Generation

These ten gaps stem from a fundamental meta-gap: most nursing education remains rooted in second-generation (1970-1990) paradigm while practice increasingly requires fourth through sixth generation capabilities. We teach diagnosis-focused, linear nursing process (ADPIE), problem-solving orientation, individual patient focus, implicit reasoning processes, and paper-based documentation mindsets. Meanwhile, practice requires outcome-focused, systems-oriented, concurrent reasoning; data literacy and knowledge modeling; working with prescriptive archetypes; and human-algorithm collaboration. We prepare students for 1980s practice while they will work in 2030-2070 environments. This temporal misalignment threatens nursing's ability to fulfill its social contract and risks making the profession reactive rather than proactive in shaping its future.

A Transformation Roadmap: From Awareness to Action

Recognizing gaps is necessary but insufficient. Transformation requires coordinated action at multiple levels. I propose a three-phase roadmap spanning immediate actions, intermediate changes, and longer-term structural reforms.

Phase 1: Immediate Actions (Now)

Faculty can implement these changes immediately within existing curriculum structures:

- Teach structured self-talk protocols explicitly: "____ is related to ____ because ____." Make this routine language.
- Introduce Clinical Reasoning Webs as primary patient representation tool. Have students construct CRWs for every major case.
- Replace "problem-focused" language with "outcome-focused" questions: "What do we want to achieve?" before "What's wrong?"
- Model metacognitive awareness by verbalizing your own reasoning in clinical teaching.
- Add futures-oriented questions to every unit: "How might this evolve over your career?"
- Use think-aloud protocols in simulation as both teaching method and assessment tool.
- Assign reflections analyzing thinking processes, not just clinical outcomes.

Phase 2: Intermediate Changes (1-2 Years)

These require curriculum committee approval and faculty development:

- Redesign assessment methods to evaluate reasoning directly. Replace some multiple-choice exams with CRW analysis, think-aloud protocols, reasoning revision exercises.
- Integrate NANDA-NIC-NOC throughout curriculum with explicit teaching of WHY they matter for knowledge modeling.
- Add data literacy competencies: understanding data mining, pattern recognition, interpreting predictive analytics.
- Implement systematic futures literacy development: six generations framework, trend analysis, scenario planning.
- Create faculty learning communities focused on teaching clinical reasoning explicitly.
- Develop partnerships with clinical sites supporting new teaching approaches.
- Revise clinical evaluation tools to assess systems thinking and keystone issue identification.

Phase 3: Longer-Term Structural Reforms (3-5 Years)

These require institutional commitment and sustained effort:

- Radical curriculum redesign organized around reasoning development rather than content coverage.
- Third-generation OPT Model as organizing framework replacing second-generation ADPIE.
- Systematic faculty development programs in metacognition, systems thinking, complexity science, futures literacy.
- New courses: Clinical Reasoning Across Generations, Futures of Nursing Practice, Human-AI

Collaboration in Healthcare.
• Technology infrastructure supporting CRW construction, visualization, and analysis.
• Practice-education partnerships creating learning environments that model future practice.
• Accreditation standard revisions emphasizing reasoning capabilities over content mastery.
• NCLEX evolution to assess clinical reasoning directly, not just knowledge recall.
• National initiatives similar to Quality and Safety Education for Nurses (QSEN) focused on reasoning competencies.

Call to Action: Stakeholder Responsibilities

Transformation requires coordinated action from multiple stakeholders. Each group has essential contributions:

Nurse Educators

Start tomorrow: Teach self-talk protocols explicitly. Introduce CRWs in your courses. Model metacognitive awareness. Replace some content with reasoning process instruction. Join or create faculty learning communities focused on clinical reasoning. Advocate for curriculum redesign. Update your own mental models, you may have learned second-generation nursing process but can teach third generation and prepare students for fourth through sixth.

Nursing Program Administrators

Invest in faculty development focused on teaching clinical reasoning. Create protected time for curriculum redesign. Support experimentation with new teaching methods. Advocate with accreditors for standards emphasizing reasoning over content. Build partnerships with clinical sites willing to support innovation. Allocate resources for technology supporting CRW construction and visualization.

Nursing Students

Demand teaching that develops your thinking, not just fills your head with facts. Construct CRWs even when not required. Practice metacognitive awareness by analyzing your own reasoning. Ask "What do we want to achieve?" before focusing on problems. Envision your practice across 40–50-year careers. Prepare for technology-enhanced environments. Advocate for assessment methods that demonstrate your reasoning.

Conclusion: The Urgency of Transformation

After fifty years in nursing, I am more hopeful than ever about the profession's future—if we embrace transformation with courage and commitment. The ten gaps identified in this article are not insurmountable. The solutions are practical, evidence-based, and achievable. What is required is collective will to move beyond incremental reform toward fundamental reimagining of how we prepare nurses to think, reason, and practice.

The meta-gap—being stuck in Generation 2 while practice evolves toward Generations 4-6—creates urgent imperative for action. Students entering programs today will practice through 2070.

They will work with artificial intelligence, predictive analytics, prescriptive care archetypes, and technologies we cannot yet imagine. They will need to reason concurrently about complex, interconnected problems. They will function as knowledge workers generating data that builds collective nursing wisdom. Preparing them with 1980s paradigms is professional malpractice.

The transformation roadmap provides concrete pathways forward. Faculty can begin tomorrow teaching metacognitive protocols and Clinical Reasoning Webs. Programs can implement intermediate changes within two years. The profession can achieve structural reforms within five years—if we act with the anticipatory leadership literacies this moment demands: awareness of gaps and consequences, authenticity in acknowledging limitations, audacity to experiment boldly, adaptability to refine based on experience, and action translating insights into changed practice (Ratcliffe & Ratcliffe, 2015).

Nursing has repeatedly demonstrated remarkable capacity for evolution. From first-generation problem-solving through second-generation diagnostic reasoning to third-generation outcome specification, the profession has transformed its knowledge work to meet emerging needs. Now we must transform again—this time preparing students not just for current practice but for six generations of evolving knowledge work spanning 120 years. This is not optional enhancement but existential necessity. The future of nursing depends on cultivating both the clinical reasoning capabilities to think effectively within increasingly complex environments and the foresight capacities to navigate transformation proactively rather than reactively.

My hope is that this article catalyzes action. By naming gaps explicitly, demonstrating why they matter, providing concrete solutions, and creating urgency for change, I aim to move the profession beyond awareness toward transformation. After fifty years, I know that nursing educators care deeply about preparing students well. What has been missing is not commitment but clarity about what needs to change and how to change it. That clarity is now before us. The question is whether we will act with the courage this moment requires. I believe we will—because nursing always has when patients' lives depend on it. And they do.

References

Abdellah, F. G. (1960). *Patient-centered approaches to nursing*. Macmillan.

Benner, P., Sutphen, M., Leonard, V., & Day, L. (2010). *Educating nurses: A call for radical transformation*. Jossey-Bass.

Benner, P., Tanner, C., & Chesla, C. (1997). *Expertise in nursing practice: Caring, clinical judgment, and ethics*. Springer Publishing Company.

Bulechek, G. M., Butcher, H. K., Dochterman, J. M., & Wagner, C. M. (Eds.) (2013). *Nursing interventions classification (NIC) (6th ed.)*. Elsevier.

Delaney, C., Reed, D., & Clarke, M. (2000). *Describing patient problems and nursing treatment patterns using nursing minimum data sets. In J. M. Overhage (Ed.), Proceedings of the American Medical Informatics Association 2000 Annual Meeting (pp. 176-179)*. Hanley & Belfus.

Delaney, C., Ruiz, M., Clarke, M., & Srinivasan, P. (2003). *Knowledge discovery in databases: Data mining the NMDS. In V. Saba et al. (Eds.), One step beyond: The evolution of technology & nursing (pp. 61-65)*. Adis International.

Gebbie, K. M., & Lavin, M. A. (1975). *Classification of nursing diagnoses: Proceedings of the first national conference*. Mosby.

Herdman, T. H., & Kamitsuru, S. (Eds.) (2018). *NANDA International nursing diagnoses: Definitions and classification, 2018-2020 (11th ed.)*. Thieme.

Kautz, D. D., Kuiper, R., Pesut, D. J., & Williams, R. L. (2006). Using NANDA, NIC, and NOC (NNN) language for clinical reasoning with the Outcome‐Present State‐Test (OPT) Model. International Journal of Nursing Terminologies and Classifications, 17(3), 129-138.

Kautz, D. D., Kuiper, R., Pesut, D. J., Knight-Brown, P., & Daneker, D. (2005). Promoting clinical reasoning in undergraduate nursing students: application and evaluation of the Outcome Present State Test (OPT) model of clinical reasoning. International Journal of Nursing Education Scholarship, 2(1).

Kuiper, R., Pesut, D. J., & Arms, T. E. (2016). Clinical reasoning and care coordination in advanced practice nursing. Springer Publishing Company.

Kuiper, R., O'Donnell, S. M., Pesut, D. J., & Turrise, S. L. (2017). The essentials of clinical reasoning for nurses: using the outcome-present state test model for reflective practice. Sigma Theta Tau.

Kuiper, R., Bell-Kotwall, L., Heinrich, C., Graham, M. J., & Matthias, A. (2008). Debriefing with the OPT model of clinical reasoning during high fidelity patient simulation. International journal of nursing education scholarship, 5(1).

Kuiper, R. A., & Pesut, D. J. (2004). Promoting cognitive and metacognitive reflective reasoning skills in nursing practice: self‐regulated learning theory. Journal of advanced nursing, 45(4), 381-391.

Moorhead, S., Johnson, M., Maas, M. L., & Swanson, E. (E. (Eds.) (2018). *Nursing outcomes classification (NOC): Measurement of health outcomes (6th ed.)*. Elsevier.

Pesut, D. J., Headrick, L. A., Holmboe, E., & Moore, S. M. (2023). Systems and complexity thinking to master leadership challenges in interprofessional health professionals education. Journal of Medical Education and Curricular Development, 10, 23821205231175205.

Pesut, D. J. (2019). Anticipating disruptive innovations with foresight leadership. Nursing administration quarterly, 43(3), 196-204.

Pesut, D. J. (2006). *21st century nursing knowledge work: Reasoning into the future. In C. Weaver et al. (Eds.), Nursing and informatics for the 21st century (2nd ed., pp. 13-23)*. Healthcare Information and Management Systems Society.

Pesut, D. J., & Herman, J. (1998). OPT: Transformation of nursing process for contemporary practice. *Nursing Outlook*, 46(1), 29-36.

Pesut, D. J., & Herman, J. (1999). *Clinical reasoning: The art and science of critical and creative thinking*. Delmar Publishers.

Ratcliffe, J., & Ratcliffe, L. (2015). Anticipatory leadership and strategic foresight: Five 'linked literacies'. *Journal of Futures Studies*, 20(1), 1-18.