

Challenges in teaching clinical reasoning in nursing education

Desafios no ensino do raciocínio clínico na educação em enfermagem

Loïc Martin 

Université de Rouen-Normandie (Normandy), France. loic.martin2@univ-rouen.fr

Regardless of the country, clinical reasoning in nursing — defined as “an intellectual activity that synthesizes information obtained from the clinical situation, integrates it with prior knowledge and experience, and uses it to make decisions regarding patient diagnosis and management”¹ — forms the foundation of healthcare education frameworks in universities, nursing training institutes, and health colleges. Like in medical professions², it is considered an essential competency and a pedagogical priority for nursing practice and the discipline itself^{3,4}. Clinical reasoning enables nurses to make individualized and appropriate clinical judgments in increasingly complex situations, particularly due to demographic aging and the rising prevalence of chronic diseases, thereby ensuring safer therapeutic decisions.

However, the literature points out that this is a complex and heterogeneous process, affecting both students and educators⁵. It highlights the lack of consensus regarding an *ad hoc* definition⁶ and unified terminology⁷, with the interchangeable use of terms such as clinical reasoning and clinical judgment. Furthermore, its structure is abstract and often invisible to students, frequently

described as a “black box” phenomenon due to both conscious and unconscious cognitive operations that depend on contextual factors^{8,9}. Although a multitude of teaching strategies are available, there is a lack of evidence-based pedagogical standards and recommendations.

Several scientific studies have been conducted to substantiate this observation¹⁰⁻¹³. For example, Sudacka et al.’s 2021 article¹⁴, although focused on medicine, provides a relevant structure and guidance regarding the obstacles encountered when teaching nursing clinical reasoning. These authors identify seven major obstacles:

1. **Lack of time** (time to teach, insufficient curriculum time, or lack of time for self-training);
2. **Teaching process issues**, such as skepticism about explicit teaching of clinical reasoning, lack of knowledge of methods, shortage of qualified teachers, and absence of local leaders to drive this process;
3. **Lack of motivation and institutional support**, particularly financial, and insufficient incentives;

4. **Insufficiently established culture**, due to an absence of a culture of error, lack of self-reflection, or insufficient collaboration between clinical professionals and academia;

5. **Teachers' lack of knowledge about the theoretical foundations of clinical reasoning** and disagreements over its definition;

6. **Lack of knowledge about relevant assessment methods**;

7. **Insufficient technical and logistical infrastructure** (availability of classrooms).

Faced with these obstacles and considering the increasing complexity of patient care as well as the evolving requirements of nursing education, this editorial aims to explore the foundations of clinical reasoning and the associated pedagogical challenges. It also provides a focus on several feasible strategies to enhance both the teaching and assessment of clinical reasoning, drawing on an experiential approach and evidence-based data.

Thus, several challenges need to be considered. First, it is essential to ensure semantic and methodological coherence among teaching professionals within training institutions. Although specialized teachers support the learning of clinical reasoning, all nursing education teams are concerned about this topic. No subject taught can avoid this essential competency.

Given that it is a complex process and is not always considered a priority in the profession, it is necessary to make its teaching engaging and attractive, and to give meaning to pedagogical activities so that they align with the future profession of students. To achieve this, as demonstrated in a book published in France¹⁵, it is essential to rely on learning facilitators from educational and training sciences¹⁶. This implies that teachers responsible for this instruction must combine pedagogical and technical expertise. This inevitably requires rigorous training based on these principles, with a specific focus on conceptual models and nursing theories that are still underutilized outside Henderson's definition

of nursing, Watson's Caring theory, or Nightingale's environmental theory.

This training will, in part, address the management of learner diversity, enabling teachers to develop differentiated pedagogy — that is, to implement a variety of teaching and learning methods and procedures so that students with heterogeneous abilities, skills, and knowledge can achieve common objectives in different ways¹⁷. This pedagogy could be based on a diversity of methods such as simulation, role-playing, mind maps, and, in addition to more traditional approaches, objective structured clinical examinations. In parallel, clinical placements would provide an opportunity, beyond the acquisition of technical skills (such as blood transfusion), to develop debriefings following care episodes, to strengthen reasoning and reflective practice.

Another challenge is to facilitate the development of shared clinical reasoning. To this end, teachers can organize pedagogical sequences to develop socio-constructivism and socio-cognitive conflict, which closely resemble students' future clinical activities^{18,19}.

Aligning the shared pedagogical project for teaching clinical reasoning between theory in training institutions and practice at the patient's bedside is also a challenge to reduce discrepancies between these two learning environments. The development of dual educator-clinician positions could be a sustainable solution to promote this alignment, thereby strengthening the partnership between these two worlds and providing more comprehensive and coherent teaching.

Finally, in addition to these non-exhaustive proposals, increased research in nursing science on this topic would provide new nursing knowledge and offer evidence-based data to leaders, positively influencing the teaching of clinical reasoning and, as a result, enabling more secure analysis of clinical situations and decision-making for better patient care. Such research would provide an opportunity to share knowledge on nursing clinical reasoning across different countries and to facilitate the creation of international collaborative networks.

Competing interests

No financial, legal or political conflict involving third parties (government, companies and private foundations, etc.) has been declared for any aspect of the submitted work (including but not limited to grants and funding, participation in advisory board, study design, manuscript preparation, statistical analysis, etc.).

Indexers

The Journal of Contemporary Nursing is indexed by [DOAJ](#) and [EBSCO](#).



References

1. Charlin B, Bordage G, Van Der Vleuten C. L'évaluation du raisonnement clinique. *Pédagogie Médicale*. 2003;4(1):42-52. <https://doi.org/10.1051/pmed:2003015>
2. Huesmann L, Sudacka M, Durning SJ, Georg C, Huwendiek S, Kononowicz AA, et al. Clinical reasoning: What do nurses, physicians, and students reason about. *J Interprof Care*. 2023;37(6):990-8. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13561820.2023.2208605>
3. Côté S, St-Cyr Tribble D. Clinical reasoning in nursing, a concept analysis. *Rech Soins Infirm*. 2012;111(4):13-21. <https://doi.org/10.3917/rsi.111.0013>
4. Higgs J, Jensen GM, Loftus S, Christensen N. *Clinical reasoning in the health professions*. 4th ed. Elsevier; 2018.
5. Gonzalez L. Teaching Clinical Reasoning Piece by Piece: A Clinical Reasoning Concept-Based Learning Method. *J Nurs Educ*. 2018;57(12):727-35. <https://doi.org/10.3928/01484834-20181119-05>
6. Young M, Thomas A, Gordon D, Gruppen L, Lubarsky S, Rencic J, et al. The terminology of clinical reasoning in health professions education: Implications and considerations. *Med Teach*. 2019;41(11):1277-84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2019.1635686>
7. Koufidis C, Manninen K, Nieminen J, Wohlin M, Silén C. Unravelling the polyphony in clinical reasoning research in medical education. *J Eval Clin Pract*. 2021;27(2):438-50. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jep.13432>
8. Parodis I, Andersson L, Durning SJ, Hege I, Knez J, Kononowicz AA, et al. Clinical Reasoning Needs to Be Explicitly Addressed in Health Professions Curricula: Recommendations from a European Consortium. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18(21):11202. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph182111202>
9. Daniel M, Rencic J, Durning SJ, Holmboe E, Santen SA, Lang V, et al. *Clinical Reasoning Assessment Methods: A Scoping Review and Practical Guidance*. *Acad Med*. 2019;94(6):902-12. <http://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000002618>
10. Tyo MB, McCurry MK. An Integrative Review of Clinical Reasoning Teaching Strategies and Outcome Evaluation in Nursing Education. *Nurs Educ Perspect*. 2019;40(1):11-7. <http://doi.org/10.1097/01.NEP.0000000000000375>
11. Audétat MC, Laurin S, Dory V, Charlin B, Nendaz M. Diagnosis and management of clinical reasoning difficulties AMEE Guide no 117 (short version). Part II. Clinical reasoning difficulties: management and remediation strategies. *Pédagogie Médicale*. 2017;18(3):139-49. <https://doi.org/10.1051/pmed/2018011>
12. Guet P. Spécificité des obstacles d'apprentissage du raisonnement clinique autour de la marche en formation initiale de masso-kinésithérapie et contribution didactique. *Kinésithérapie Rev* [Internet]. 2011;11(117):35-41. Available from: <https://www.em-consulte.com/article/653357/specificite-des-obstacles-dapprentissage-du-raison>
13. Demeester A, Eymard C, Vanpee D. Learning clinical reasoning: identified difficulties for future midwives. *Rev Fr Pédagogie*. 2012;(181):43-54. <https://doi.org/10.4000/rfp.3906>
14. Sudacka M, Adler M, Durning SJ, Edelbring S, Frankowska A, Hartmann D, et al. Why is it so difficult to implement a longitudinal clinical reasoning curriculum? A multicenter interview study on the barriers perceived by European health professions educators. *BMC Med Educ*. 2021;21(1):575. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-021-02960-w>
15. Martin L. *Le raisonnement clinique: guide méthodologique infirmier*. 2nd ed. Issy-les-Moulineaux: Elsevier Masson; 2023.
16. Guillaume L, Manil JF. *7 facilitateurs de l'apprentissage: vivre du bonheur pédagogique*. *Chronique sociale*; 2016.
17. Miniac CB. La pédagogie différenciée. *Rech Form* [Internet]. 1989;5(1):119-24. Available from: https://www.persee.fr/doc/refor_0988-1824_1989_num_5_1_970
18. Astolfi JP, Darot E, Ginsburger-Vogel Y, Toussaint J. *Mots-clés de la didactique des sciences: repères, définitions, bibliographies*. 2nd ed. Bruxelles: De Boeck Université; 2011.
19. Bourgeois É. Chapitre 1. Les théories de l'apprentissage: un peu d'histoire... In: Bourgeois É, Chapelle G. *Apprendre et faire apprendre*. Presses Universitaires de France; 2011. p. 23-39. <https://doi.org/10.3917/puf.brgeo.2011.01.0023>