JOURNAL OF BEHAVIORAL HEALTH AND PSYCHOLOGY, 2025
VOL 14, NO. 6, PAGE 1 – 7

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Open Access

From Master and Apprentice to Multiple Choice: The Erosion of Clinical Judgment in Medical Education

Julian Ungar-Sargon MD PhD*

Borra College of Health Sciences, Dominican University IL, USA.

ABSTRACT

The apprenticeship model, tracing its roots to medieval guild systems, served as the foundation of medical education for centuries. This pedagogical approach, characterized by sustained mentorship, situated learning, and the gradual development of clinical judgment through direct observation and practice, has been progressively displaced by standardized assessment methods dominated by multiple-choice examinations. Drawing upon historical analysis of medieval apprenticeship structures, contemporary scholarship on medical education, and qualitative interview data, this article examines how this transformation has fundamentally altered the nature of physician training. The shift from apprenticeship to assessment-centered education has introduced systematic biases related to socioeconomic status, cultural capital, and linguistic fluency while simultaneously undermining the development of essential clinical competencies including narrative reasoning, empathic engagement, and tolerance for diagnostic ambiguity. This analysis proposes alternative assessment frameworks including narrative medicine, workplace-based evaluation, and competency-based portfolios that might restore the relational and experiential dimensions of medical learning while addressing the structural inadequacies of current credentialing systems.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received Date: 20 October 2025
Accepted Date: 04 November 2025
Published Date: 12 November 2025

KEYWORDS

Medical education, Apprenticeship, Clinical judgment, Assessment, Multiple-choice examinations, Narrative medicine, Cultural capital, Epistemological violence, Tacit knowledge, Competency-based education, Hemispheric functioning, Situated learning, Right hemisphere, Left hemisphere, Cognitive integration.

Introduction

Contemporary medical education faces a profound paradox. While technological capabilities for diagnosis and treatment have expanded exponentially, systematic evidence suggests that physicians' fundamental capacity for clinical reasoning, empathic connection, and diagnostic acumen may be deteriorating [1].

This degradation occurs not despite but because of contemporary education reform efforts that have replaced experiential apprenticeship models with standardized, metric-driven assessment regimes. The transformation represents more than pedagogical evolution; it constitutes an epistemological shift in how medical knowledge is understood, transmitted, and validated.

The historical continuity between medieval craft apprenticeship and medical training illuminates what has been lost. For centuries, both domains relied upon sustained immersion in practice communities, where novices learned through observation, guided participation, and gradual assumption of responsibility under expert supervision. This article traces the historical trajectory of medical apprenticeship, examines the forces driving its dissolution, and explores the consequences of assessment industrialization for both medical education and healthcare delivery. Through analysis integrating historical scholarship, educational theory, and firsthand perspectives from medical educators, this work argues that recovering apprenticeship's core principles—while addressing its historical limitations—remains essential for producing physicians capable of the narrative, empathic, and ethical dimensions of clinical practice.

Historical Foundations: Medieval Apprenticeship as Educational Model

Medieval European guilds, emerging between the eleventh and thirteenth centuries, established institutional frameworks for knowledge transmission that would influence professional education for centuries [2,3].

These organizations, arising initially in northern European mercantile centers and later expanding throughout the continent, served multiple functions: economic regulation, quality standardization, social welfare, and critically, systematic training of new practitioners.

The guild apprenticeship system operated through a hierarchical structure of apprentice, journeyman, and master, each stage representing distinct levels of competence and autonomy. Apprenticeships typically began between ages ten and fifteen and lasted seven to fourteen years, depending upon the craft's

Contact: Julian Ungar-Sargon, Borra College of Health Sciences, Dominican University IL, USA.

complexity [3]. During this period, apprentices lived within their master's household, receiving not merely technical instruction but comprehensive socialization into professional identity, ethical standards, and community obligations [3]. The Statute of Artificers (1563) in England formalized these practices nationally, mandating seven-year apprenticeships and establishing minimum standards for master-apprentice relationships [4].

This legislation recognized apprenticeship's dual function: economic (ensuring skilled labor supply) and social (providing structured transition to adulthood and citizenship) [4].

Pedagogical Principles of Apprenticeship

Medieval apprenticeship embodied distinctive pedagogical principles that differentiated it from didactic instruction. First, learning occurred through legitimate peripheral participation—novices engaged in authentic work from the outset, initially performing supportive tasks before gradually assuming more complex responsibilities [5]. This progression enabled apprentices to develop tacit knowledge: the embodied, contextual understanding resistant to explicit verbalization that distinguishes expert from novice performance [5].

Second, knowledge transmission was fundamentally situated—learning occurred within authentic contexts of practice rather than abstracted educational settings. Apprentices observed not merely techniques but the judgment required for their application: when to deviate from standard approaches, how to adapt methods to specific circumstances, and which cues signaled quality or impending failure.

Third, the master-apprentice relationship provided sustained mentorship extending beyond technical instruction to encompass professional identity formation. Masters modeled not only skill but also ethical judgment, community responsibility, and the values defining competent practice. The journeyman stage, requiring travel and work under multiple masters, further enriched learning by exposing practitioners to diverse approaches and contexts [6].

From Craft Guilds to Medical Training

Physician training historically followed parallel patterns. Before formal medical schools dominated, aspiring physicians learned through extended apprenticeship with established practitioners. This model persisted in American medical education into the nineteenth century, when Abraham Flexner's 1910 report revolutionized medical training by mandating university-based scientific education [7]. While Flexner's reforms appropriately emphasized scientific rigor, they inadvertently initiated apprenticeship's gradual displacement [7].

The phrase "see one, do one, teach one," traditionally attributed to William Stewart Halsted at Johns Hopkins, captured apprenticeship's essence in clinical medicine [8]. Despite its apparent simplicity, this approach encoded sophisticated pedagogical principles: graduated responsibility, experiential learning, and knowledge consolidation through teaching. However, contemporary medical education has increasingly abandoned these principles in favor of standardized curricula and assessment regimes that privilege explicit, codifiable knowledge over tacit clinical judgment [8].

The Rise of the Assessment-Industrial Complex

Contemporary medical education has become increasingly dominated by what might be termed the "assessment-industrial complex"—an interconnected network of credentialing organizations, examination boards, and regulatory bodies that derive substantial revenue from standardized testing. Organizations such as the National Board of Medical Examiners (NBME), the Physician Assistant Education Association (PAEA), and various specialty boards collectively generate hundreds of millions of dollars annually through examination fees, study materials, and continuing education requirements.

This credentialing economy creates institutional incentives favoring assessment formats that are scalable, legally defensible, and administratively efficient—qualities epitomized by multiple-choice examinations. Such assessments offer apparent objectivity, statistical reliability, and standardization across large candidate populations. They enable uniform scoring, item analysis, and comparative metrics that satisfy accrediting bodies while minimizing examiner bias and subjective judgment.

However, these administrative advantages come at substantial pedagogical cost. As Groopman observes in "How Doctors Think," clinical reasoning fundamentally involves managing ambiguity, synthesizing narrative information, and tolerating diagnostic uncertainty [1,9]—cognitive processes that multiple-choice formats actively undermine. By reducing complex clinical scenarios to discrete, predetermined options, such assessments train students in pattern matching rather than genuine diagnostic reasoning.

Fragmentation of Knowledge and the Medical Gaze

The displacement of apprenticeship has produced what Groopman terms "fragmentation of knowledge" [1,10]—the reduction of integrated clinical understanding into disconnected factual elements. This fragmentation reflects deeper epistemological assumptions about medical knowledge as comprising discrete, objectively verifiable facts rather than contextualized, narrative understanding.

Michel Foucault's concept of the "medical gaze" illuminates this transformation [11]. Foucault described how modern medicine transformed illness from subjective experience into objectively observable pathology, enabling systematic classification but simultaneously obscuring the suffering person behind the disease [11]. Multiple-choice assessments intensify this reductionism by evaluating students' capacity to assign patients to diagnostic categories while ignoring the narrative context, emotional dimensions, and social determinants that shape illness experience.

This pedagogical approach produces what one educator described as "physicians fluent in differential diagnosis who cross out human encounter" from their clinical framework. Students become adept at generating diagnostic lists and selecting from predetermined options but struggle with the open-ended inquiry, empathic engagement, and narrative integration that characterize expert clinical judgment.

The Illusion of Competence and Pattern Recognition

Multiple-choice examinations create what cognitive psychologists term the "illusion of competence" [12]—students develop facility with test-taking strategies while acquiring superficial rather than deep understanding. Research demonstrates that high performance on multiple-choice tests correlates poorly with clinical diagnostic accuracy [12], particularly in cases involving atypical presentations or diagnostic uncertainty.

The assessment format actively trains students in premature closure [12]—the cognitive error of settling on an initial diagnosis without adequately considering alternatives. When examinations consistently present questions with single correct answers selected from limited options, students internalize an epistemological framework where clinical problems similarly possess definitive solutions identifiable through algorithmic reasoning. This mindset proves maladaptive in actual practice, where diagnosis requires sustained tolerance of uncertainty, consideration of multiple possibilities, and integration of contradictory evidence.

Furthermore, the emphasis on pattern recognition over reasoning produces clinicians dependent on familiar scenarios [12]. They struggle when confronted with atypical presentations, multiple comorbidities, or patients whose experiences don't conform to textbook descriptions. Apprenticeship learning, by contrast, exposed students to the full complexity and variability of human illness, developing adaptive expertise rather than rigid pattern matching.

Cultural Capital and Linguistic Hegemony

Pierre Bourdieu's theory of cultural capital illuminates how standardized assessments systematically advantage students from privileged backgrounds while masquerading as objective meritocracy [13]. Cultural capital encompasses the linguistic facility, tacit knowledge of dominant cultural codes, and familiarity with institutional expectations that students acquire through socialization in educated, affluent families [13].

Multiple-choice examinations, despite claims of standardization, embed assumptions reflecting middle-class, anglophone cultural norms. Question construction privileges particular linguistic patterns, implicit cultural references, and modes of reasoning that students from marginalized communities may find opaque. Test-taking itself constitutes a specialized skill developed through years of practice in well-resourced educational institutions—experience disproportionately available to students from privileged backgrounds.

The economic dimensions further compound these inequities. Comprehensive preparation for medical licensing examinations can cost thousands of dollars in commercial question banks, review courses, and study materials. Students from wealthy families can afford extended dedicated study periods, while those from working-class backgrounds often must maintain employment while preparing for examinations. This creates a systematic sorting mechanism that, while apparently merit-based, actually perpetuates existing class structures within the medical profession.

Epistemological Violence and Alternative Ways of Knowing

Standardized medical assessment embodies what postcolonial scholars term "epistemological violence"—the imposition of dominant knowledge systems while delegitimizing alternative ways of understanding illness and healing [14]. Multiple-choice examinations presuppose biomedical frameworks as the sole legitimate approach to health and illness, systematically excluding Indigenous healing traditions, non-Western medical systems, and community-based understandings of wellness [14].

This epistemological narrowing has profound implications for health equity. Physicians trained exclusively through standardized assessments may lack cultural humility and struggle to provide effective care for patients whose illness narratives incorporate spiritual, cultural, or alternative medicine frameworks. The emphasis on biomedical pattern recognition over holistic understanding undermines physicians' capacity to address social determinants of health, structural racism, and the complex ways culture shapes illness experience and treatment expectations.

Apprenticeship models, while historically imperfect, at least potentially allowed for contextualized learning sensitive to community needs and cultural particularities. Contemporary assessment regimes, by contrast, enforce cognitive uniformity that may actively impede culturally responsive care.

Narrative Medicine and Reflective Practice

Rita Charon's narrative medicine offers one framework for reintegrating humanistic dimensions into medical education and assessment. Narrative medicine emphasizes close reading, attentive listening, and reflective writing as essential clinical skills [15,16]. Rather than reducing patients to diagnostic categories, narrative approaches train clinicians to engage with illness stories in their complexity, ambiguity, and particularity [15].

Assessment through narrative medicine might require students to submit written reflections on complex cases, demonstrating their capacity for moral reasoning, empathic engagement, and integration of medical, social, and experiential dimensions of illness. Such assessments evaluate precisely those competencies—interpretive skill, ethical deliberation, and emotional intelligence—that multiple-choice formats cannot measure but that prove essential for effective clinical practice.

Columbia University's narrative medicine program demonstrates this approach's viability. Medical students maintain reflective portfolios documenting their evolving understanding of professionalism, uncertainty, and the patient-physician relationship. These portfolios, reviewed by faculty mentors, provide rich evidence of competency development while fostering the self-awareness and humility essential for lifelong learning.

Workplace-Based Assessment and Direct Observation

Workplace-based assessment represents another approach recovering apprenticeship principles while addressing contemporary educational requirements. Tools such as Mini-Clinical Evaluation Exercises (Mini-CEX) and Direct Observation of Procedural Skills (DOPS) evaluate learners during authentic clinical encounters rather than artificial testing environments [17]. These assessments capture dimensions of clinical competence—communication, professionalism, clinical judgment under pressure—that standardized examinations cannot measure [17].

Research demonstrates that workplace-based assessment,

when implemented thoughtfully, provides more valid evidence of clinical competence than do multiple-choice examinations. Faculty observers can evaluate not merely whether students reach correct diagnoses but how they reason through uncertainty, respond to unexpected findings, and engage with patients' concerns. This formative feedback, delivered in context, enables more effective learning than do delayed, generic examination scores.

However, workplace-based assessment requires substantial faculty time and institutional commitment—resources that healthcare systems increasingly resist allocating. The displacement of apprenticeship reflects not merely pedagogical evolution but economic pressures toward efficiency and standardization that fundamentally conflict with high-quality clinical education.

Script Concordance Testing and Adaptive Expertise

Script concordance testing (SCT), developed by Bernard Charlin and colleagues, offers a promising middle ground between multiple-choice examinations and fully qualitative assessment [18]. SCT presents clinical vignettes with evolving information, asking learners to assess how new data should modify their diagnostic or therapeutic reasoning. Rather than selecting single correct answers, students indicate the degree to which new information increases or decreases the probability of various diagnoses [18].

Responses are scored against expert panels, acknowledging that clinical reasoning involves judgment rather than algorithmic certainty. SCT thus assesses precisely the tolerance for ambiguity, integration of contradictory evidence, and adaptive reasoning that characterize expert clinical judgment. Research demonstrates that SCT performance correlates better with actual clinical competence than does traditional multiple-choice testing, particularly for complex diagnostic scenarios.

Healthcare System Pressures and the Erosion of Educational Time

The displacement of apprenticeship cannot be understood purely through pedagogical analysis; it reflects broader transformations in healthcare economics and organization. The industrialization of medical practice, with its emphasis on efficiency metrics, revenue generation, and productivity standards, has fundamentally altered the context within which medical education occurs.

As Sawatsky and colleagues observe, contemporary medical education has shifted "from apprenticeship to assembly line" [19]. Healthcare institutions increasingly view trainees primarily as sources of inexpensive labor rather than learners requiring sustained mentorship [19]. The pressure for clinical productivity leaves faculty insufficient time for teaching, while rapid patient turnover and brief clinical encounters provide inadequate opportunities for meaningful apprenticeship [19].

Residency work-hour restrictions, implemented to address trainee burnout and patient safety concerns [19], have paradoxically further undermined apprenticeship by fragmenting clinical experiences and reducing time for sustained patient relationships. While such regulations address genuine problems, they also reflect a broader shift toward viewing medical training as a series of discrete competencies to be acquired rather than an integrated professional identity to be formed through sustained practice.

The introduction of electronic health records, while beneficial in many respects, has similarly transformed clinical education [19]. Documentation requirements increasingly monopolize trainee time, reducing opportunities for direct patient interaction and bedside teaching. Faculty model data entry rather than clinical reasoning, while trainees learn to satisfy bureaucratic requirements rather than develop diagnostic acumen.

Toward a Revitalized Apprenticeship Model

Recovering apprenticeship's essential principles requires acknowledging both its historical strengths and limitations. Medieval guilds, while effective at knowledge transmission, were also exclusionary institutions that restricted access based on gender, ethnicity, and social class. Contemporary medical education must preserve apprenticeship's pedagogical benefits while actively addressing its historical inequities [20-22].

This revitalization demands several structural interventions. First, medical education must resist the assessment-industrial complex by developing evaluation methods that capture the full complexity of clinical competence [23,24]. This includes expanded use of narrative assessment, workplace-based evaluation, and portfolio-based review that can document professional development over time rather than snapshot performance.

Second, healthcare institutions must recognize that quality medical education requires protected faculty time and institutional resources. The current model, which expects faculty to maintain high clinical productivity while providing meaningful mentorship, proves unsustainable. Academic medicine must develop compensation structures that appropriately value teaching and create opportunities for sustained faculty-learner relationships.

Third, medical schools must embrace longitudinal integrated clerkships and other curricular innovations that provide sustained clinical relationships rather than brief rotations. Research demonstrates that such models improve both educational outcomes and students' professional identity formation while maintaining clinical competence [20]. However, these models require institutional commitment and willingness to challenge traditional structures [20].

Finally, addressing the cultural and socioeconomic biases embedded in current assessment requires conscious effort to develop evaluation methods accessible to students from diverse backgrounds. This includes reducing reliance on expensive commercial test preparation, incorporating multiple assessment modalities, and ensuring that evaluation criteria respect diverse cultural frameworks for understanding health and illness.

Conclusion

The transformation of medical education from apprenticeship to standardized assessment represents a profound epistemological and social shift with consequences extending far beyond

pedagogy. The displacement of sustained mentorship, situated learning, and gradual competency development has produced physicians skilled in pattern recognition and algorithmic reasoning but often deficient in narrative understanding, empathic engagement, and tolerance for diagnostic uncertainty.

This shift reflects broader societal transformations: the commodification of education, the privileging of quantifiable metrics over qualitative judgment, and the systematic reproduction of social inequality through apparently meritocratic institutions. Multiple-choice examinations, while administratively convenient and financially profitable for credentialing organizations, systematically advantage students from privileged backgrounds while undermining the development of essential clinical competencies.

Recovering apprenticeship's core principles—sustained mentorship, experiential learning in authentic contexts, and gradual professional identity formation—requires confronting powerful institutional and economic forces. The assessment-industrial complex, healthcare system productivity demands, and contemporary cultural emphasis on standardization and measurement all actively resist pedagogical reform.

Nevertheless, alternative frameworks exist. Narrative medicine, workplace-based assessment, script concordance testing, and competency-based portfolios all offer approaches that can capture clinical expertise's full complexity while providing meaningful developmental feedback. Implementing these alternatives demands institutional courage, resource allocation, and willingness to prioritize educational quality over administrative convenience.

The stakes extend beyond medical education to the future of healthcare itself. Physicians trained primarily through standardized assessment may prove technically competent but humanistically deficient—capable of diagnostic pattern matching but struggling with the relational, ethical, and narrative dimensions of healing. In an era of increasing healthcare complexity, aging populations, and growing health disparities, medicine needs clinicians who can engage with patients' lived experiences, navigate diagnostic uncertainty with humility, and maintain empathic connection amid bureaucratic pressures.

The medieval guild master's workshop, where apprentices learned craft not through lectures but through sustained observation and guided practice, offers surprising relevance for contemporary medical education. While we cannot and should not return to historical apprenticeship's exclusionary practices, we must recover its recognition that professional expertise develops through relational learning in authentic contexts over time. Only by resisting the reductivist logic of standardized assessment can medical education fulfill its fundamental purpose: forming physicians who can think like healers, not merely test-takers.

Addendum

Ian McGilchrist's Master and Emissary Metaphor—Implications for Medical Education and Culture

Ian McGilchrist's monumental work, The Master and His Emissary: The Divided Brain and the Making of the Western World [21], offers a compelling neurological and philosophical framework that resonates profoundly with the crisis in medical education described in this article. McGilchrist's central thesis—that the relationship between the brain's hemispheres mirrors a fundamental struggle in human culture between two modes of attending to the world—provides crucial insight into why apprenticeship has been displaced and what has been lost in that displacement.

McGilchrist draws upon a Nietzschean fable to characterize the relationship between the brain's hemispheres: the right hemisphere functions as the wise master, offering broad, contextual, integrative understanding of the world, while the left hemisphere serves as the emissary—brilliant at focused, analytical tasks but prone to overconfidence and disconnection from reality when it usurps the master's proper role. This is not merely a neurological observation but a metaphor for understanding profound cultural transformations.

The right hemisphere apprehends the world holistically, contextually, and implicitly. It grasps metaphor, tolerates ambiguity, perceives wholes before parts, and maintains connection to embodied, lived experience. It understands meaning not through denotative precision but through connotative richness—the way we "know a person" rather than "know a fact." The left hemisphere, by contrast, excels at analysis, categorization, explicit articulation, and manipulation of abstracted representations. It breaks wholes into parts, creates systematic taxonomies, and privileges clarity and certainty over nuanced complexity.

McGilchrist argues that healthy cognition requires the right hemisphere's primacy: experience begins with the right hemisphere's broad, contextual apprehension, passes to the left hemisphere for focused analysis and explicit articulation, then returns to the right hemisphere for reintegration into lived understanding. When functioning properly, this process enriches experience. But when the left hemisphere—convinced of its own sufficiency—refuses to return its findings to the master's integrative wisdom, cognitive and cultural disaster ensues.

Apprenticeship as Right-Hemispheric Learning

The apprenticeship model described in this article exemplifies right-hemispheric education [2,3,5]. Traditional apprenticeship honored precisely those qualities the right hemisphere provides: situated, contextual learning within authentic practice communities; transmission of tacit, embodied knowledge resistant to explicit verbalization; tolerance for ambiguity and gradual development of judgment; attention to the whole person within relational contexts; and recognition that expertise develops through lived experience rather than abstract instruction.

The medieval craft guild's apprentice learned not through decontextualized lectures but through immersion in actual practice. The apprentice observed not merely techniques but the master's judgment in applying them—when to deviate from standard approaches, how to adapt methods to particular circumstances, which subtle cues indicated quality or impending failure. This knowledge remained largely implicit, transmitted

through demonstration and guided practice rather than explicit instruction. The master-apprentice relationship itself embodied the right hemisphere's relational, contextual mode: the apprentice learned to be a craftsperson, not merely to perform discrete skills.

McGilchrist emphasizes that skills requiring long apprenticeship—craft, musical performance, clinical judgment—depend fundamentally on right-hemispheric capacities. He writes: "Purely intellectualised, consciously derived art is congenial to the age, because it is easy, and therefore democratic. It can be made to happen on a whim, without the long experience of apprenticeship leading to skill, and without the necessity for intuition, both of which are in part gifts, and therefore unpredictable and undemocratic. Skills have been de-emphasised in art, as elsewhere in the culture" [21].

This observation applies directly to medical education as analyzed in the preceding sections. The displacement of clinical apprenticeship in favor of standardized assessment reflects precisely the left hemisphere's cultural ascendancy. Multiple-choice examinations privilege explicit, propositional knowledge over tacit understanding [21]. They demand categorization and algorithmic reasoning rather than contextual judgment. They reduce complex clinical scenarios—rich in narrative, embodied in particular patients, demanding tolerance for ambiguity [21,23]—to discrete questions with predetermined correct answers. This is the left hemisphere's reductionist vision imposed upon a domain that fundamentally requires the right hemisphere's integrative wisdom [21,24].

The Assessment-Industrial Complex as Left-Hemispheric Dominance

McGilchrist's framework illuminates why the assessment-industrial complex described earlier has proven so resistant to reform. The left hemisphere, once ascendant, actively perpetuates its dominance through institutional structures that privilege its own mode of knowing. Standardized testing organizations, credentialing boards, and regulatory bodies constitute what McGilchrist might term left-hemispheric institutions—bureaucratic systems that value quantification, standardization, explicit measurement, and administrative efficiency above contextual understanding, relational learning, and qualitative judgment.

The left hemisphere "does not know what it doesn't know." Having achieved dominance, it cannot recognize what has been lost because the very capacities necessary for such recognition—contextual awareness, metaphorical understanding, integration of implicit knowledge—reside in the subjugated right hemisphere [21,24]. This explains why calls for educational reform so often fail: reformers trained within left-hemispheric institutions propose solutions that further entrench left-hemispheric dominance. More standardized testing, more explicit competencies, more quantifiable metrics—these responses, however well-intentioned, compound rather than address the fundamental problem.

McGilchrist observes that left-hemispheric dominance produces a "self-enclosed, self-referring, essentially empty system" of language and thought. This precisely describes contemporary medical education's assessment regime. Multiple-choice examinations test students' facility with medical vocabulary and taxonomic categories—a closed system of representations increasingly divorced from the lived reality of illness and healing. Students learn to manipulate medical concepts abstractly while losing connection to the embodied, relational, narrative dimensions of actual clinical practice.

Education, Metaphor, and the Restoration of Balance

McGilchrist's etymology of "education" resonates powerfully with apprenticeship principles. The word derives from educere—to draw out, to lead forth. True education, McGilchrist argues, draws out capacities latent within learners through lived experience and relational engagement. It cannot be reduced to information transfer, as if "we insert understanding into people like we insert a widget into a machine." This stands in stark contrast to contemporary medical education's banking model, where standardized curricula "deposit" explicit knowledge into passive students who demonstrate acquisition through standardized recall.

The restoration of apprenticeship principles, as proposed in this article, requires acknowledging the right hemisphere's primacy while honoring the left hemisphere's legitimate contributions. Medical education needs explicit knowledge, systematic classification, and analytical rigor—left-hemispheric strengths—but these must serve rather than supplant the right hemisphere's integrative, contextual, relational wisdom. Narrative medicine, workplace-based assessment, and reflective portfolios represent efforts to restore this balance by evaluating capacities the left hemisphere cannot measure: empathic attunement, narrative understanding, tolerance for ambiguity, contextual judgment.

McGilchrist's work suggests that metaphor itself—a primarily right-hemispheric capacity [21]—remains essential for meaningful education. Metaphor, he argues, is not decorative addition but the foundation of meaning itself. Without metaphor, language becomes an empty, self-referential system disconnected from lived experience. The master-apprentice relationship functioned metaphorically: it was not merely instrumental skills transfer but the transmission of a way of being in professional practice. The apprentice learned through metaphor and lived example what could not be reduced to explicit instruction.

Contemporary medical education has largely abandoned metaphorical, narrative modes of knowledge transmission in favor of literal, propositional formulations. But illness itself is fundamentally metaphorical—patients describe pain as "stabbing" or "burning," depression as "darkness," recovery as "journey." Clinical understanding requires navigating between literal biomedical categories and metaphorical patient narratives [23], integrating both into coherent understanding. This integration demands precisely the right-hemispheric capacities that standardized assessment cannot measure and may actively undermine.

Cultural Implications and the Path Forward

McGilchrist argues that periods of left-hemispheric cultural dominance [21]—including the Enlightenment, certain phases of the Reformation, and contemporary modernity—share characteristic features: privileging of explicit over implicit knowledge, rejection of metaphor and tradition, faith in systematic method and algorithmic reasoning, devaluation of embodied and relational ways of knowing, and conviction that all meaningful questions can be answered through analytical decomposition.

Contemporary medical education exhibits precisely these characteristics. The displacement of apprenticeship represents

not merely pedagogical change but a manifestation of broader cultural transformation toward left-hemispheric dominance. Recovering apprenticeship's core principles requires confronting this cultural pattern—recognizing that the crisis in medical education participates in a larger crisis of Western modernity's increasingly unbalanced hemispheric relationship.

McGilchrist warns that unchecked left-hemispheric dominance [21] threatens human flourishing by severing connection to what makes us most fully human: relational engagement, contextual understanding, tolerance for ambiguity, capacity for empathy, and recognition that meaning emerges through lived experience rather than abstract analysis. In medical education, this threatens to produce technically proficient but humanistically impoverished physicians—clinicians who can diagnose but cannot truly hear their patients, who possess biomedical knowledge but lack clinical wisdom, who excel at algorithmic reasoning but founder when confronting the irreducible complexity of human suffering.

The restoration of apprenticeship principles in medical education, viewed through McGilchrist's framework, requires more than pedagogical reform. It demands recognition that education itself constitutes a hemisphere struggle—between modes of knowing, ways of attending to the world, and ultimately, conceptions of what it means to be human. By recovering the right hemisphere's primacy while honoring the left hemisphere's proper contributions, medical education might produce physicians capable of integrating scientific rigor with empathic engagement, explicit knowledge with tacit wisdom, analytical precision with narrative understanding.

McGilchrist's master and emissary metaphor illuminates both the depth of the crisis in medical education and the radical nature of the transformation required to address it. As this article has demonstrated, the displacement of apprenticeship represents not a neutral evolution toward efficiency but the usurpation of the master by the emissary—a pattern McGilchrist traces across Western cultural history. Only by recognizing this pattern and consciously working to restore balance can medical education fulfill its fundamental purpose: forming physicians who can think, feel, and act as healers rather than mere technicians.

References

1. Groopman J. How Doctors Think. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. 2007.
2. Epstein S, Prak M. Guilds, Innovation and the European Economy, 1400-1800. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2008.
3. https://historylearning.com/medieval-england/medieval-guilds/
4. Davies MG. Statute of Artificers 1563. In: The Enforcement of English Apprenticeship: A Study in Applied Mercantilism, 1563-1642. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1956; 28-43.
5. Lave J, Wenger E. Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1991.
6. Reith R. Circulation of skilled labour in late medieval and early modern central Europe. In: Epstein SR, Prak M, editors. Guilds, Innovation and the European Economy, 1400-1800. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2008; 114-142.
7. Flexner A. Medical education in the United States and Canada. From the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Bulletin Number Four, 1910. Bull World Health Organ. 2002; 80: 594-602.
8. Kotsis SV, Chung KC. Application of see one, do one, teach one concept in surgical training. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2013; 131: 1194-1201.
9. Groopman J. How Doctors Think. Boston: Houghton Mifflin; Chapter 1, Flesh-and-Blood Decision Making. 2007; 27-40.
10. Groopman J. How Doctors Think. Boston: Houghton Mifflin; Chapter 3, Spinning Plates. 2007; 59-76.
11. Foucault M. The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception. Sheridan A, translator. London: Tavistock. 1973.
12. Dunlosky J, Rawson KA, Marsh EJ. Et al. Improving students' learning with effective learning techniques: promising directions from cognitive and educational psychology. Psychol Sci Public Interest. 2013; 14: 4-58.
13. Bourdieu P. The forms of capital. In: Richardson J, editor. Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education. New York: Greenwood. 1986; 241-258.
14. Spivak GC. Can the subaltern speak? In: Nelson C, Grossberg L, editors. Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. 1988. 271-313.
15. Charon R. Narrative Medicine: Honoring the Stories of Illness. New York: Oxford University Press. 2006.
16. Charon R, Hermann N, Devlin MJ. et al. Close reading and creative writing in clinical education: teaching attention, representation, and affiliation. Acad Med. 2016; 91: 345-350.
17. Norcini J, Burch V. Workplace-based assessment as an educational tool: AMEE Guide No. 31. Med Teach. 2007; 29: 855-871.
18. Charlin B, Roy L, Brailovsky C. et al. The Script Concordance test: a tool to assess the reflective clinician. Teach Learn Med. 2000; 12: 189-195.
19. Sawatsky AP, Rea JR, Hafdahl LT. et al. From apprenticeship to assembly line: recovering relationships in medical education. J Grad Med Educ. 2023; 15: 627-631.
20. Hirsh DA, Gaufberg EH, Ogur B. et al. Educational outcomes of the Harvard Medical School-Cambridge integrated clerkship: a way forward for medical education. Acad Med. 2012; 87: 643-650.
21. McGilchrist I. The Master and His Emissary: The Divided Brain and the Making of the Western World. New Haven: Yale University Press. 2009.
22. Ungar-Sargon J. The Epistemology of Clinical Judgment: Language, Power, and the Social Construction of Medical Knowledge. 2025.
23. Ungar-Sargon J. Healthcare Reform and Physician Retention: Toward a Dialogical Reconstruction of Medical Practice. Borra College of Health Sciences, Dominican University. 2025.
24. Ungar-Sargon J. The MCQ Monopoly: How Medical Education's Obsession with Standardized Testing is Destroying Clinical Wisdom and Perpetuating Healthcare's Crisis. Borra College of Health Sciences, Dominican University. 2025.