DRAFT
February 2026

SOME CONSEQUENCES OF NOT DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN POSITIVE FORMING WITHIN AND OUTSUDE AN ADULT-CHILD EDUCATIVE RELATIONSHIP[@]

George D. Yonge

INTRODUCTION

Although colloquial usage apparently belies it, existentially and etymologically, the root meaning of "educating" (Latin, *educare*, to bring up, to rear to adulthood) concerns the universal event which arises as an inherent activity of human existence when a child is born and an adult or adults (usually parents) spontaneously and intuitively enters a relationship within which he/she supports and guides his/her child emotionally, cognitively, and normatively until he/she becomes a responsible adult and upbringing ends. However, when a society develops and becomes complex and intricate, a child must learn matters a parent is not able to teach him/her. Then, in response to these societal demands, schools are *created,* designed, and staffed by teachers who have been prepared and certified to teach such required and other subject matter within a formalization of the essential relationship, sequence, activity, and sim structures of the primordial, informal, spontaneous parent-child (now teacher-pupil) relationship of upbringing. This educative schooling includes other cognitive as well as affective and normative contents which are taught to groups of children in different grade levels.

It is precisely this formalization of the original parent-child relationship of upbringing which enables a teacher to harmoniously complement and help complete the parents' task of bringing up their child to actively participate in society as a responsible adult. This is possible because parent and teacher, in fact, are involved in the same essential relationship, sequence, activity, and aim structures of educating, as upbringing, but the parent in spontaneous, informal and intuitive ways, and the teacher in formal, planned, knowledgeable ways. Thus, it is these accompanying, guiding, and teaching activities which occur **within** the formalization of the primordial parent-child relationship which give schooling its *educative* nature (see Gous' paper at: georgeyinge.net/node/129). Hence, primordial upbringing is the source for all educative or pedagogical categories and criteria necessary for a genuine pedagogical perspective, and of an autonomous science and full-fledged academic discipline, and not mostly an eclectic conglomerate of categories borrowed from various disciplines, ill-fitting or not.

[@] The following distinctions between forming (molding)and educating use the more detailed typology by C. G. de Vries (1986), Orientation in fundamental educational theory. Stellenbosch: University Publishers and Booksellers, pp. 21-26. The consequences and implications drawn are mine and not De Vries'.

Irrespective of this, the academic study of education by college and university faculties of education in the U.S.A. usually begins with and is limited to studying formally constituted schools and, in doing so, they bypass informal upbringing, the source of its own essential categories, structures, and criteria needed for the study of educative schooling (and primordial upbringing in the family) to be an autonomous science and full-fledged academic discipline. Overlooking these foundational essences transforms the study of educating into a field of study requiring the application of categories borrowed from other academic and scientific disciplines, such as philosophy and psychology. Then theoreticians and practitioners of educating don't have their own categories and criteria to distinguish educating, as upbringing, from other instances or kinds of positive forming. This lack of access to pedagogical categories and criteria, necessary for delimiting primordial educating within the domain of positive forming, leads to *unwittingly* distorting and obfuscating the meaning of primordial educating by including instances of positive forming, colloquially called "education", whose structures are essentially different from educating as upbringing.

Since a pedagogical (educational) perspective, with its *own* categories and criteria, has **not arisen** from this applied approach, and since the academic study of educative schooling is so prominent in the U.S.A., there is a resulting absence of such a pedagogical perspective, by which the essential meaning of "educating" is disclosed and sharpened. Thus, it is not surprising that there is no explicit scientific or academic objection to subsuming diverse non educative events and meanings of positive forming under the word and concept "educating". Thus, colloquially, it is used to refer to a diversity of matters such as a synonym for any positive and sometimes even negative forming, even by many faculty members and practicing teachers! For example, in everyday English usage, it is common for "educate" to mean "inform about", "make aware of", to refer to schooling, teaching, and learning of *any kind,* and much more.

To show how this broad colloquial usage stretches and distorts its original meaning and covers over and obscures its essential structures, requires an insightful understanding of the nature or essences and structures of the primordial event of educating in its pristine meaning of upbringing so that these insights can be expressed as categories which can be used as criteria for precisely evaluating these distorting influences of some of these divergent colloquial meanings.

Of course, there is no objection to the everyday use of the word "educate" in its diverse colloquial usage. A problem arises only when one is interested in gaining scientific insights into the one universal meaning of educating, as upbringing.

As noted above, the main focus and thrust of the scholarly study of education in the U.S.A. is on educating as it occurs in schooling, and even though its essential educative structures are obscured and even hidden, they must be present for schooling to be a genuine *educative* institution rather than, e.g., a trade school, which has essentially different teaching, learning, and aim structures than educative schooling. And even though empirical studies of educative schooling provide valuable information and knowledge of what is found and occurs there, an empirical approach is concerned with

what **is** but does not explicitly identify what must be (the essentials). A genuine pedagogical (educative) perspective requires using its own categories and criteria which are rooted in the essential structures of a primordial event of educating, and which are given with being human and are not created but lived. Thus, the event of educative schooling is **not** given with human existence and is designed to serve and supplement the already existing event of educating as upbringing.

The origin or primordial appearance of educating in human existence is the birth of a child, and has been studied for many decades overseas (see section below), as the point of departure for studying the informal upbringing of a child in the family **and** its formalized reconstitution in educative schooling, by using the phenomenological method which is designed to disclose or uncover and verify the essences and structures of any experiential occurrence, e.g., educating, and I use these essences/structures in what follows (regarding this method, see: georgeyonge.net/node/151).
Since no child is born an adult, and he/she needs considerable support and guidance to become one, an adult-child relationship of upbringing, parenting is an **existential necessity** for a child to be humanized and taught to be a full-fledged adult, but schooling is not an existential necessity although, as noted above, in complex societies, educative schools are established to complement and complete family educating by teaching children skills, dispositions, life contents, which most parents cannot teach, and which are needed to actively participate in society; indeed, in
"Home schooling", a parent *does* teach his/her child required curriculum content without his/her child attending school, which illustrates that school attendance itself is not an essence of educating in its primordial meaning.

DE VRIES' TYPOLOGY OF INFLUENCRS
There are two main types of influence of human change: (1) physical, biological, emotional, social, cognitive **growth, maturation, and decline**, called ***human development;*** and (2) positive and negative influences of the entire natural and cultural worlds, called ***forming,*** which give direction and nuance to human development and forming. In what follows, my focus is on forming and not on human development itself because my concern is with some theoretical and practical confusions which arise when positive forming and educating are conflated.

Following DeVries' typology, forming refers to the circumstances, events, and influences from the entire environment which shape a person's changing or becoming, and which result in the quality of his/her being human. The total environment includes the positive and negative formative influences from people, animals, and things in both the natural and the socio-cultural worlds, and which occur over the span of one's life. In addition, some of these influences are deliberate or incidental, and are purposeful or aimless.

Negative forming refers to influences which have a detrimental effect and include influences from the environment, friends, literature, movies, etc. This negative forming is intentional when someone deliberately influences someone to do wrong, or incidental

when someone is unintentionally or incidentally influenced detrimentally by someone, by reading an article in a magazine, by watching a television program, etc.

A person also encounters events and influences which are beneficial and promote the favorable course of his/her becoming. This *lifelong,* positive forming includes all positive influences from the world of nature and the socio-cultural human world; important here is the fact that a person always gives meaning to and deals with these influences and, thus, is an active participant in and is responsible for what he/she makes of these influences (e.g., their resulting potentialities and limitations).

In *contrast* to the above examples of *lifelong* positive and negative forming, ***educating is an existentially necessary instance of positive forming which only occurs within an adult-child relationship (situation) with the aim of accompanying and supporting a child in becoming a morally independent, responsible adult, at which time educating/upbringing is superfluous and ends.*** (Of course, in educating, as one kind of positive forming, an educator must always act in consideration of the pedagogic implications of a child's developmental level, e.g., toddler, adolescent).
For someone who views educating as including lifelong teaching and/or learning activities which occur anywhere and irrespective of any relationship, but primarily within the context of schooling, and who, thus, might be inclined to consider educating to mean *any* occurrence of positive (and for some, even negative) forming, the above delimitation of "educating" to an adult-child supportive, accompanying relationship *for the sake of* a child's becoming an adult, might be too restrictive, if not arbitrary. As is evident in DeVries' typology, educating is *one kind* of positive forming, the essential structures of which *do not* extend to *other* kinds of positive forming, which is precisely the justification for this delimitation.

For a child, as not yet an adult, there is a distinction between positive forming which occurs *within* and *outside* an adult-child educative relationship/situation. That is, both a child **and** an adult are positively formed outside an adult-child educative relationship, i.e., by events and actions which bring about changes for the better in the lives of both, such as movies, television, literature, peer groups, and the natural and cultural environments in general, but **it is only a child who can be positively formed educatively.**

This is because educating is a *special kind* of positive forming.
Thus, the positive influence of one child on another, a child's positive contribution to an adult's way of living, one adult's contribution to another adult's potentialities and becoming, as well as the positive influence of interacting with or caring for pets and animals, etc. all **occur *outside* an adult-child *educative* relationship and are *not examples of educative forming* (i.e., educating). The aim of an educative event is *limited to* a relationship within which an adult supports and accompanies a *child* to become adult via positive forming.** An adult, as already adult, is not in an educative (i.e., pedagogical) situation to be supported and accompanied to what he/she has already become; however, when he/she is supported and accompanied by another adult to become a more "refined" adult, he/she is in an adult-adult andragogical

relationship/situation. Furthermore, formative accompaniment is a ***lifelong*** matter which includes positive, caring accompaniment of the elderly who are then in a gerontological situation and not a pedagogical (educative) or andragogical one.

Often, the ***formative results*** which occur within and outside an educative situation are indistinguishable and, thus, are equally desirable. Two children might learn the same woodworking skill with equal proficiency, but one has learned it on his/her own by trial and error, i.e., outside an educative relationship, while the other has learned it under the guidance of a high school woodshop teacher, i.e., in an educative relationship. In this comparison of successful, positive learning, being within or outside an adult-child educative relationship is not essential for learning to perform this concrete skill. This equivalence of the *resulting* learning effect does not neutralize the *essential* structural difference of being within and outside an educative situation. It is only a reminder that a positive learning effect is necessary but not sufficient for an educative situation to be**. What makes a positive formative influence "educative" is whether a child is in an educative relationship/situation with an accompanying adult.** In its primordial, essential meaning, "educative" modifies the *situational event* and not just the result itself.

Negative forming and educating are incompatible because, in its root meaning and aim, educating must be a *kind of positive* forming. However, it is worth noting that "educational neglect", in the sense of a neglectful adult-child relationship, is all too evident, and occurs within a situation/relationship which *fails* to adequately realize the essences of educating and, thus, is negative forming and not genuine educating.

A CONCISE OVERVIEW OF SOME RESULTS OF DECADES OF PHENOMENOLOGICAL STUDIES OF THE PRIMORDIAL EVENT OF EDUCATING UNDERTAKEN AT THE UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA (see website of translations at: geogeyonge.net and georgeyonge.net/node/148).
Educating, as upbringing, is a necessary and universal human event which comes into being or originates when a child is born and an adult establishes an educative relationship with the *purpose* of accompanying, assisting, and guiding him/her to live as an independently choosing and morally responsible adult ***human being*****.** As repeatedly noted, this event is constitutive of and only **occurs within** an adult-child educative relationship. The original (i.e., primordial) educative event is constituted by a parent-child relationship in the family, and later a teacher-pupil *educative* relationship is established in school as a formalized, supplemental extension and completion of the original parent-child relationship. Thus, **the essential structures of *educative teaching* and *accompanying* at home and at school do not differ essentially, even though in school they occur more systematically, formally, and less spontaneously than at home.**

Within any family or school educative situation, there are *intentiona*l and *incidental* educative actions. Intentional educative actions are purposeful, planned, and deliberate, and involve accepting a child's approvable actions or, if necessary, correcting unacceptable ones by deliberately presenting a child with positive alternatives and values to encourage him/her to act acceptably.

Incidental influencing includes a child's conscious imitation of his/her educator and his/her spontaneous or incidental identifying with the adult and the notion of adulthood exemplified by his/her educator. However, a precondition for intentional and incidental educative action to occur within an educative relationship/situation is the realization of a sequence of mutual interacting by which the adult-child relationship *at the core* of educating deepens from a mere being-by (association), via a being-with (encounter) to a being-for each other (engagement). These first three phases make an increase in mutual trust and understanding possible, which makes a child more receptive and involved in an adult's approving or correcting intervention (teaching), which then is followed by a return to associating and ending the sequence structures when the child periodically breaks away from associating and acts and chooses in an adult's absence.

Hence, **some essentials of educating are that it only occurs within a situation constituted by a special adult-child relationship of trust, understanding, and authority, which is characterized by a sequential rhythm of relaxation, intensification, intervention (e.g., by teaching), and relaxation by means of purposeful activities aimed at supporting and guiding him/her to normative adulthood. This educating is only realized through teaching and learning *within* this relationship**. In an incidental way, via a child's spontaneous identification with a trusted and understanding adult/educator, as a person, and intentional imitation of his/her example of being an adult, the adult/educator him/herself becomes educative *content* for a child within this situation.

The essences (categories) of educating can be used to constitute an *educative/pedagogical perspective* on other events of positive forming, and, by changing these categories to questions, they can serve as criteria for judging whether the categories (essences) of other occasions of positive forming meet the pedagogical criteria for being an educative (pedagogic) event, and why.

WHY AND HOW CONFLATING BELIEFS AND ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT POSITIVE FORMING AND EDUCATING OBSCURE ACCESS TO THE PRIMORDIAL MEANING OF EDUCATING

Here I present a **thought** experiment indicating *why* the following four hypothetical examples, considered by many to be educative activities, mainly by unknowingly conflating positive forming and educating. These examples are viewed in terms of a few criteria expressive of the above essential structures of educating, i.e., the primordial parent-/adult-child relationship formed with the aim of supporting and guiding a child to adulthood, by engaging in a sequence of mutual **activities**. (see georgeyonge.net/node/148 for access to a detailed discussion of the essences of each of these structures which are preconditions for an educative event).

In comparing each hypothetical example of positive forming with some pedagogical criteria expressive of the primordial (ontological) foundation of the event of educating (as upbringing), it is shown why each of the four hypotheticals do not qualify as an example of educating, *and* how the primordial meaning of educating is distorted (reconstituted) by insisting that each example is a matter of "educating":

(1) During a playground pick-up softball game not involving any adults, a child spontaneously shows another child how to figure out his/her batting average. As a result, this child suddenly attains a new insight into and deeper understanding of fractions, proportions, etc. This learning result promotes his/her future classroom learning in this area of arithmetic, and even in daily life. In other words, this playground teaching-learning supplements this child's future learning in educative and teaching situations in and out of school. Even though this instance of positive forming, which includes teaching and learning, is valuable and desirable, *at least two essentials for it to be an educative event are missing, i.e., an adult-child educative relationship* ***and*** *the aim of guiding the child in the direction of normative adulthood.* A child, as not yet an adult, cannot guide another child, or anyone, to where he/she is not yet. Thus, effective teaching and learning are necessary for educating but are sufficient **only** if they occur within an adult-child relationship directed to the child's adulthood. Hence, a similar child-child episode is educative if, e.g., an adult/teacher asks a child to teach another child something *and* that the adult/teacher takes pedagogical responsibility; then the episode becomes an activity embedded in an adult-child event of educating.

Now, if a researcher assumes or believes that "educating" includes hypothetical episode 1, he/she has a distorted his/her understanding of educating without being aware that his/her assumption or belief logically eliminates the **necessity** of an adult-child relationship, which changes the entire structure or form of educating, including its aim. Hence, the primordial meaning of educating is obscured.

(2) A child independently runs across a "how to" book on photography, studies it, and immerses him/herself in taking pictures. As an example of positive forming, this reading and experiencing possibly are preparing him/her for later systematic instruction in photography. Even so, this independent reading and experiencing do not occur *within* an educative relationship. There is *no adult-child educative relationship, or any other kind, there is no teaching (except, perhaps, metaphorically; neither a book nor experiencing "teach", even though a child learns plenty from both), and the aim of helping him/her become adult is also absent.* Such independent learning is highly valued by most educators, especially since independent learning is an indication that a child is becoming or progressing in the direction of independent, responsible choosing and acting expected of an adult, but *it is not educative* ***unless*** *it occurs within an adult-child pedagogical relationship aimed at a sequential rhythm of activities which guide and support a child in his/her becoming adult*, e.g., as an assignment by a teacher, which then is evaluated in terms of the criteria derived from the essences of the pedagogical aim structures.

A researcher who believes this episode is an example of and, thus, a source of insight into educating, in fact, is reducing educating to positive learning, and this obscures everything pedagogical. In this hypothetical episode, learning (without

teaching) is too broad and decontextualized a category for illuminating the fundamental nature of educating.

(3) A child teaches an adult a procedure or provides information which is relevant and valuable to an aspect of this adult's work performance. Again, *teaching and learning are involved, but there is no adult-child pedagogical relationship, (even though there is a child-adult one), and the aim of the teaching is not to support and help an adult become what he/she already is*. As with example (1), educating is reduced to teaching-learning and is an impoverished focus for gaining fundamental insight into the primordial, essential nature of educating.

(4) A schoolteacher begins an advanced degree program of study in a School of Education at a University. This course of study involves teaching and learning, independent study, research, etc., but *it is not an educative situation*. This is *not an adult-child pedagogical relationship but an adult-adult andragogical one* which, in many regards has a structure which parallels, while differing qualitatively from the pedagogical—e.g., the relationship, sequence, and activity structures. However, *the aim is the further cultivation of this adult's adulthood*, in this case the development and fostering of his/her professional potentialities. This kind of positive forming is better characterized as "higher or advanced learning" than "higher education" or even "adult education". Thus, here there is learning and teaching within an adult-adult andragogical relationship of higher learning, but not an adult-child one.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS AND IMPLICATIONS

In the context of positive forming, it is **only** teaching and related learning activities occurring *within* a special parent-/adult-child relationship aimed at supporting a child to become an independent, responsible adult, which constitutes the primordial occurrence and meaning of educating as upbringing (parenting).

When one's primary focus is on the academic study of the formal nature of teaching and learning in school, there is an invitation to label the primordial occurrence of family educating "parenting", and to separate it from what occurs in school; this hinders seeing the continuity of the *educative relationship/event which begins* with parenting and *continues* by more formally complementing and completing parenting via educative schooling. That is, family upbringing is the existential or primordial foundation and point of departure for the academic and human scientific (i.e., pedagogical) study of formal educative schooling. Since the event of educating has essential relationship, sequence, activity, and aim structures, and the essences or categories constituting these structures, it is possible to disclose and take a full-fledged pedagogical perspective on educating and, thus, on the *educative* nature of schooling. In this study, I have used this perspective, (i.e., its categories/criteria) as has De Vries in his typology, to distinguish educating from other instances of positive forming.

As one small member of the family of positive forming, the humanizing, individualizing, and socializing effects of educating, as essential conditions for being human, make other kinds of positive forming more accessible as possibilities. That is, of all instances of positive forming, **educating, as upbringing, is *the most primordial or fundamental*.**

The *choice* is between studying educating as an applied field with borrowed categories or studying educating as a full-fledged academic discipline with its own categories. The *decision* is ours!