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Intended as a historical starting point for a critically informed assessment of the state of multimedia social work research, advocacy and practice, this dissertation explores the methods and practice models envisioned by Progressive Era social work leader and media producer, journalist, and editor Paul U. Kellogg (1879-1958). Kellogg harnessed the most advanced visual technologies of his time in service of progressive social change. In social surveys such as The Pittsburgh Survey and in his editorship of two widely read periodical publications, The Survey and Survey Graphic, Kellogg brilliantly combined documentary photography, art, maps, data, and textual narratives with the goal of making unavoidably visible the inequities of industrializing America.

Key aspects of Kellogg’s contributions—particularly his vision for a social work practice deploying media production in service of community-based research, education, and political advocacy—have largely been forgotten, particularly in social work. Responding to this historical amnesia, this dissertation aims to document and analyze, in their innovation and limitations, the projects Kellogg undertook during his career. I aim to enrich the field’s historical memory of Kellogg’s variation on the social
survey method, which sought to assess conditions of health, environmental safety, and labor in a given geographic area as carried out during the Pittsburgh Survey, 1907-1908.

Representing a moment in which the social work profession was focused on environmental intervention in low-income urban communities, Kellogg’s variation on the social survey method emphasized the significance of multidisciplinary teams and partnerships with local community organizations. In light of a recent re-commitment by social welfare researchers to environmental, place-based practice (Kemp & Palinkas, 2015), it feels especially timely to explicate Kellogg's social survey methodology.

Kellogg’s approach was distinctly journalistic in that it demanded that social workers produce media in order to disseminate findings not only to community stakeholders but also to the larger voting public in order to influence social action and policy-making. As social work research methods employing media approaches ranging from photography and video to participatory mapping rise in popularity, there seems to be little awareness of this prior rich period of media-based practice and research during the Progressive era. Revisiting Kellogg’s methodology counters a presentism in current scholarship regarding media-based methods.

Several scholars of social research have measured the success of the Pittsburgh Survey by contemporary standards of empirical, quantitative research and found it lacking (Bulmer, 1991, 1996; Turner, 1996; Zimbalist, 1977). I believe I bring a fresh perspective by considering it as a genealogical forebear of community-engaged approaches operating in epistemological frameworks that appreciate the significance of both emic and etic knowledges of place and community.

Paul U. Kellogg’s publications positioned social workers as public pundits in regards to interventions in poverty and social welfare policy (Chambon, 2012),
providing them with a public voice that the field has largely lacked since his journals closed down in 1949 and 1952. By exploring Kellogg’s publishing collective, Survey Associates, and their publications, *The Survey* and *Survey Graphic*, I hope to raise questions regarding the loss of a media platform upon which social work practitioners and scholars can engage each other and the public regarding a variety of issues and to consider what the legacy of what this period means for current practitioners of public scholarship in social work.
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CHAPTER 1.
TRUTH PLUS PUBLICITY

INTRODUCTION

Underlying this factor of graphic portrayal is the factor of truth; truth plus publicity.... The philosophy of the survey is to set forth before the community all the facts that bear on a problem, and to rely upon the common understanding, the common forethought, the common purpose of the people as the first great resource to be drawn upon in working that problem out. Thus conceived, the survey becomes a distinctive and powerful implement of democracy. (Paul U. Kellogg, 1912, p. 6)

Intended as a historical starting point for a broadened, critically informed assessment of the state of multimedia social work research, advocacy and practice, this dissertation explores the innovative hybrid of methods and practice models deployed by Progressive Era social work leader, media producer, journalist, and editor Paul U. Kellogg (1879-1958, see Figure 1.1) in the early years of the 20th century. As he eloquently describes in the opening quote, Kellogg employed research skills (“truth”) in concert with the most advanced media technologies of his time (“publicity”). In social surveys such as The Pittsburgh Survey, and in his editorship of two widely read periodical publications, *The Survey* and *Survey Graphic*, Kellogg brilliantly combined documentary photography, art, maps, data, and textual narratives with the goal of making unavoidably visible “all the facts that bear on a problem”: that “problem” being the inequities of industrializing America. Deeply committed to educating the wider public about urban social issues – and to mobilizing them to action – he broadcast to a national audience the experiences of social workers and social reformers on the front lines of efforts to reform unfair labor practices, unsafe and unhealthy housing, and public health issues.
Kellogg developed his hybrid methods most significantly with his directorship of the groundbreaking Pittsburgh Survey between 1906 and 1908. Kellogg (1909) described the Pittsburgh Survey as “...a rapid close range investigation of living conditions in the Pennsylvania steel district” (p. 518) made possible via the cooperation of “a remarkable group of leaders and organizations in social and sanitary movements” (p. 518), across the United States as well as those within Pittsburgh. Kellogg’s work was representative of a larger cultural movement of urban reform known as the Progressive era (1890-1917). The “social and sanitary movements” of the Progressive era sought to intervene in the overcrowded urban landscapes and unsafe working conditions of rapidly industrializing cities populated by millions of newly arrived immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe.

The methodology Kellogg and his colleagues developed and refined in Pittsburgh, including a multi-method, multi-disciplinary approach to data collection, an emphasis on community engagement, and the use of visual media as mechanisms for community mobilization and public education (Harrison, 1916; Kellogg, 1912), became the impetus for a social survey movement. Hundreds of cities across the country attempted to replicate the methods of the Pittsburgh Survey (Bartlett, 1928). Similar to contemporary community-based research methods, Kellogg envisioned the social survey movement as a means of bringing together the expertise of social workers, social scientists, and communities seeking to identify and solve systemic social problems (Turner, 1996). He argued for visual media as a way to facilitate community decision-making processes and raise the profile of philanthropic groups who funded progressive projects, as well as to advocate for changes in industry and social work during this formative period of the field.
In his role as a journalist and editor, Kellogg published the findings of the Pittsburgh Survey in Charities and the Commons, which he renamed The Survey in 1909 (Chambers, 1971). In 1912, he also shifted the journal away from the auspices of the New York Charity Organization Society to become a free-standing, membership-based publishing collective called Survey Associates. Standing in stark contrast with the more narrowly clinical casework methods that would come to dominate the field during the 1920s (Reisch & Andrews, 2002; Turner, 1996), Kellogg’s expansive model of social workers as community-based researchers and media producers was supported in this period by powerful organizations within social work, including the Russell Sage Foundation’s Department of Surveys and Exhibits.

Finally, Kellogg found his ultimate challenge in establishing a magazine, Survey Graphic (1921-1952) which allowed him the greatest freedom to carry out his goal of engaging the public regarding important social issues of the day. While Survey, or Survey Midmonthly as it was later known, served the growing professional community of social work, Survey Graphic was intended for the wider audience of those interested in “social problems” more broadly (Chambers, 1971, p. 85). Kellogg continued to edit both the Survey Midmonthly and Survey Graphic until 1949, when Survey Midmonthly went out of circulation. Kellogg retired due to poor health in 1952, at which point, Survey Associates, publishing house of both journals, also folded for financial reasons.
RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND GOALS OF THIS DISSERTATION

Key aspects of Kellogg’s contributions to Progressive Era reform—particularly his unique vision for a social work practice deploying media production in service of community-based research, education, and political advocacy—have largely been forgotten, particularly in the social work field. Responding to this historical amnesia, this dissertation aims to document and analyze Kellogg’s hybrid methodology, in its innovation and limitations, focusing in particular on the Pittsburgh Survey.

From our current vantage point, Paul Kellogg is an odd character in social work history. He does not map readily onto contemporary definitions of what social work practitioners and researchers are or do. Recent scholarship by welfare scholar Adrienne Chambon (2012) underscores this point. In an essay interrogating the “expansion and contraction” of social work’s disciplinary “borders” and knowledge base, Chambon follows two lines of inquiry that are currently considered “outer limits” of the field—
questions of political economy and of the arts. In both of these seemingly very different arenas she arrives at projects directed by Kellogg. On one hand, she explores the 1907-10 Pittsburgh Survey as a site of social investigation clearly aimed at reforming the policies structuring severe socio-economic inequality, as well as dangerous industrial conditions, hazardous housing, and subsequent public health and safety issues experienced by the laborers working in the steel mills of Pittsburgh. On the other, she foregrounds Kellogg’s Survey Graphic magazine (1921-1952) as a site using art, documentary photography, and innovative graphic representations of complex information to inform the mainstream public about critical social issues of the day. Calling for further scholarly work on these complex locations at the historical and intellectual borders of the field, Chambon concludes that:

Political economy and the arts did not dilute the specificity of social work. They were used instead as catalysts. The boundary activity of the early discipline served its interests and promoted social work to a central knowledge position, and its leaders as significant social agents.  
(2012, p. 10)

Following Chambon’s lead, I too am using Kellogg’s work as a catalyst for conversation regarding expanding the boundaries of the profession. What might we learn from revisiting Kellogg’s hybrid practice? This exploration has led me to several key research questions.

**RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

First, in Kellogg’s approach to data collection, or “truth,” how do his methods in the Pittsburgh Survey predict contemporary place-based and community-engaged approaches to research and environmental intervention? A sub-question of this revolves
specifically around how his methods predict understanding of emic and etic perspectives in community-based practice.

Second, what are the implications of Kellogg’s legacy of multimedia methods for data collection, and perhaps more significantly, research dissemination and public engagement (“publicity”) for contemporary social work practitioners and researchers?

Third, what are the implications of the publishing apparatus Kellogg built via his collective, Survey Associates, and the Russell Sage Foundation Department of Surveys and Exhibits – an enterprise located entirely outside of the university – for contemporary public engagement in terms of research dissemination, policy advocacy, and social action?

As I recover and analyze critically the lessons of Kellogg’s equation, “Truth Plus Publicity,” I hope to address several gaps in the interdisciplinary literature on Kellogg, his publications, and the social survey movement that he partly founded. I aim to demonstrate that the social survey movement and the publications Kellogg developed and edited are significant genealogical forebears of contemporary community-engaged practice and policy advocacy employing multiple media and of public scholarship in social work in general.

I also aim to enrich the field’s historical memory of Kellogg’s multi-method, journalistic variation on the social survey method, as carried out during the Pittsburgh Survey. Kellogg, in fact, dubbed the spread of this method the social survey “movement” and envisioned social workers as its key practitioners (Kellogg, 1912). This model of social work practice and research integrating journalistic media production skills dominated the profession during the second decade of the twentieth century (Turner, 1996; Zimbalist, 1977). Kellogg’s methods captured the imagination of social workers
for several reasons. First, it emphasized partnerships between national “experts” on urban reform with local organizations. Second, it paired a place-based, structural analysis of social problems with on the ground practical solutions. Last, it used a range of media not only to engage local community stake holders in the issues at hand, but to inform the mainstream voting public. While the social survey movement has largely been forgotten in social work over the past century, I will argue that it offers some useful object lessons for contemporary social workers engaged in media-based practice and research as well as publicly-engaged scholarship. Central to my interest in this method is the social survey’s positioning of social workers as key practitioners leading what we would now call multi-disciplinary teams of reformers.

Paul U. Kellogg’s publications also positioned social workers as “significant social agents” in regard to interventions in poverty and social welfare policy (Chambon, 2012, p. 10), providing them with a public stage that the field has largely lacked since his journals closed down in 1952. By exploring Kellogg’s publishing collective, Survey Associates, and their publications, The Survey and Survey Graphic, I hope to raise questions regarding the loss of a media platform upon which social work practitioners and scholars can engage each other and the public regarding a variety of issues, and to consider what the legacy of this period means for current practitioners of public scholarship in social work.

In this account, I also intend to illuminate and critically examine the unique institutional infrastructure, shared by the Russell Sage Foundation, The New York Charity Organization Society Publication Committee and later, Survey Associates, that emerged to support both the social survey movement and Kellogg’s twin publications, The Survey (later Survey Midmonthly) and Survey Graphic. Existing as it did entirely
outside of the academy, what questions does this early model of research and publication raise for current public scholarship in social work?

In order to pursue these objectives, I will situate Kellogg’s activist knowledge production within the social, political, economic, professional, and scientific discourses of the Progressive era, 1890-1917. I will unpack Kellogg’s visual research methods, using as a case study his work on the Pittsburgh Survey and his work in building what he referred to as the subsequent “social survey movement”¹. I will then illuminate Kellogg’s multimedia approach to research dissemination, as illustrated by his strategy for disseminating the findings of the Pittsburgh Survey (primarily through his social work journal, *The Survey*, but also using other methods, such as exhibits and his later publication, *Survey Graphic*). My goal is to critically assess Kellogg’s work in both its contributions and complexities—in order to draw implications from his pioneering visual praxis for contemporary public scholarship, community-engaged research and policy advocacy.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature regarding Kellogg’s life and work as well as that of his projects and publications falls into several major categories, beginning with several key biographical sources. I then will discuss the literature regarding the social survey method in general, and the Pittsburgh Survey and subsequent social survey movement more specifically. I next will consider the literature that has emerged from the field of visual culture studies

---

¹ The term “social survey movement” was coined by Kellogg and is associated with the particular form of social survey method that emerged out of the Pittsburgh Survey (1907-1909) and found its home in the Russell Sage Foundation Department of Surveys and Publicity (1912-1931). Bulmer, Bales, and Sklar noted that the Pittsburgh Survey’s roots in the Charity Organization Society Publication Society,
regarding Kellogg’s work. Lastly, I review the small body of social work literature that discusses Kellogg.

**BIOGRAPHICAL SOURCES**

For the purposes of this project, there is no more complete history of Kellogg’s life and career than Clarke Chambers biography of Kellogg, entitled *Paul U. Kellogg and The Survey: Voices for Social Welfare and Social Justice.* (1971). Chambers’ engaging biography captured the development of Kellogg’s career as well as the various stages of his personal life, including both of his marriages. Researched and written in the late 1960s, Chambers was able to interview some of Kellogg’s contemporaries and collaborators, including his second wife, Helen Hall. Not only is his work an essential resource on Kellogg, but it also conveys the richness of the networks of both the Progressive reformers and the subsequent generation of those who built early social work. More than any other scholar who has studied Kellogg, Chambers captured the evolution of Kellogg’s vision of a social work profession engaged in structural social change and media production. Chambers also captured Kellogg’s distinct warmth and enthusiastic personality.

Chambers described Kellogg’s hybrid practice of integration of social work and media as “social work journalism” (Chambers, 1971, p. 3). I see Chambers’ term as referring to the bi-directional ways in which Kellogg on one hand, used journalistic methods in his approach to social investigation in the Pittsburgh Survey and subsequent social survey movement, while on the other, he developed and edited social work’s first professional journal, *The Survey* and later, a magazine deeply influenced by his social work training called *Survey Graphic.*
Another significant biographical source regarding Kellogg can be found in Megan Morrissey’s 1996 dissertation regarding Kellogg’s second wife, Helen Hall. Morrissey devoted a chapter to Hall’s relationship and ultimately, marriage to Kellogg, describing how their work together and time spent at Henry Street Settlement led to a personal relationship that was deeply transformative for both of their lives. Of special note, this chapter reveals Kellogg’s lengthy and profound struggle to determine an honorable path forward in dealing with the crisis his love for Helen Hall presented him as a married man. Ultimately he and his first wife, Marion divorced. Hall and Kellogg were married for over 20 years.

THE PITTSBURGH SURVEY AND THE SOCIAL SURVEY MOVEMENT

The 1990s witnessed a surge in scholarship on the social survey method with two edited volumes – one broadly focused on the social survey as it manifested throughout both the United States and Europe between 1880 and 1940 (Bulmer, Bales, & Sklar 1991); the second focused exclusively on the Pittsburgh Survey (Greenwald & Anderson, 1996). The former volume, *The Social Survey in Historical Perspective, 1880-1940*, examines the rise of the social survey method as an early form of social investigation throughout Europe and the United States at the turn of the last century. Contrasting the impact of the social survey method in Britain with the United States, the editors of this volume assert in their introduction that while the social survey became foundational to latter iterations of British social science methodologies, it became a “road not taken” in American sociology (Bulmer et al., 1991).
The second volume, *Pittsburgh Surveyed* (Greenwald & Anderson, 1996) had no such unified theme. Instead, as Mary Furner (2000) pointed out in her review of the book, this edited volume represents

a retrospective on different ways of interrogating such a source tried out since the 1970s, when a new appreciation for the need to recognize the indeterminate, contingent, and constructed character of all forms of knowledge transformed the history of the social sciences and suggested the need for a more comprehensive and conceptually nuanced history of social investigation. (pp. 405-406)

Like the first volume, a number of authors in *Pittsburgh Surveyed* were concerned with theorizing about the short life of the social survey method in the United States context. The work of three key scholars of the Pittsburgh Survey lies at the heart of both volumes: Martin Bulmer, Steven R. Cohen, and Steven Turner. As Furner (2000) points out, their interpretations ultimately are contradictory. Martin Bulmer, a historian of sociology, critiqued the social survey movement that emerged out of the Pittsburgh Survey as a dead end on the methodological family tree of sociology, replaced by empirical methods and positivist theoretical frameworks demanding a distance from the reformist goals of the social survey “movement” (Bulmer et al., 1991;1996; Kellogg, 1912). Steven R. Cohen followed a similar trajectory in his essay in the 1991 volume edited by Bulmer, Bales, and Sklar. In the 1996 volume, however, he explored the Pittsburgh Survey as a critical moment in the ideological development of the social liberalism that undergirded the welfare state (Cohen, 1996; Furner, 2000).

Perhaps most significantly for the purposes of this dissertation, Steven Turner (1996) contemplated Kellogg’s “social survey movement” as but an episode in the emergence of social work’s developing claims on a domain of expertise. Turner argues that the social survey movement as Kellogg defined it was, in fact, a disregarded model
for social work practice in an era when social work would soon be making commitments to increasingly clinical practice methodologies and social research would move towards models of scientific purity (1996, p. 44). In contrast to Turner’s position, I see in Kellogg’s social survey movement many similarities with current models of mezzo- and macro-level interventions—or community-engaged social work practice—a point I will take up in chapters 3 and 4.

Offering one of the most useful analyses for this project, social welfare historian Sidney E. Zimbalist (1977) analyzed the “rise and decline” of the social survey movement as a moment in the evolution of social work/welfare research methods. Like Steven Bulmer, he viewed the social survey method as lacking in epistemological rigor in regards to its goals of influencing policy. He critiqued Kellogg’s method as being too diffuse in its attempt to survey complex problems in many aspects of an urban community. Like Turner, however, he also sees Kellogg’s survey movement as being very much a product of the field of social work. Unlike Turner, however, Zimbalist does not see aspects of the methodologies employed as having disappeared from the field as much as absorbed into other aspects of practice or other professions, such as urban planning and public health.

**PROGRESSIVE ERA VISUAL CULTURE SCHOLARSHIP**

Simultaneous with the social science and social policy histories of the social survey movement, a number of visual culture scholars undertook studies of the rhetorical frameworks informing the photography produced by Progressive era visual welfare interventions, including Kellogg’s projects. In the following section, I discuss several whose work has been particularly influential for this project.
The idea of social workers as media producers is documented nowhere more strongly than in photography scholar Alan Trachtenberg’s work on Lewis Hine (1980, 1990). Trachtenberg explores the methodology of “social photography” that Lewis Hine developed working with Kellogg on the Pittsburgh Survey and later in articles in *The Survey* and *Survey Graphic*. Trachtenberg discusses Hine’s 1909 speech to the National Congress of Charity and Corrections encouraging the entire profession of social work to take up cameras in order to document their work on the front lines of social inequality. This concept of social workers producing media is also deeply imbued in Kellogg’s social survey method as laid out in his 1912 essay, “The Spread of the Survey Idea.” Trachtenberg’s interest in social workers as media producers is at the heart of this dissertation project, and will be further unpacked in chapters 3 and 4.

Maren Stange’s 1989 book, *Symbols of Ideal Life: Documentary Photography in America, 1890-1950*, which traces the history of documentary photography for social reform from Jacob Riis’ 1895 classic, *How the Other Half Lives* through to the Federal Farm Security Administration’s Historical Section photography project during the Great Depression, was also a critical source for this dissertation. Stange is intent upon unpacking the theoretical underpinnings underlying these projects. She posits that while these documentary photography projects of the first half of the twentieth century are carried out in service to social reform, this social reform is ultimately in service in a corporate capitalism and social engineering that ultimately undermines its efficacy. She is also interested in how this corporate capitalist epistemological framework also ultimately informs our national aesthetics. While I find Stange’s project and her prose constricting and at times lacking in nuance, her compact exploration of these deeply
inter-related projects challenged me to critically interrogate Kellogg’s epistemological frameworks and the limits of what he could achieve towards social change within them.

Cara Finnegan is similarly concerned with tracing the theoretical frameworks of the media generated by social reformers such as Hine, Kellogg and later, the documentary photographers hired by the Farm Security Administration Historical Section to document government interventions during the Depression. As a visual rhetoric scholar, Cara Finnegan’s series of projects, including her 2003 book, *Picturing Poverty: Print Culture and FSA Photography*, examine the development of a modernist liberal, bureaucratic scientism emerging in a rapidly professionalizing welfare state as manifested in visual media. Finnegan has extensively analyzed the theoretical trajectory that informed visual welfare interventions as it evolved over several decades, from the social gospel and reform themes of the turn of the 20th century through an era of progressive political reform and into a professional bureaucratic scientism by the 1920s and 30s, paying special attention to the work of key thinkers, such as Louis Brandeis and his concept of “social invention” in early social work. Like Stange’s work, Finnegan’s project was also deeply important for my own analysis not only of the media produced by social reformers like Kellogg, but also in further understanding the driving forces competing for social work’s soul during this formative period as the field grappled with the tension between social reform and professionalization. Finnegan’s work also reflexively articulated her methodological approaches to working with visual culture. It was fascinating to watch her own developing methodological sophistication throughout the trajectory of her work on these topics.
Kellogg’s pioneering use of a range of visual methods, including documentary photography and maps, has not been thoroughly explored from within the field of social work since Chambers’ 1971 biography. Several welfare scholars have included Kellogg in smaller scale projects. Peter Szto’s 2008 paper includes Kellogg in a larger review of photography employed in service to social welfare reform. Particularly inspiring for this project, Adrienne Chambon’s 2012 essay regarding the expansion and contraction of the borders of social work’s body of knowledge featured several of Kellogg’s projects. Deeper examination of Kellogg’s deployment of “truth plus publicity” is however needed, both in relation to social work’s contemporary use of visual methods and as a genealogical forebear of community-engaged research and practice: methods grounded in space, place, and community that seek to understand the impact of environmental contexts on the wellbeing of residents, arts-based practice, and consciousness-raising or popular education approaches.

As critical, community-engaged methods employing visual media proliferate in social work research and practice, as the work of scholars such as Adrienne Chambon, Izumi Sakamoto, Rory Crath and Moshoula Capous-Desygalles suggests they are, Kellogg’s integration of photography and art into his research processes, his efforts to disseminate social work findings to a broad public, and his engagement in popular education may hold significant lessons and legacies for current practitioners of these multimedia methods. Ultimately, this dissertation is a synthesis of perspectives,

---

2 Regarding digital storytelling, video production, photography, participatory community mapping, and Photovoice in social work: Capous Desyllas, 2009-2010, 2014; Chapman, et al., 2013; Crath, 2012; Hewson et al., 2010; Hillier & Kemp, 2011; Huss, 2011; Miles, 2006; Phillips & Bellinger, 2011; Rosenthal-Gelman & Tosone, 2010; Sakamoto et al., 2010; Szto et al., 2005; and Yoshihama & Carr, 2002.
grounded in scholarship cross-cutting history, social welfare, and visual culture that seeks to describe a period in which a diversity of institutions and scholarly formations were initiated and developed.

THE STATE OF MULTIMEDIA METHODS IN CURRENT SOCIAL WORK RESEARCH

Despite a “visual turn” in research methods over the past 25 years in both the social sciences and the humanities (Banks, 2001; Burgess & Green, 2009; Hart, 1997; Mierzoff, 1999; Pink, 2006, Spencer, 2011), social work has been slow to catch up in this arena. In a 2015 literature review regarding visual research methods in Qualitative Social Work, projects were identified all over the world. British authors, Clark and Morriss comment:

In terms of social work, we note that the word ‘visual’ did not appear in the subject headings index within key texts on social work research ... until very recently ... Notably, in their review of the first 10 years of publication of Qualitative Social Work up to 2011, Shaw, et al. (2013) found that only 3 articles out of 237 used visual research as the main fieldwork method. (2015, p. 2)

As qualitative methods and critical theoretical frameworks have become more mainstream however, the visual, multi-sensory, and multi-modal approaches emerging in allied fields are slowly building momentum inside social work. Clark and Morriss’ project involved reviewing a number of databases for titles including “social work” and a number of prefixes, such as “vis,” “photo,” “art,” “draw,” and “collage” (p. 3). They identified 43 articles out of 1744, published primarily in Qualitative Social Work and the British Journal of Social Work, noting however that many other multimedia projects may not be found in scholarly journals because they were not reported on in traditional academic publications.
The use of visual media in social work research and practice is often depicted as a relatively recent phenomenon, related to the development of digital visual technologies. Contemporary accounts typically ignore earlier examples of the innovative use of visual media discussed in this dissertation, which like contemporary iterations were both groundbreaking for their time and complex in their implications. In fact, these prior iterations of visual social work are not even noted in Clark and Morriss’ review. Social work scholar, Adrienne Chambon has also noted this erasure. She comments,

The visual dimension of knowledge, which we tend to think as something recent, a product of the internet and the abundance of visual media, can be traced to earlier manifestations, linked in part to the democratization of knowledge in a social reform perspective, and to the enthusiastic adoption of new technology, which also then greatly shaped public media. (2012, p. 9).

Historically, visual research methods such as photography and mapping were employed in social work in order to collect data for research purposes as well as to engage various publics regarding issues of concern to Progressive reformers such as labor injustice, infant mortality, environmental injustice, public health, and housing. Use of these methods arose in the wake of the rapid and massive urbanization and immigration, as concentrations of industrial capital coalesced in northern U.S. cities during the late 19th and early 20th centuries (DuBois, 1899; Residents of Hull House, 1895; Riis, 1890; Pittsburgh Survey, 1909-1914).

Several contemporary social work scholars have addressed the role of visual media in early stages of social work history. Peter Szto’s 2008 essay traced the history of the use of documentary photography in social welfare research and advocacy. Another social work scholar whose work has literally bridged the gap between the Progressive era and contemporary practice is Amy Hillier. Exploring the legacy of the Social Survey
Movement via new technology, Hillier and her research team used participatory mapping methods similar to those used by Teixeira to re-map Philadelphia’s Seventh Ward (Hillier & Boddie, nd). Re-tracing the dimensions of W.E.B. DuBois’ 1899 social survey, *The Philadelphia Negro: A Social Study* (1995), Hillier’s community-based participatory research project engaged the local community in exploring the current and historical dimensions of race and class, producing a website, documentary film, photography and a host of writing projects by faculty and students alike (http://www.dubois-theward.org/about/the-ward/) (Hillier, 2011).

Adrienne Chambon (2008) has written extensively on the role of the arts in social work currently, as well as researching visual archives of Canadian child welfare organizations (Chambon, et al, 2010). Particularly relevant to this project is her 2012 essay, “Disciplinary Borders and Borrowings: Social Work Knowledge and its Social Reach.” Historically analyzing the expansions and contractions of what is considered (or not) within the knowledge domain of the profession, she explores several of Paul Kellogg’s projects. In a moment in which social work appears to be currently expanding it’s “disciplinary borders” to include various forms of media praxis, the literature reflects that this conversation is very much in it’s infancy, particularly in the United States academic context.

My own review of the current social work literature involving visual methods also reveals that social work scholars are increasingly employing visual research methods – particularly for the purposes of community-based participatory action research. A commonly cited definition of community-based participatory research by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation Community Health Scholars is this:
Community-based participatory action research is a collaborative approach to research “that equitably involves all partners in the research process and recognizes the unique strengths that each of them brings. CBPR begins with a research topic of importance to the community, has the aim of combining knowledge with action and achieving social change to improve health outcomes and reduce health disparities.” (2007, np)

As noted by social work scholar, Samantha Teixeira,

The use of photography in qualitative and participatory research is fairly widespread. In the spirit of community-based participatory research (CBPR), photographic methods have been adapted to suit different populations and community settings and have grown to include methods such as Participant Employed Photography, Photovoice, photo novellas, and photo elicitation, to name a few. (2015, p. 395)

For instance, in a community-based participatory action research project conducted with women in the Hmong refugee community of Detroit, Photovoice was used as a tool to collectively assess the issues the group wanted to address and the assets they possessed in their community (Yoshihama & Carr, 2003. Photovoice is a method developed by Public Health scholar, Caroline Wang rooted in Paulo Freire’s notions of empowerment (Texeira, 2015) in which cameras are given to participants to explore a series of collectively agreed-upon themes or topics (Wang & Burris, 1994). Moshoula Capous Desyllas has employed Photovoice with a diverse group of sex workers to see their goals and needs from their perspective. Their photography has been exhibited several times as well (2010, 2014). Matthew Chin, Izumi Sakamoto, and colleagues similarly used a range of arts-based methods for engaging members of the Toronto homeless community (2014). Teixeira’s own work integrates participatory photographic methods with the use of GIS technology to engage youth in “assessments of neighborhood features related to the their well-being, while building civic engagement and fostering community partnerships and mentoring relationships...” (2015, p. 395).
Interestingly, this emerging community-engaged, place-based multimedia methodology perhaps most closely resembles the model Kellogg developed in the Pittsburgh Survey.

Like other participatory photographic methods, digital storytelling is another method intended to engage participants in sharing their own stories, perceptions, and feelings regarding their lives and issues in their communities. Ramona Beltrán and Stephanie Begun (2014) recently explored the use of digital storytelling in engaging a group of Indigenous youth in Aotearoa/New Zealand in processes of narrativity with the goal of healing the impacts of historical trauma. If carefully facilitated, the process of producing these digital stories can be deeply therapeutic for the storytellers. If the storytellers choose to share their digital stories, these narratives have the potential to be socially transformative, serving as testimony of communities whose stories are not often heard or seen in mainstream media.

Taking a different tack, social work scholar, Rory Crath (2012) has critically interrogated the use of visual media created by welfare policymakers in Toronto as a means of “aesthetic governance strategies” intended to regulate “the problematics of socio-economic and racialised difference, and for mediating rifts in the social fabric as fallout from welfare retrenchment.” He found that though these media interventions were intended to depoliticize and segregate communities, there were disruptions to this agenda at levels of policy implementation, providing spaces to create visions for different approaches to social work praxis, policy and research (2012, p. 3).

While I think that the literature reveals that there is indeed a somewhat robust conversation occurring around the integration of multi-media approaches in community-based participatory action methods, conversations such as Crath’s (2012) interrogation of the ways in which social welfare is wielding visual media in a public
relations context illustrate the need for more critical scholarship at this contemporary juncture between visual cultural production and social work. My hope is that by revisiting Kellogg’s unique legacy of multimedia research methods and dissemination that this dissertation will contribute to this conversation in several ways. First, it will attempt to enrich the field’s historical memory of the social survey movement- a brief period in which a model of social work practice integrating media production skills dominated the profession during the second decade of the twentieth century (Turner, 1996; Zimbalist, 1977). I also hope that my exploration of Kellogg’s publishing collective, Survey Associates and their publications, *The Survey* and *Survey Graphic*, will raise questions regarding the loss of a media platform upon which social work practitioners and scholars could engage each other and the public regarding a variety of issues.

**PUBLIC SCHOLARSHIP IN SOCIAL WORK**

A number of social work scholars have expressed dismay at the dearth in the field of public intellectuals, particularly since the mid-century attacks associated with McCarthyism on political activism and collectivity in the profession (Reisch & Andrews, 2002), and the subsequent demise of Kellogg’s journals, *The Survey* and *Survey Graphic* (Chambers, 1963, 1971; Chambon, 2012; Karger & Hernandez, 2004; Howard, 2010; MacKinnon, 2009; Reisch & Andrews, 2002). In stark contrast to the first 60 years of the profession (1890-1950), social work scholars neither individually nor collectively have a media presence or impact on the mainstream public discourse regarding the issues we are at the forefront of addressing through practice and research. Despite clearly stated goals of promoting social justice, and the fact that social work’s research and practice puts the profession on the front lines of dealing with the impact of
social inequalities on many populations, contemporary social work academe lacks public intellectuals who are critically engaged in influencing the public sphere regarding issues such as welfare policy via mainstream media (Chambon, 2012; Karger & Hernandez, 2004; Howard, 2010; MacKinnon, 2009; Reisch & Andrews, 2002).

Scholars identify the midcentury closure of Kellogg’s Survey Associates publications as an end point to social work’s public voice. Clark Chambers commented, “The demise of Paul U. Kellogg’s Survey magazine ... left a vacuum that no other publication could fill. When it ceased publication in 1952, the attachment of the profession as a whole to broad social action was irrevocably weakened” (1963, p. 84). Sadly, in the five decades since Chambers wrote this, not much has changed in this regard. Though our scholarship aims to inform both social policy and social work practice, we lack a media apparatus that facilitates our voices being heard in the realms of policy and social action. Why is this the case?

In a 2004 essay on the topic, social work scholars, Howard Karger and Marie Theresa Hernandez comment, “(I)n contrast to the early twentieth century, there is a marked absence of social commentators with the appellation ‘social worker’” (2004, p. 51). Karger and Hernandez are concerned primarily with the dearth of a social work presence at the intersection of media and policy-making. Considering that welfare scholars’ research and practice directly deals with the impact of social inequalities on many populations, they argue that the field lacks a presence in policy or the public sphere.

Karger and Hernandez cite several reasons for this absence. These include conditions in both social work practice and social work academe, including the challenging circumstances under which most social workers work—heavy case loads and
dwindling funding; rigid conceptions of what it means to be a social work professional (i.e., working in mental health); a retreat by social work academia in general into the “ivory tower” and away from politics; and social work research being-dominated overwhelmingly by quantitative research methods. In this era, these critiques also suggest, academic production and grant getting are the primary currency upon which scholarly worth is evaluated in the field of social work, as in academia more broadly (Chambon, 2012; Karger & Hernandez, 2004; MacKinnon, 2009; Reisch & Andrews, 2002).

Social work scholar, Shauna T. MacKinnon has also written on the recent absence of public intellectuals in social work academe. She cites “a shrinking welfare state with policies that reinforce individualist values over commitment to the collective,” and “institutional pressures to ‘publish or perish’” as critical factors keeping social work scholars from engaging in the public sphere (2009, p. 512). Even more essential, she identifies the impact of neo-liberal policies and privatization on funding models in the social sciences in particular and higher education more generally. Within the context of the social sciences and social work, MacKinnon expresses a concern regarding scholars choosing research agendas according to philanthropic trends set by corporate donors as public funding for higher education and research dwindle.

In spite of the institutional challenges discussed by Karger, Hernandez, and MacKinnon resulting in a lack of public intellectual pundits among social work scholars, perhaps, paradoxically, social work academics are highly engaged in a wide variety of other forms of public engagement. While the phrase, public intellectual implies a certain form of charismatic leadership, public engagement or scholarship includes a far broader array of activities and roles played by scholars. How is the term public engagement
defined? In a 2008 report written for Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life, authors Julie Ellison and Timothy Eatman comment,

Publicly engaged academic work refers to the scholarly or creative activity integral to a faculty member’s academic area. It encompasses different forms of making knowledge about, for, and with diverse publics and communities. Through a coherent, purposeful sequence of activities, it contributes to the public good and yields artifacts of public and intellectual value. (p. iv)

Miriam Bartha and Bruce Burgett (2014) also cite a variety of “understandings and investments in public scholarship” in a recent article regarding their certificate program for graduate students in public scholarship. These range from “public humanities” to “civic engagement, community-based learning, participatory action research, arts-based collaboration, cultural and social activism, and various forms of organic intellectual practice” (2014, p. 33-34). Paralleling Paul Kellogg’s projects of a century ago, Bartha and Burgett emphasize integrating research, media production and art towards goals of social transformation. Furthermore, like Kellogg, there is a value placed on utilizing multimedia approaches to democratize access by the mainstream public to scholarship and other university resources.

Clearly, looking at the proliferation of community-based participatory approaches within social work research as noted above, social work scholars are indeed engaged in forms of public scholarship. Social work academe works in partnership with a wide range of organizations and institutions both to educate our students as well as to conduct research that impacts many health and welfare issues in the realms of child welfare, mental health, and services to the aging among many others.

The following section will present my personal scholarly and professional orientation to exploring Kellogg’s legacy, which indeed has been grounded in training
and involvement in place-based, community engaged participatory research methods and practice as well as multimedia production and scholarship.

ORIENTATION TO THE PROJECT

Kellogg’s place-based, multimedia work spoke to me as the product of a deeply interdisciplinary hybrid training combining social work and welfare with visual culture and media studies. I explored his work through the lenses of several key concepts in contemporary scholarly praxis in both fields. These include: community-engaged and place-based practice and research grounded in critical theoretical frameworks in social work; a wide array of media-based work, ranging from work with documentary photography collections in urban archives to Photovoice and digital storytelling projects, and; my methodological training in the multimodal humanities and visual culture.

As a social work practitioner and scholar, my training and experience have largely taken place in the realm of community-based/engaged practice and research. My analytic understanding of Paul Kellogg’s methodology as carried out in the Pittsburgh Survey and “social survey movement” is deeply informed by these models. Encompassing a wide array of practice contexts and methods, community practice in social work is contested territory with multiple genealogical roots (Weil & Reisch, 2005). During the first half-century of social work history—the era in which Kellogg himself came of age as a social work practitioner, these roots emerged from the social movements such as women suffrage and the labor movement as well as the neighborhood-based approaches of the settlement houses as well as from communities meeting their own needs via mutual aid models (Jackson, 2001; Reisch, 2008; Reisch & Andrews, 2002; Weil & Reisch, 2005). Community organizing was formally recognized
as a form of social work practice in the 1930s in the wake of both the Rank and File movement for unionization. During the 1960s, the methods of Saul Alinsky were also deeply impactful for mezzo-level or community interventions in social work practice (1946, 1971) (Weil and Reisch, 2005).

Having personally come of age in the era of Empowerment Practice (Gutiérrez, Parsons, & Cox, 1998) during the late 1990s, my own commitments in the field have been particularly shaped by the roots of that framework, which include liberation theology, Freirean popular education and consciousness raising, intersectional feminist praxis and decolonizing, Indigenist methodologies (Gutiérrez & Lewis, 2005; Walters & Simoni, 2002; Wilson, 2009). Community-engaged practice claims a wide repertoire of skills, ranging from program development and evaluation to cross-sectoral planning to community mapping, participatory forms of research and social action (Weil & Reisch, 2005). Much of my own professional experience has taken place within the context of partnerships between university departments and a variety of organizations, health care providers, and school systems, addressing early childhood intervention, maternal mental health, and youth work.

My own research interests in social work have explored the evolution of social work professional identity with a concentration on place-based community intervention. My work over the years has included many projects employing multimedia methods such as Photovoice with various communities in Detroit (see Yoshihama and Carr, 2002 for a publication regarding one of these projects), community mapping, as well as digital storytelling and film making with Indigenous Youth at the University of Washington Indigenous Wellness Research Institute.
Experience in various aspects of media production in other settings also shaped my view of Kellogg. As a staff person working in a large urban archive in Cleveland in my youth, I had the distinct pleasure of spending many hours preserving photography collections. My imagination was captured by this visual documentation of the evolution of the city’s landscape and its communities over the course of a century, setting the stage early for my interest in Kellogg’s work. Several years of training and experience in film production, particularly archival research for documentary films produced for the museum of popular culture, Experience Music Project, also influenced my desire to work on a historical project that explored media.

As the age of participatory media on the web arose, my interests in film production shifted towards new realms of multimedia scholarship. Coming of age as a scholar at the advent of a robust development in publicly engaged multimodal scholarship has also shaped my perspectives on Kellogg’s work. Always intertwined to some degree, the fields of Visual Culture and Digital/Multimodal Scholarship have increasingly coalesced, particularly with the rapid development of digital media technology over the past two decades at the intersections of fields like Communications and Cultural Studies. Concerned with an infinite number of issues related to visual media, the field of visual culture emphasizes that visual “events” (Mirzoeff, 1999) can be understood in a multiplicity of ways or are, in other words, “polysemic” (Shohat & Stam, 1999). Not merely focusing on images themselves or the “how to” of production, visual culture scholars interrogate the gazes of spectators, the apparatuses by which images are produced, distributed and broadcasted, and the rhetoric in which images are embedded. Visual culture scholar Martin Jay comments in his seminal 2002 essay, “That Visual Turn,”
Insofar as we live in a culture whose technological advances abet the production and dissemination of such images at a hitherto unimagined level, it is necessary to focus on how they work and what they do, rather than move past them too quickly to the ideas they represent or the reality they purport to depict. In so doing, we necessarily have to ask questions about...technological mediations and extensions of visual experience. (p. 88)

In this quote, Jay captures the critical importance of slowing down to unpack the meaning and production of visual culture in a world in which we are literally constantly inundated with images. For the purposes of this project, this perspective is critical to employ not only in relationship to the media produced under Kellogg’s editorial direction, but also the mechanisms by which they were produced in terms of technology, funding, theoretical underpinnings, goals, and the political milieu into which they were deployed.

Several years of study and participation in multimodal scholarship has also deeply informed my view of Kellogg. Multimodal (or multimedia) scholarship has emerged as an arm of visual culture studies concerned as much with the context as with the content of their scholarship. Employing emerging forms of web-based digital media, these scholar/producers are creating new digital platforms for academic authorship and publishing with a strong focus on democratization of access to scholarly work by a wider array of audiences.

In a seminal 2009 issue of Cinema Studies journal edited by media studies scholar Tara McPherson, she asks “what our scholarship can do in the world” and describes research that requires collaborative teams with a multiplicity of skill sets as theorists, activists, and media producers in order to carry out this type of work (2009, p. 123). She also asks questions such as, “Can scholarship show as well as tell?” “Will representing data differently change the ways we understand, collect, or interpret it?
...The ability to deploy new experiential, emotional, and even tactile aspects of argument and expression can open up fresh avenues of inquiry and research” (pp. 120-121).

McPherson’s world of digital media, collaborative team work, activist agendas, and questions regarding the potential of media to offer more meaningful experiences of data collection and dissemination form a parallel universe with Kellogg’s concerns.

Another essay in that same issue by digital artist and activist scholar, Sharon Daniel also deeply influenced my understanding of Kellogg. Her deployment of Walter Benjamin’s definition of an “apparatus” for media production brought Kellogg’s work, particularly in the realm of his publishing collective, Survey Associates, into sharp relief:

What matters, therefore, is the exemplary character of production, which is able first to induce other producers to produce, and second to put an improved apparatus at their disposal. And this apparatus is better the more consumers it is able to turn into producers—that is, readers or spectators into collaborators. (1934)

Daniel also defines herself in a manner that felt apropos for thinking about how to approach Kellogg’s legacy. She comments,

I see myself as a context-provider stretching the concept of artistic creation from making content to making context. Context provision comprises both Benjamin’s “exemplary character of production” and his “apparatus.” A context-provider does not speak for others, but “induces” others to speak for themselves by providing both the means, or tools, and the context where they can speak and be heard. (2009, p. 154)

Kellogg was also a multimodal scholar—a “context provider” seeking to effect social change via democratizing access to research outcomes with innovative uses of visual media. Like Daniel and McPherson, Kellogg worked outside of traditional academic boundaries to carry out research as well as to find new means of disseminating it, integrating skills as a journalist, editor; social worker; and activist. He too was deeply concerned with “democratization” of access to information about social issues. Perhaps
most significantly, like contemporary digital humanists, he understood that representing data visually can engage the emotions in a different way than text. Sharon Daniel’s “hybrid practices” – the “both/and” of integrating multiple professional identities and modalities of practice as well as scholarly products have helped me to understand Kellogg in his many simultaneous roles and gave me the language of “hybrid practices” to understand his projects both during their his time as well as from a contemporary vantage point (Daniel, 2009).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

Foucault took the stance that transformative knowledge is disturbing by nature....To take up Foucault’s challenge with social work today is to take the stance that it may be helpful, and urgently needed, to reflect on the foundations of our profession, rather than merely rearranging the furniture. (Chambon, 1999)

Methodologically, this historical case study aims both to restore Kellogg’s legacy of visual and journalistic practice to social work’s historical record, and to interrogate the implications of that past for the present field— to write, in Michel Foucault’s words, “a history of the present” (Chambon, 1999, Foucault, 1977; Garland, 2014). Consistent with Foucault’s genealogical approach, it is concerned with unpacking and critically analyzing the implications of an earlier, if now largely forgotten, iteration of the hybrid, visual methods that characterize current trends in social work research more generally, and community-engaged approaches in particular. To quote Foucault,

Genealogical work makes no sweeping generalizations. Selecting particular practices and statements, it traces back the ‘conditions of their existence,’ or how they came to be what they are, and not other. In this manner, it identifies new continuities and discontinuities among the ideas and practices of a field. It highlights critical moments, breaks and departures. (1977, p. 146)
In addition to exploring the particularities of Kellogg’s work and vision, the project is driven by a curiosity regarding the “continuities and discontinuities” between “epistemes” (taken by Foucault to mean the knowledge systems which primarily informed thinking during certain periods of history, and the social context in which certain knowledges and practices emerged as permissible and desirable or changed). Foucault (1970) viewed knowledge as discontinuous rather than cumulative, a conceptualization that is particularly useful considering the extent to which social work practice and research moved away from Kellogg’s visual methods and ‘reform research’ values in the 1920s and beyond, as part of a larger epistemic shift away from the Progressive political context of the first few decades of the century.

In Foucault’s (1980) view, furthermore, knowledge is inextricably connected to power, a formulation he constructed as power/knowledge. This insight is critical to the process of analyzing Kellogg’s work, particularly in relation to Kellogg’s role as a research director, editor, and media producer responsible for the making of ‘subjects’ using an array of new technologies, for example by creating visual and data representations of working class industrial workers and immigrant communities in the Pittsburgh Survey. Kellogg’s power in this regard would only grow in his roles as editor of The Survey and later the Survey Graphic, platforms that played important roles in shaping professional discourse in the profession in its early years of formation and in representing it to a wider national audience through midcentury.

**PERIODIZATION**

In regards to the periodization of this study, I have focused in particular on the formative years of Kellogg’s career during the Progressive era (1890-1917). That said,
some of his most thoughtful reflective writing on his own early projects and the
Progressive ethos that animated early social work more generally are found not only in
his correspondence with long term collaborators, such as Shelby Harrison, but also in
two special 25th anniversary “numbers” of Survey Graphic from December, 1937 and
January, 1938. Furthermore, certain elements of his early Progressive era vision are not
fully realized until his work with Survey Graphic magazine, which was initiated in 1921.
Kellogg’s hybrid practice of social work journalism seemed to reach a “high water” mark
in the late 1930s. Not only did Survey Associates reach a maturity of 25 years, Kellogg
also served as president of the National Congress of Social Work in 1939 (Chambers,
1963).

SOURCES

The study draws on an array of primary sources, including archival resources, as
well as a range of secondary historical materials. Thanks to Paul Kellogg’s biographer
and founder of the Social Welfare History Archives (SWHA), Clarke Chambers, there are
several outstanding archival resources available to better understand Kellogg. Working
with the staff at the SWHA, I utilized a variety of records from both the Paul U. Kellogg
Papers and the Survey Associates, Inc. collections. The Kellogg collection spans his fifty
year long career, reflecting both the formation of his journals as well as of the changing
tides of the early social work profession. Of particular interest to me in these papers
were the many resources regarding Kellogg’s early training via the Summer School in
Applied Philanthropy at Columbia University and records regarding Kellogg’s role as
managing editor of the forerunner of The Survey, known first as Charities, then,
Charities and the Commons. Of greatest significance in this collection were the many
records related to the Pittsburgh Survey, including the famed 1906 letter sent by Juvenile Courts worker, Alice Montgomery, requesting that the survey take place. Files regarding the Pittsburgh Survey also included many of Kellogg’s speeches in Pittsburgh defending its results, indicating the response the local community had to it, which was indeed mixed. Lastly, this collection featured the plans to transition the journal, *Charities and the Commons* from its auspices within the New York Charity Organization Society Publications Committee to a free standing, publishing collective called Survey Associates.

The Survey Associates collection revealed more of Kellogg and his team’s journalistic process, including correspondence with many contributors, including economist, Paul Taylor and photographers, Lewis Hine and Tina Modotti. Also useful were his correspondence with other key social work leaders, such as Richard Cabot, MD, considered the founder of medical social work. Kellogg also discussed the founding of *Survey Graphic* with philanthropist (and model for cartoon character, Daddy Warbucks), Paul Warburg. Perhaps of greatest value to this project was Kellogg’s correspondence with Shelby Harrison, director of the department of Surveys and Exhibits at the Russell Sage Foundation. Spanning between 1917 and 1942, their conversations documented the formation and dissolution of the social survey method, particularly as it was realized in the Russell Sage Foundation.

In addition to the archival collections, I have spent a great deal of time working with Kellogg’s voluminous body of written work found in both the journals he edited, which include *The Survey*, (1912-1949) and *Survey Graphic*, (1921-1952); the findings of the Pittsburgh Survey, which were published in *Charities and the Commons* between 1909 and 1914; and his numerous speeches given in a variety of contexts, including
academic conferences, the most significant of which for this project was a 1912 talk entitled “The Spread of the Survey Idea” published in the proceedings of the conference of the Academy of Political Science.

Another significant source of published work was found in Kellogg’s mentor, Edward T. Devine’s numerous books and memoirs of early social work (1909, 1910, 1939). Devine’s descriptions of the conditions early social workers contended with shaped much of chapter 2 of this dissertation.

The dissertation also draws on and responds to two bodies of relevant secondary historical literature. To place Kellogg’s work in a larger context, I have referred to a wide array of sources in the voluminous literature analyzing the social survey movement as a key moment in the emergence of the social sciences, social welfare and the settlement house movement as well as journalism and documentary photography. On Kellogg himself, I am particularly indebted to social welfare historian Clarke A. Chambers’ meticulously researched 1971 biography. Chambers (1963) also made significant contributions to historical scholarship on the emergence of the profession of social work out of Progressive reform. He was especially interested in tracking the early tension between policy, environmental, and labor reform work and efforts to develop a more scientific approach to charity in the form of social case work addressing an individual or family’s needs – a tension that shaped both the formation of the profession and Kellogg’s role in it.

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I have introduced Paul Kellogg and his unique contributions to social work, raising questions regarding the implications of his legacy for current
practitioners of visual research methods and public scholarship. I have evaluated the state of these two domains of practice in social work. I have laid out my orientation to this study grounded in my background in community-engaged practice and multimedia scholarship. Lastly, this chapter introduces the Foucauldian research methodology used in this dissertation as well as the array of sources it relied on.

Looking ahead, chapter 2 will explore the Progressive episteme in which Kellogg came of age as a young man. Kellogg became part of a national community of reformers intent on responding to the social injustice and poor living conditions experienced in rapidly industrializing cities. However, as he and his cohort grappled with claiming expertise and forming a profession, and with the social changes that came with the entry of the United States into World War I, the spirit of reform grounded in the radical collectivity of the Settlement House movement and John Dewey's theories of public engagement faded in the wake of the war. In spite of all of this, the Progressive spirit continued to inspire Kellogg’s work throughout his fifty year long career devoted to carrying out his vision of facilitating processes of “truth plus publicity.”

Chapter 3, entitled, “Truth” will focus on unpacking Kellogg and his collaborators’ research methods employed during the Pittsburgh Survey, first exploring precursors in the form of prior Progressive era social investigation projects. It then considers what made Kellogg’s vision for the Pittsburgh Survey and subsequent social survey movement unique.

Chapter 4, “Publicity,” will consider Kellogg’s model for engaging various publics and the apparatus which he built to carry this out. Via his publishing collective, Survey Associates, Kellogg employed his journals to call into being two different publics: The Survey primarily engaged a social work public, while Survey Graphic engaged a
progressive public interested in social change. Simultaneously, Kellogg was deeply involved in the development of the social survey movement, which was facilitated and often funded by the Russell Sage Foundation.

In conclusion, Chapter 5 will first weigh up Kellogg’s hybrid method of “truth plus publicity.” It then considers the implications of Kellogg’s legacy for contemporary practitioners of community engaged visual research methods, policy advocacy, and public scholarship, explores the current state of both multimedia methods in social work academe, and discusses the significance or stakes of the dissertation for the current profession of social work and welfare research.
CHAPTER 2.
KELLOGG AND HIS CONTEXT: "THE NEW CONFIDENCE"

INTRODUCTION

This chapter will explore Paul Kellogg’s milieu as he arrived in New York City and initiated his career in social work journalism. Kellogg was influenced and mentored by a number of prominent progressives and early social work leaders. Coming of age at a moment in which both the charity organization societies and the settlement house movement were evolving towards increasing professionalization, Kellogg was close to leaders of both movements, working inside the New York Charity Organization Society (NYCOS) under Edward Devine but frequently visiting and often residing amongst the leaders of the settlement house movement such as Jane Addams, Lillian Wald, Florence Kelley, and later, his second wife, Helen Hall. Providing a larger context for these more personal influences, this chapter will also consider the conditions of possibility (Foucault, 1973, p. 35) that shaped the Progressive era broadly, as well as some of the key ideas and theories that animated and indeed troubled Kellogg’s work, focusing in particular on reform of the urban environment, the transition from social reform towards professional social work, the impact of the settlement house movement, and John Dewey’s theories of engaging publics via media.

CONDITIONS OF POSSIBILITY: “MISERY WAS IN EVIDENCE”

The glaring evils and startling injustices found on every hand in the congested sections of large cities supplied the first and strongest impetus towards social reform in this country. (Margaret Byington, 1910, p. 4)

In the late 1800s, the United States experienced explosive urban growth as millions of im/migrants from Southern and Eastern Europe, the rural United States,
and later Mexico arrived to work in factories and the sweating system in cities such as New York, Chicago, Pittsburgh, and Cleveland (Popple & Reid, 1999, p. 10). Crowded and complex multicultural urban landscapes took shape. Trattner (1998) comments, "In 1860, one-sixth of the American people lived in cities; by 1900, the proportion had grown to one-third; and by 1920, it was one half. New York City’s population increased by four times between 1860 and 1910...” (pp. 147-148).

Midwestern cities grew at even faster rates than did East Coast cities. Chicago’s population, for example, experienced a “twentyfold increase” in the same 50-year time period (Trattner, 1998). As East Coast and Midwestern cities’ populations expanded, infrastructure in terms of housing, health care, and education could scarcely keep pace.

As a result, slums emerged, filled with poorly regulated tenement housing and streets insufficient in every way to meet the needs of their residents in terms of space and sanitation. In Homestead, the Pittsburgh mill town depicted in Margaret Byington’s (1910) volume of the Pittsburgh Survey, Kellogg described housing conditions: “One hundred and ten people were found using one yard hydrant. Out of 239 families, 51 families, including sometimes four or five people, lived in one room each... A crude reflection of the effect of these conditions was indicated by the death rate in the second ward. To every three children born there one died before it reached two years of age...” (Kellogg in Byington 1910, p. 23).

Conditions in factories were similarly hazardous to the health of workers. Injuries were common, and hours were as yet unregulated (Devine, 1910; Popple & Reid, 1999). Millions of children worked alongside adults in factories. Thousands more children of all ages eked out an existence on the streets of large cities (Popple & Reid, 1999). “Out of place” (Connolly & Ennew, 1996) in these new urban landscapes, they became a central
preoccupation of the progressive reformers, who developed a wide range of child-focused interventions, from Charles Loring Brace’s “orphan trains” (Gordon, 2001) to Florence Kelley and the National Child Labor Committee’s efforts to eradicate child labor (National Child Labor Committee, 1944).

As this multitude of im/migrants created tumultuous new lives in the streets, tenements, and factories of New York and Chicago, progressive reformers’ lives were also transformed. Largely from privileged, well-educated backgrounds, a variety of social reformers descended upon urban landscapes determined to intervene in the overwhelming poverty and poor health they witnessed (Jackson, 2001; Trattner, 1998). In the process, they wrought policies, social institutions, and professions that have continued to the present, including modern philanthropy, social work, public health, social research, urban planning, and social policy (Greenwald & Anderson, 1996; O’Connor, 2001).

That said, there is something essentially contradictory about this period. On one hand, it produced policies and practices that would indeed be canonized throughout the 20th century and beyond. However, it is the era’s ephemeral characteristics that illuminated key aspects of early social work in general and Kellogg’s vision for “truth plus publicity” in particular (Greenwald & Anderson, 1996; Jackson, 2001). As Shannon Jackson explores in her 2001 history of “reformance” at Chicago’s Hull House, the Progressive era was a liminal time and space, a beginning, an explosion of creative energy that would not and perhaps could not be sustained, particularly in the wake of the devastation of World War I.

In this stimulating context, Kellogg became a deeply committed reformer, subscribing strongly to the idealistic Progressive ethos that if the public only knew about
social issues, they would be moved to do more to address them (Chambers, 1971; Szto, 2008). Despite the relative brevity of the Progressive era (commonly considered to last from roughly 1890 to 1917), scholars have noted that Kellogg’s work continued to be shaped by a Progressive vision throughout his 50-year career—long after the movement had in fact ended (Chambers, 1971; Finnean, 2006a; Zimbalist, 1977).

“WHEN SOCIAL WORK WAS YOUNG”

Born in 1879 to Frank Israel Kellogg and Mary Foster Underwood Kellogg, Paul Underwood Kellogg and Arthur, his older brother and lifelong business partner, grew up in Grand Rapids, Michigan. Their father left the family when Paul and Arthur were teenagers. Unable to afford college, Kellogg began his career as a journalist shortly after high school at the Kalamazoo Daily Telegraph, where he was quickly followed by Arthur (Chambers, 1971). Kellogg spent several years at the newspaper before making his way to New York City in 1901.

In New York, Kellogg enrolled at Columbia University, where for several years he attended evening classes in journalism. In 1902, he also participated in the NYCOS’s Summer Program in Applied Philanthropic Work, forerunner of the Columbia University School of Social Work. Founded in 1898 by the NYCOS in conjunction with Columbia University, this program aimed to provide training for the newly forming profession then emerging from the conjunction of the charities’ methodology of “friendly visiting” (Richmond, 1903) and the structural approaches to social issues at the heart of the settlement house movement.

At the turn of the 20th century, the institutional “ecology” that constituted the field of social work was quite different than it is now. The various charitable and reform
activities that had characterized the charity organization societies and the settlement houses’ responses over the prior decade or so were beginning to coalesce into a conversation about forming a larger profession called “social work” (Chambers, 1963, 1971; Devine, 1939). While both approaches involved people largely of privileged backgrounds attempting to intervene in the lives of the poor, this was a significant moment in the development of the field because there was deep tension between these two camps politically, philosophically, and methodologically (Franklin, 1986; Reisch & Andrews, 2002).

During the late 19th century, the charity organizations had largely focused on “friendly visiting to the poor,” with the goals of moral uplift and eradicating the pauperism that they assumed was rooted in laziness and vice amongst the immigrant poor pouring into large Eastern and Midwestern cities. Meanwhile, the settlement house movement worked to overcome these social barriers through more structural approaches to environmental issues and interactions with the poor grounded in an ethic of neighborliness. That said, the settlers also struggled with the challenges of class in their work. Jane Addams addresses in detail the painful class dynamics that would shape social workers’ interactions with the poor for generations in her amazingly prescient 1899 essay in the *Atlantic Monthly* entitled, “The Subtle Problems of Charity.” She comments, regarding the internal conflicts experienced by a young friendly visitor:

> As she daily holds up these standards, it often occurs to this mind of the sensitive visitor, whose conscience has been made tender by much talk of brotherhood and equality which she has heard at college, that she has no right to say these things; that she herself has never been self-supporting; that, whatever her virtues may be, they are not this industrial virtues; that her untrained hands are no more fitted to cope with actual conditions than are those of her broken-down family. (para 8)
Amidst such ethical complexities, the goals of organized charity began to shift around the turn of the century as leaders such as Mary Richmond, Edward Devine, and others began to work for replicable systematic solutions to the problems their clients faced in concert with the means to educate professionals who could effectively deliver welfare interventions. Additionally, in the first decade of the 20th century, charity organizationists such as Devine, Kellogg’s mentor, were beginning to join the settlers in focusing on environmental “social forces” such as poverty and poor housing rather than just the personal failings and pauperism of their clientele (Devine, 1910; Park & Kemp, 2006).

As the burgeoning community of charity volunteers, settlement house workers and other social reformers grew in the late 19th century, a variety of pamphlets and newsletters developed to meet their needs (Chambers, 1971). Near the turn of the century, as social work and reform began to professionalize, the flimsy periodicals first written for a volunteer audience became more sophisticated and specialized (Bethune, 1994; Chambers, 1971).

Devine, who became Secretary of the NYCOS in 1896, was a key player in this process. Seeing the potential in the role of the organization’s journal, in 1897 he undertook the editing of it himself. Charities became the most influential journal of the charity organization societies, quickly absorbing a number of other smaller publications, including the well-respected Charities Review in 1901 (Chambers, 1971; Devine, 1939).

Simultaneously, Devine was deeply involved in developing professional education via the Summer School in Applied Philanthropy coordinated by the NYCOS at Columbia University, detailing the process of developing the program in his memoir of the field’s early days, When Social Work Was Young (1939). The teaching staff of the program
included President of the NY COS, Robert DeForest; Lee Frankel, Manager of the United
Hebrew Charities of New York; social case work innovator, Mary Richmond; and
Baltimore social welfare leader and attorney, John M. Glenn, among other early leaders
representing the charity organizations. Social settlement leaders such as Jane Addams
of Hull House fame and Graham Taylor, editor of Chicago’s early settlement house
movement journal, The Commons also joined the list (Devine, 1939). Homer Folks,
Commissioner of Public Charities for the city of New York lectured as well (New York
Charity Organization Society, 1902).
According to his note-covered curriculum for the 1902 summer program (Figure 2.1), Kellogg encountered a wide array of content that would actually sound quite familiar in many ways to contemporary students of social work. Curriculum content ranged from direct practice topics such as “Treatment of Needy Families in Their Homes” to the distribution of welfare dollars in “The Uses and Limitations of Material Relief,” and from child welfare, “The Care of Neglected, Destitute and Delinquent Children,” to the “Institutional Care of Adults.” Perhaps most germane to Kellogg’s future, the program ended with a week devoted to “Neighborhood Improvement” under
the direction of Edward Devine. Topics in this arena ranged from settlement house practice, to urban planning projects to improve the lives of the “poor,” to sanitary efforts at street cleaning.

In addition to being a student in the program, Kellogg was assigned to prepare copy on the daily lectures and events for local news outlets. His journalistic skills soon caught Edward Devine’s eye (Chambers, 1971, Devine, 1939). In his capacity as executive editor of the NYCOS journal, Charities (Chambers, 1971; Devine, 1939), Devine was seeking a new managing editor that summer. He quickly offered Kellogg the position. Perhaps ironically in retrospect, Devine noted that his main “difficulty lay in persuading him (Kellogg) to see the possibilities of the post.” To convince him, Devine agreed that Kellogg could continue his university studies. Hence, “his (Kellogg’s) reluctance was overcome, and the beginning made of the brilliant career as managing editor and later as editor which has so deeply influenced social work and social developments” (Devine, 1939, p. 108).

Significant both to Kellogg’s personal life as well as to the development of the journal, Kellogg’s brother, Arthur followed him from Michigan to New York and also completed the Summer Program in Philanthropic Work and also joined the staff of Charities. Arthur went on to become business manager of Survey Associates as well as an editor of both Survey and Survey Graphic. The brothers worked closely throughout their lives until Arthur’s unexpected death in 1934 (Chambers, 1971).

In 1905, Kellogg played a central role in integrating the two contentious streams of early social work into a more unified profession via integrating their journals—Charities, the most influential organ of the charity organization societies, and The Commons, which served the settlement house community, into a new monthly
periodical, *Charities and the Commons* (Chambers, 1971). Shortly thereafter, *Jewish Charity*, journal of the United Hebrew Charities of New York also joined the fold. These developments underscored the broadly ecumenical base established by the new journal – not only in terms of unifying the secular and sectarian, but also in bridging charities and settlements. This also prefigured the significantly more elaborated publication infrastructure he would go on to establish with *The Survey* and *The Survey Graphic* in the following decades.

In the process, Kellogg built professional and personal bonds across the burgeoning national network of progressive reformers and early social workers. Furthermore, operating in the role of a managing editor of the leading journal of the period, Kellogg possessed both emic and etic perspectives on the developing field. On one hand, as managing editor of the integrating field’s foremost journal, he served as an observer and commentator responsible for reflecting the developing profession back at itself (Chambers, 1971). On the other, he was very much a key player in the development of the profession, providing leadership across his career in the National Conference on Charities and Corrections, the National Federation of Settlements, and the American Association of Social Workers. In 1939, he served as president of the National Conference of Social Work (Chambers, 1971).
Although Kellogg was an employee of the NYCOS, he was also deeply influenced by the settlement house movement. His correspondence with Jane Addams throughout their careers was voluminous, as indicated in the Jane Addams Memorial Collection at University of Illinois at Chicago. Kellogg’s personal life was also profoundly impacted by settlement living. In 1909, Kellogg married his first wife, Marion Sherwood Kellogg—a cousin of Arthur’s wife, Augusta and fellow native of Grand Rapids—after a 7-year courtship. They had two children, Richard Patrick, born in 1911 and Mercy Pearce in 1918 (Chambers, 1971, p. 46). As Kellogg’s biographer Clarke Chambers notes, however, one gets the impression that there was a constant tension between his life at home and his career. Kellogg rarely left his work at the office, traveling a great deal domestically.
and abroad and spending long hours in New York City, where he was a frequent guest at
the Lower East Side’s Henry Street Settlement. A close friend of Henry Street’s first
director, Lillian Wald, his bond with its second director, Helen Hall was even stronger,
resulting in a painful divorce from Marion in 1934 (Morrissey, 1996). His brother,
Arthur passed away unexpectedly later that year, devastating Kellogg both personally
and professionally. He married Hall in 1935. The couple lived at Henry Street
Settlement and created a fulfilling bond that lasted till Kellogg’s death in 1958.

This commingling of the personal, professional, and activist was deeply impactful
for Kellogg’s vision of what was possible to achieve. As seen in the Hull House photo on
the previous page (Figure 2.2), settlers lived, ate, and worked together. Shared living
spaces such as the Hull House dining room or the Henry Street Settlement breakfast
table were places where collaborations were formed, ideas became plans and later
federal policy, and problems were solved.

Furthermore, the settlements worked collectively to explore and address social
problems, as evidenced in the collectively authored *Hull-House Maps and Papers*
(1895). Hull House and other settlements also facilitated collective solutions to social
problems, such as creating affordable housing for single men and women that featured
dining halls and shared mealtimes (Jackson, 2001). Clean milk stations provide another
example of a collective solution to the problem of infant morality due to diarrhea during
the long hot summers in heavily populated tenement districts (Muncy, 1991).

Pasteurized, refrigerated milk and free pediatric care were made available to urban
communities by the Sheppard-Towner Act, a model originally envisioned at the
breakfast table at Henry Street Settlement by Julia Lathrop and Lillian Wald in 1903
(Muncy, 1991). During the more conservative 1920s, the collective approaches of the
settlement house movement and the Sheppard Towner Act would be branded as Bolshevik and encounter serious resistance in the form of the Spider Web Conspiracy (Muncy, 1991; Reisch & Andrews, 2002).

As universities – the University of Chicago in particular – built the infrastructure for the scholarly publishing in the social sciences during the 20th century, collective approaches to research dissemination such as Hull House Maps and Papers would also become impossible. This issue was one of the many complexities complicating Hull House’s relationship with the budding field of sociology (Deegan, 1988). Nonetheless, the collectivist ethic embodied in the settlement movement continued to animate Kellogg’s approach to The Survey and The Survey Graphic, in terms not only of the ethos of “team play” Kellogg cultivated in Survey Associates but in terms of the structural approaches he took to approaching social problems.

“THE NEW CONFIDENCE”

The new confidence was in what might be accomplished by conscious social action. It was not a naïve optimism. The pioneer social workers knew the difference between illusive panaceas and specific remedies for recognized social evils. Misery was in evidence, but its causes were believed to be discoverable and removable. The hardships and injustices under which the poor suffered were to be measured, analyzed, and dealt with. The prosperous were to be persuaded or compelled to share their prosperity. Child labor, sweatshops, preventable diseases, insanitary slums were to be abolished. Organized labor was encouraged to demand decent working conditions and living wages. The state was to be called in to fix the levels below which the exploitation of workers and consumers would not be tolerated, above which the principle of free competition might be safely and advantageously be left free to operate. (Devine, 1939, p. 4)

Edward T. Devine’s eloquent summary of the Progressive ethos captures the optimism, indeed the “confidence” that so infused his protégée Paul Kellogg’s work. One
of early social work’s most influential progenitors, Dr. Edward Devine, was both a lecturer in the Department of Economics at Columbia University and Secretary of the NYCOS as well as editor of its journal, *Charities*. Kellogg and Devine were not alone in this reform project by any means. They were part of a large and innovative network of reformers who worked tirelessly to create social change. This optimism Devine describes was a faith that the growing profession of social work now had the capacity – through social action in tandem with modern social science techniques and social interventions – to effect change. Misery, as he confidently asserted, would be “measured, analyzed, and dealt with.”

The word “progress” is the root of the name of this time period and group of reformers. Progressive reformers represented a fairly wide swathe of political positions and orientations toward how best to intervene in social inequality, from charity and models imbuing a sense of personal responsibility to socialism (Popple & Reid, 1999; Reisch & Andrews, 2002). That said, Kellogg among many others was a proponent for a need for strong government intervention in the ravages of laissez faire capitalism, particularly in regards to labor (Cohen, 1996). In this domain, progressives also saw an important opportunity to advocate for government intervention by partnering with organized labor. This vision of the connections among organized labor, labor reform, and social policy is vividly reflected in the Devine quote above. As he notes: “Organized labor was encouraged to demand decent working conditions and living wages. The state was to be called in to fix the levels below which the exploitation of workers and consumers would not be tolerated...” (1939, p. 4)

In addition to intervening in actual labor policy with other authors of the Pittsburgh Survey (Cohen, 1996), Kellogg also invoked imagery of the cogs and wheels of
the factories in his vision of social work practice. He envisioned social workers as engineers tinkering in the machinery of community (Chambers, 1971; Kellogg, 1912; Turner, 1996). Intervening in the urban environment, labor conditions, and health and welfare systems, Kellogg could be categorized as being influenced by the “social engineering” ethos of the period (Chambers, 1971, p. 238). Aware of the darker shades of eugenics and totalitarianism this term implied, Chambers nonetheless emphasizes that Kellogg also believed deeply in democratic processes as a protective factor against totalitarianism, which is evident in his use of visual media for community engagement (Kellogg, 1912).

Examining the development of the modernist liberal, bureaucratic scientism emerging in a rapidly professionalizing welfare state as manifested in the visual media that Kellogg, Hine, and others produced, visual rhetoric scholar, Cara Finnegan has criticized Kellogg’s work as evidence of the formation of modernist social engineering and variation on the professionalization and scientism that so preoccupied social work during the first half of the 20th century (Finnegan, 2000, 2003, 2006a, 2006b, 2008; see also Stange, 1989).

Citing Dewey as the theoretical source of this scientism, Finnegan comments,

The only way for the public to know itself, Dewey argued, was through application of the principles of modern science to human relations. “Genuinely public policy cannot be generated unless it be informed by knowledge, and this knowledge does not exist except when there is systematic, thorough, and well-equipped search and record.” (2000, p. 338)

For better or for worse, Dewey’s ideas would, however, prove to be foundational to Kellogg’s work.
CALLING IN PUBLICS: DEWEY’S INFLUENCE

Though there is no evidence of a personal relationship between John Dewey and Paul Kellogg, at least according to Kellogg’s biographer, Clarke Chambers (1971), they certainly had many close connections in common, including Jane Addams and documentary photographer, Lewis Hine. Jane Addams and Dewey were collaborators, personal friends, and mutually influential; indeed, Charlene Haddock Siegfried argues that Addams and the women of Hull House deeply influenced the more emancipatory elements of Dewey’s pragmatist philosophy through their settlement house praxis (1999).

Meanwhile, Hine studied pragmatist philosophy with Dewey at University of Chicago before moving to New York in 1901. Hine worked closely with Kellogg on the Pittsburgh Survey and Survey Graphic. Furthermore, Kellogg’s work indicates that he was indeed steeped in Deweyan pragmatism, particularly in regards to employing media to cultivate participatory democratic processes in several key overlapping publics: the developing professional community of social workers, the mainstream voting public, and community stakeholders in communities in which social surveys were taking place.

Kellogg’s desire to engage these different publics maps clearly onto Dewey’s framework for utilizing media to democratically organize diverse publics. Believing that society comprises many overlapping publics, Dewey struggled with the following very practical problem: How do “multiple and fragmented publics organize themselves as well as coordinate with other publics” (Cohen, 2013, p. 145)? Or, in Dewey’s words, “By what means shall [the public’s] inchoate and amorphous estate be organized into effective political action relevant to present social needs and opportunities?” (Dewey, 1927, p. 125).
Dewey reasoned that the capacity for diverse publics to come together to enact democratic processes necessitated communication. Otherwise, he feared, the capacity for collective democracy would never be realized. Essentially, communication – mechanisms for literally calling publics into being – undergirded Dewey’s political vision of egalitarian, democratic governance: “For him, communication not only made people human through ongoing and reciprocal processes of self and social realization, it enabled humans to create forms of social organization that are not grounded in individual market exchange” (Cohen, 2013, p. 146).


For Dewey, communication was a very particular – and political – social good. It was both a means of producing publics and the activity that made those publics meaningful. Or to put the point a bit differently, for him, communication was a means of creating social feeling and binding people together that could not be separated from questions of a good society. (p. 144)

This concept clearly also informed Kellogg’s vision of employing “truth plus publicity” in the social survey movement to engage or call in the “overlapping publics” that Cohen describes. These included local stakeholders in social issues, local government, as well as the broader, mainstream voting public and through his publications, the burgeoning professional community of social work.

Another concept of Dewey’s animating Kellogg’s philosophy and methods revolved around the significance of collaborative, collective processes. Rejecting the individualism so common to many American ideologies, Dewey was committed to collective processes and community – a concept near and dear to settlement workers and to Kellogg’s team approaches to both the Pittsburgh Survey and later, Survey
Associates and their publications. Dewey commented that “the great community required regeneration of local community life” (Dewey, 1927, p. 142). This comment sums up Kellogg’s deep commitment to “team play,” as he lovingly described his process of working with his many collaborators over the course of his career (Kellogg, 1937).

CONCLUSION

On one hand, Kellogg was but one player in a large cast of characters attempting to solve the enormous social problems brought about by the rapid development of industrialization, urbanization, and immigration in large U.S. cities during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. On the other, Kellogg was a unique leader who took themes common to many Progressive projects – including Dewey’s pragmatic emphases on participatory democracy, collectivity, and using media to stimulate public awareness of pressing social problems – to build a unique form of social work practice, the social survey movement, which will be explored in the next several chapters.
CHAPTER 3.
“TRUTH”: THE PITTSBURGH SURVEY

Figure 3.1. “A View of Homestead from Pittsburgh” in Homestead: the Households of a Mill Town by Margaret Byington, a volume of the Pittsburgh Survey, edited by Paul U. Kellogg, 1910.

INTRODUCTION

(T)he Pittsburgh Survey gave us not only our name, but broadened our scope, reaching out from the poor and sick and ill-housed to the wage earning community—to everybody. It sharpened our working techniques “to get at the facts of social conditions in ways that would count.” And it strengthened that framework of educational functions on which we have built up the cooperative support for Survey Associates.

(Paul U. Kellogg, December, 1937 special issue of Survey Graphic magazine celebrating the 25th Anniversary of Survey Associates)

In the pithy paragraph above, Paul Kellogg summarized the multifaceted 30-year-long project he began with the Pittsburgh Survey in 1907. Emerging out of the early interventions of the New York Charity Organization Society with the “poor, sick and ill-housed,” Kellogg hailed the Pittsburgh Survey as a sea change in the newly forming
domain of advocacy-oriented social work research via, as he noted, graphic methods that “...sharpened...working techniques 'to get at the facts of social conditions in ways that would count’” (Kellogg, 1937). This Deweyan vision of using visual media to engage various publics in social change would sustain him for his 50-year-long career.

This chapter explores how Kellogg and his colleagues developed the visual methods deployed in the Pittsburgh Survey (1907-1908) to gather and represent truth, including photography, maps, sketches, and data visualization. It has two primary foci. First, it will unpack a variety of Progressive era visual media-based urban reform projects that pre-dated and informed Kellogg and his collaborators’ work on the Pittsburgh Survey. Second, the chapter will discuss the methods of the Pittsburgh Survey, both in terms of use of visual media, and also in relation to epistemological frameworks and larger goals.

PROGRESSIVE ERA PREDECESSORS TO THE PITTSBURGH SURVEY

The methods Kellogg employed in the Pittsburgh Survey to conduct and disseminate social research and which characterized the subsequent survey movement were an amalgam of approaches that had been emerging over the prior decade, both in the settlement houses and later in the charity organization societies. Kellogg was deeply influenced by social investigation projects such as Charles Booth’s Life and Labour of the People of London (17 vols, 1889-1903), and in the United States, Hull House Maps and Papers (The Residents of Hull House, 1895) and W.E.B. DuBois’ The Philadelphia Negro Study (1899), all of which utilized mapping techniques to make visible the complex relationships among place, space, race and ethnicity, and socio-economic status. Kellogg was also influenced by documentary photography approaches such as
those used by Jacob Riis and Lawrence Veiller (Stange, 1989; Yochelson, 2007). By 1907 these methods were well established, yet fraught with a variety of ethical and epistemological complexities.

**THE SOCIAL SURVEY AND MAPPING**

The Pittsburgh Survey was a particularly innovative form of the social survey method, a category of “social investigation” that emerged in the late 19th century as a response to sea changes in urban communities in the wake of industrialization in Europe and the United States. Bulmer, Bales, and Sklar (1991) use the term to refer to a broad array of projects undertaken roughly between 1880 and 1940 in Europe, Canada, and the United States. A 1930s edition of *The Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* edited by Alvin Johnson defines it thus, “In its broadest sense a social survey is a first-hand investigation, analysis and coordination of economic, sociological and other related aspects of a selected community or group” (quoted in Bulmer et al., 1991, p. 2). Distinctly place-based, the social survey was intended as a first step in solving social problems.

Characterized by a concern with the conditions of poverty and with situating social data contextually within space and place, social surveys collected both qualitative and quantitative data and were frequently primarily descriptive. The social survey emerged from a variety of locations, including philanthropic organizations, social settlement houses, and to some extent, the fledging discipline of sociology. This methodology pre-dates statistical methods we currently associate with the term “survey,” which largely emerged after 1940 (Bulmer et al., 1991). Notable social surveys included those of Booth, DeBois, and Hull House noted above.
Historian of the social survey method, Katherine Kish Sklar has commented that:

The interactions between population and geography were especially appropriate tools for analyzing the problems of late-nineteenth-century cities. Maps evoked the physical dimensions of those problems and their spatial scale, exposing the realities of social problems more concretely and more convincingly than prose descriptions or statistical charts. (1991, p. 123)

Mapping various forms of data was at the heart of the social survey method. Articulating this relationship between place, social problems, and the data that described them, the maps at the center of the survey methods were indeed brilliant and clearly an antecedent to current research regarding health determinants. Yet they were also freighted with epistemological contradictions that to some extent continue to plague research regarding low-income communities. As Park and Kemp have noted:

Two potent, mutually reinforcing discursive threads were woven through early social workers’ deeply textured knowledge of immigrants and their neighborhood environments: (1) a fundamentally racialized, pathologizing conceptualization of immigrants and (2) constructions of immigrants, their homes, and their neighborhoods as contaminants lodged in the nation’s cities. At a deeper register than their expressed interest in “the needs and possibilities of the immigrant” (Abbott 1917, p. 282), social work representations underscored the problematization of immigrants in the larger public discourse. (2006, p. 708)

This darker edge to Progressive reformers’ feelings and intentions toward immigrants and African American communities is fundamental to understanding their depictions of low-income neighborhoods through mapping. It thus becomes imperative to interrogate the moral “grid” imposed in community maps, raising the question of whom the data in fact reflected, the surveyors or the surveyed, in regards to a variety of questions (Sklar, 1991, p. 126). For example, the Hull House Maps and Papers Ethnicities map (Figure 3.2) depicts the relationship between race/ethnicity and place. Each color or pattern represents different groups and where they resided in the
neighborhood surrounding Hull House. Progressive era portrayal of data regarding race and socio-economic status in space and place revealed the literal and figurative marginalization in terms of the relationship between spatial distribution and living conditions different communities experienced, just as it does in our contemporary context. As seen in the map below, African Americans were residing on the same street as brothels. What might be inferred from that information? And hence, what types of interventions might be appropriate based on this knowledge?

*Figure 3.2. Hull House Maps and Papers, 1895. Ethnicities map.*

At the same time, Progressive reformers were not insensitive to the ethical dilemmas entailed in gathering data and creating these maps. For example, Shannon Jackson has described Hull House resident Agnes Holbrook’s “Notes and Comments” at
the beginning of *Hull House Maps and Papers* as a “self-reflective statement [regarding]... ‘the painful nature’ of this research, particularly the discomforting violations of privacy that accompanied the systemization of civic housekeeping” (2001, p. 273). And Holbrook herself expressed anxiety regarding the data collection process necessary to carry out community mapping, commenting that, “insistent probing into the lives of the poor would come with bad grace even from government officials, were the statistics obtained so inconsiderable as to afford no working basis for further improvement” (Residents of Hull House, 1895, p. 58).

**PHOTOGRAPHY AND MAGIC LANTERNS**

Like mapping, the rapidly developing technology of photography was taken up by urban reformers during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Photography was also already prominent as a method for documentation, education, and publicity regarding health and welfare issues. Jacob Riis literally illuminated conditions in the tenements with the new technology of flash photography (Yochelson, 2007). A journalist as well as a public pundit, Riis gave talks throughout the country accompanied by “magic lantern” slides of his images (Figure 3.3). These were later transformed into his popular and influential book, *How the Other Half Lives: Studies Among the Tenements of New York* (1890).
Figure 3.3. Jacob Riis, “5 Cents a Spot: Lodgers in a crowded Bayard Street Tenement,” 1890.

Riis employed images in combination with the sensationalizing rhetorical style of muckraking journalism in service to an agenda informed by evangelical Christianity (Yochelson) and a fierce commitment to private enterprise, entrepreneurialism, and middle-class individualism (Stange, 1989b, p. 278). He sought to reform the tenements not through policy-making but through exposés aimed at emphasizing the ethics and morals of the landlords who owned them. A Danish immigrant himself, Riis struggled to find steady work in the United States for 7 years before he settled into a career in journalism in the late 1870s (Stange, 1989b). While tenement housing was the “chief villain of How the Other Half Lives (1890), Riis’s exposé also lingers on the ‘foreign’ with a rhetoric and gaze that undermine his nobler intention of a reformist indictment of the emergent industrial-capitalist order” (Jacobson, 2001, p. 123). The following is excerpted from a chapter entitled, “The Sweaters of Jewtown.”
The tenements grew taller, and the gaps in their ranks close up rapidly as we cross the Bowery, and leaving Chinatown and the Italians behind, invade the Hebrew Quarter...No need of asking where we are. The jargon of the street, the signs of the sidewalk, the manner and dress of the people, their unmistakable physiognomy, betray their race at every step. Men with queer skull-caps, venerable beard, and the outlandish long-skirted kaftan of the Russian Jew, elbow the ugliest and handsomest women in the land. The contrast is startling. The old women are hags; the young, houris. Wives and mothers at sixteen, at thirty they are old. (Riis, 1890 in Diner, 2010, p. 63)

Reiterating Park and Kemp’s comments regarding Progressive reformers’ objectifying if not utterly racist and pathologizing view of immigrant communities, Riis was one of the worst purveyors of this type of content. Simultaneously, his books and presentations were also extremely popular in the middle-class communities in which he presented.

Despite his own background as a struggling recent immigrant, Riis was distinctly against government intervention in regards to poverty and housing reform. Visual culture scholar, Maren Stange has called his proposed approach a “conscientious personal philanthropy” that would reaffirm “the benignity of middle-class values, and of wealth itself, even as the respectable classes girded themselves anew against the threatening forces breeding in the slums” (1989b, p. 279). Not only were Riis’ politics very different from those of many other Progressive reformers, but his positionality was as well. Nonetheless, he would later serve as a close advisor on the Pittsburgh Survey and the Charity Organization Society Publications Committee (Kellogg, 1914a; Chambers, 1971).
THE PITTSBURGH SURVEY

In 1906, Kellogg fielded a letter from Alice Montgomery to *Charities and the Commons*. A reformer and Allegheny County juvenile court probation officer in Pittsburgh, Montgomery had been inspired by a March 1906 *Charities and the Commons* story on Washington DC entitled, “Neglected Neighborhoods: in the Alleys, Shacks, and Tenements of the National Capital,” (Chambers, 1971; Kellogg, 1914a) and was, as Clarke Chambers put it, “determined that some such report on the decayed neighborhoods and neglected lives be done for the city of steel” (p. 33). Montgomery wrote requesting assistance in “appointing a special investigator to study and make a report of the social conditions in Pittsburgh and vicinity” (Greenwald & Anderson, 1996, p. 7; see also Chambers, 1971, p. 33).

Kellogg chose to undertake oversight of this survey of Pittsburgh himself in conjunction with the Publication Committee of the New York Charity Organization Society (NYCOS), leaving the day-to-day management of the journal in the capable hands of his brother and business manager, Arthur. As director of the Pittsburgh Survey, Kellogg oversaw all its aspects, including an interdisciplinary staff of over fifty researchers, relationships with hundreds of what we would now refer to as community partners, and a data collection design employing a combination of methodological approaches (Chambers, 1971; Stange, 1989).
Figure 3.4. Image from The Pittsburgh Survey, in Charities and the Commons, Volume XXI, January 2, 1909.

As depicted in the graphic representation of the organizational structure of the Pittsburgh Survey (Figure 3.4), the Charities Organization Society Publications Committee mobilized a wide array of social institutions related to all aspects of health, education, welfare, labor, and industry, as well as individual community leaders in Pittsburgh, including settlement house leader, William H. Matthews, Mayor George W. Guthrie, and the president of the Chamber of Commerce. (Kellogg, 1914a, p. 497).

Initial funds for the project were provided by a donation from the NYCOS of $1000 for a proposed data collection period of 3 months. This was followed by Pittsburgh Civic Association’s contribution of $350. In Kellogg’s biography, Chambers drily comments that this was indeed “a token sum which may be taken as a predicting
sign of the amount of concern the citizens of Pittsburgh would later demonstrate when the study was completed” (1971, p. 34). Ultimately, the bulk of the financing would come from the newly formed Russell Sage Foundation (RSF). RSF provided an initial $7000 to cover the originally planned 3 months of research, beginning in September 1907. However, the observations of the initial group – or “flying wedge” as Kellogg put it – of investigators were deemed to require longer term research (1914a, p. 498). The project ended up continuing over 18 months throughout 1907 and 1908. RSF spent $27000 in total on the data collection stage of the Pittsburgh Survey, and later bankrolled the publication, for $20,000, of the six bound volumes that ultimately made up the results (Chambers, 1971, p. 34).

With this funding in place, Kellogg put together an “efficient staff of investigators” to study conditions and create an “unbiased presentation of the facts” (see Figure 3.4) relating to people, water and typhoid, labor, health education, schools, children, social institutions, and so on.

**THE FIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF A SOCIAL SURVEY**

In a July 1912 presentation to the American Academy of Political Science entitled “The Spread of the Survey Idea,” Kellogg laid out the five cardinal characteristics of the approach emerging from the Pittsburgh Survey that made it, in his words, “a distinctive enterprise” (1912, p. 2):

1. To bring a group of experts together to cooperate with local leaders in gauging the social needs of one city.
2. To study these needs in relation to each other, to the whole area of the city, and to the civic responsibilities of democracy.
3. To consider at the same time both civic and industrial conditions, and to consider them for the most part in their bearings upon the wage-earning population.

4. To reduce conditions to terms of household experience and human life.

5. To devise graphic methods for making these findings challenging, clear, and unmistakable (1912, pp. 2-3).

In the following sections, I elaborate further on each of these characteristics.

1. **TO BRING A GROUP OF EXPERTS TOGETHER TO COOPERATE WITH LOCAL LEADERS IN GAUGING THE SOCIAL NEEDS OF ONE CITY.**

Kellogg was very intentional about assembling a team of 50 “experts” representing different arenas of concern to the project, both local to Pittsburgh and national. Accordingly the Pittsburgh Survey included his Associate Director Frank E. Wing (public health) and a field advisory group, which consisted of labor experts Florence Kelley and John R. Commons and Settlement House leader, Robert Woods. Kellogg’s field researchers included housing expert Lawrence Veiller, labor lawyer Crystal Eastman, social survey expert Shelby Harrison, and Boston settlement worker and Pittsburgh native Robert A. Woods (Kellogg, 1914a, pp. 499-501). The team also included artist (and Italian interpreter) Joseph Stella and photographer Lewis Hine. Were these researchers based in a contemporary university, this approach would be called interdisciplinary and multi-method. Since many of these folks literally invented the work that they were doing, their expertise was primarily grounded in their experience as well as in their academic training.

Kellogg clearly envisioned the social survey methodology as a means of bringing “expert” help together with communities – or at least community leaders – seeking to identify and **collectively** solve systemic social problems (Turner, 1996). To this end,
Kellogg and his research team of national experts carefully partnered with a variety of institutions and organizations throughout the city. Their research team also included an array of members from the local community, including interpreters from immigrant communities, visiting nurses, librarians, lawyers, and members of the Pittsburgh Civic Commission (Kellogg, 1914).

2. **TO STUDY THESE NEEDS IN RELATION TO EACH OTHER, TO THE WHOLE AREA OF THE CITY, AND TO THE CIVIC RESPONSIBILITIES OF DEMOCRACY.**

   As the graphic representation of the project in Figure 3.4 indicates, the Pittsburgh Survey cut across a broad swathe of subject areas. Kellogg’s method was both deeply place-based, and relational, in the sense of being concerned, as he noted, in “the major elements entering into a given community” (1912, p.4). Commenting on the importance of local knowledge, or specificity, as opposed to reliance on aggregated and generalized data, he noted: “And when the subject matter is not specialized, but concerns the more intangible ‘needs’ of a community, the survey becomes necessarily different things in different localities” (1912, p. 3). Invoking the imagery of an engineer or a builder, Kellogg was especially concerned with seeing systems in relationship to each other. For example, in his introductory note to *The Pittsburgh District Civic Frontage* (1914a), a bound volume of the minor reports of the Pittsburgh Survey, he commented,

   In binding up the minor reports at this date in a permanent form, only those are included which as transcripts of the human consequences of some phase of our civic or economic order, as cross sections of community life, or as exhibits of either retrograde or nascent social institutions, will be of service to those generally at work upon the social welfare. (1914a, p. iii)
3. TO CONSIDER AT THE SAME TIME BOTH CIVIC AND INDUSTRIAL CONDITIONS, AND TO CONSIDER THEM FOR THE MOST PART IN THEIR BEARINGS UPON THE WAGE-EARNING POPULATION.

In addition to examining – and illuminating – the interconnections between “civic and industrial conditions,” Kellogg was particularly interested in how these conditions impacted the primary subjects of the Pittsburgh Survey, industrial laborers. Deeply concerned with the wellbeing of laborers and their families, the Pittsburgh Survey devoted numerous resources to evaluating the conditions of their lives from as many angles as possible. For instance, Crystal Eastman’s research in *Work Accidents and the Law* examined the impact of injuries sustained by laborers on their families’ wellbeing, particularly from a financial perspective, providing key data in support of legislation on workmen’s compensation laws (Eastman, 1910). Meanwhile, Margaret Byington’s (1910) research on the community of Homestead, a mill town across the river from Pittsburgh, considered the relationship between the mill and its residents from a variety of perspectives, ranging from unease regarding labor in the wake of the 1893 strike, to the household budgets and expenditures of the mill’s workers, to the lives of children.

Chapter 1 of Margaret Byington’s *Homestead: Households of a Mill Town* (1910) (volume 4 of The Pittsburgh Survey) opens with a narrative of the great strike of 1892 at the Carnegie Steel Corporation (later U.S. Steel) mill in Homestead. The Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers’ strike lasted over 3 months before the workers realized that the mill wasn’t going to negotiate. Many were refused work when they tried to return due to their participation in the strike or because their positions had been taken by strike breakers (Byington, 1910, p. 10).
Bitterness over the outcomes of the strike and the demise of the union still lingered 15 years later when Byington conducted her study in Homestead.

Not only was Kellogg concerned with making the “piled up actualities” (Kellogg, 1914, p. 5) of the impact of dysfunctional and unjust civic and industrial conditions on the daily lives of laborers visible, he was also concerned with making them recognizable to those laborers themselves, as characteristics four and five both convey.

4. TO REDUCE CONDITIONS TO TERMS OF HOUSEHOLD EXPERIENCE AND HUMAN LIFE.

Invoking the Charity Organization Societies’ focus on the casework method, Kellogg was deeply concerned with engaging the general public regarding the findings of the Pittsburgh Survey by “bringing problems down to human terms” (1912, p. 5). In 1914, for example, he made a telling comment regarding the significance of “bringing the facts home to the community” in a description of the field work and publication scheme of the project in the Pittsburgh Survey’s final volume, The Pittsburgh District: Civic Frontage:

But if there are two generalizations more than others growing out of the experience, which should be of service to future surveys, they are: first, to spend more and not less in bringing the facts home to the community, so that they reach every householder and become part of the common understanding; and second, to set aside far greater allowance of time for drafting the material into shape, once gathered. The greater the absence of social records in any community the slower the process of collation, the greater the time and technique necessary to shape them into a telling message. (1914, p. 501).

This emphasis on a “greater allowance of time” for focusing on the form of dissemination was bedrock to his journalistic, Deweyan methods of “publicity” and ran counter to what would emerge in academic publishing in the social sciences in the
decades to come (O’Connor, 2007). Kellogg literally called the use of journalistic skills in disseminating the findings of the Pittsburgh Survey, “writing for democracy.” He continues, “This is not a counsel, bear in mind, of flimsy sensationalism...” (1914, p. 6), though this is precisely what would be critiqued by social scientists as the method’s downfall in the coming years (Bulmer, 1991, 1996). In addition to carefully constructing prose that is digestible to multiple audiences, Kellogg’s social survey method emphasized the critical significance of use of visual media.

5. TO DEVISE GRAPHIC METHODS FOR MAKING THESE FINDINGS CHALLENGING, CLEAR, AND UNMISTAKABLE (1912, P. 2).

In contrast with prior social surveys, the Pittsburgh Survey made innovative use of visual media in several unique ways: integrating the use of sketch portraits and landscapes, maps, and experimental new forms of data visualization and photography to document and publicize urban issues and reform projects. These visual modalities, as Kellogg aptly noted, “exploited...the advantages the eye has over the ear as a means of communication”(p. 5), with the aim of making the survey’s findings “challenging, clear, and unmistakable” (p. 3).

SKETCHES

Artist Joseph Stella sketched many portraits of research subjects as well as city scenes (examples, Figures 3.5-3.7). Stella was an Italian immigrant himself and also provided translation services with Italian research subjects during the course of data collection (Greenwald, 1996; Stange, 1989). Like the photographic portraits Lewis Hine created for the Pittsburgh Survey, though luminously beautiful, the devil lay in the details of how the photos were described. With titles like “immigrant types,” “Hungarian
types,” “Polish types,” etc., these images reinforced popular ethnic stereotypes of the period. As Pittsburgh Survey historian, Maurine Greenwald comments,

Stella’s ethnic portraits fit compatibly with the racial stereotyping that pervaded American culture at the time and appealed to the liberal reformers’ mixed reactions to immigrants...Stella’s portraits...embodied the dual message that although immigrant workers all possessed different “racial” traits, they all deserved social uplift. (1996, p. 139)

Figure 3.5. “In the Bread Line” by Joseph Stella in The Pittsburgh Survey: Wage Earning Pittsburgh (Kellogg, 1914b, p. 76).

Simultaneously, Stella’s sketches of industrial interiors and urban landscapes captured an environment inhospitable to its human inhabitants, making the case for the need for reform, particularly in the steel mills.
Figure 3.6. “At the Base of the Blast Furnace” by Joseph Stella in *The Pittsburgh Survey: Wage Earning Pittsburgh* (Kellogg, 1914b, p. 111).

Figure 3.7. “Pittsburgh Night” by Joseph Stella in *The Pittsburgh Survey: The Pittsburgh District Civic Frontage* (Kellogg, 1914a, p. 1).
As in Hull House Maps and Papers (1895) and DuBois’ work in Philadelphia (1899), the surveyors of the Pittsburgh Survey represented a wide array of different data geographically via maps, such as how tuberculosis was spread to the locations of different industries employing women, as seen below.

*Figure 3.8. Map in Elizabeth Beardsley Butler’s *Women and the Trades: Pittsburgh, 1907-08* (1909, p. 22).*

Data were also represented in unique graphic forms reminiscent of contemporary Infographics. For instance, in a chapter addressing 35 years of the presence of typhoid in Pittsburgh due to impure water, each page included silhouettes representing the 622 deaths due to typhoid in the year 1907 alone (Figure 3.9). The charm of these simple figures makes the data they represent particularly emotionally impactful.
PHOTOGRAPHY

Kellogg worked especially closely with Lewis Hine, a documentary photographer, sociologist, and former schoolteacher, to integrate documentary photography into the research approach of the Pittsburgh Survey and to develop a variety of graphic formats for collecting data (Sampsell-Willman, 2009; Stange, 1989a, 1989b; Trachtenberg, 1990). This process in turn formed the basis for Hine’s personal amalgam of documentary photography, research, and political advocacy. Kellogg and Hine’s collaboration on the Pittsburgh Survey was a turning point in the careers of both editor and photographer. The Pittsburgh Survey included 300 photos, 80 of which were taken by Hine.

Originally from Wisconsin, Lewis Hine made his way to New York City, cutting his teeth as an amateur photographer in creating images of newly arrived immigrants at Ellis Island. Hine was also a trained and experienced sociologist and schoolteacher (Sampsell-Willman, 2009; Trachtenberg, 1987). Like Kellogg, he was deeply influenced
by the ideas of John Dewey. He developed his unique practice of “social photography” (Trachtenberg, 1980) within a framework much informed by his training in pragmatic philosophy at University of Chicago with John Dewey and his education in social pedagogy at New York University. Trachtenberg, in an essay entitled, “Camera Work/Social Work,” has commented that:

In fact, Hine’s educational theory aimed at something at once more general and more basic: to teach an art of social seeing, a process basic to what the teacher of his generation, John Dewey, called the “process of living” [....] Dewey’s creed became fundamental to Hine’s photographic social work: a concern with the process of seeing within the larger process of social “betterment”—the more conscious use of intelligence to achieve a more rational collective life. (1990, p. 191)

When Hine left teaching in 1908, he moved on to simultaneous positions as a field reporter and photographer with several of the most significant reform organizations of the period: The National Child Labor Committee (NCLC), the Pittsburgh Survey, and later, Charity and the Commons/The Survey (Sampsell-Willmann, 2009; Stange, 1989a).
Figure 3.10. “One arm and four children,” Work Accidents and the Law (Eastman, 1910, p. 153). Illustrating the cost to family welfare of steel mill injuries, this picture depicts an father of four unemployed due to the loss of his arm.
Figure 3.11. Irish stogie-maker, Pittsburgh, 1909. “Working at the Suction Table” in Elizabeth Beardsley Butler’s Women and the Trades: Pittsburgh, 1907-08, (1909, p. 90). The Miriam and Ira D. Wallach Division of Art, Prints and Photographs: Photography Collection, The New York Public Library. Hine sought to dignify labor through his photography. His portraits of women working in industrial settings were among the first of their kind (Greenwald & Anderson, 1996).

Of particular interest to this dissertation and influential for Kellogg’s conceptualization of the social survey method and his publications alike, Hine advocated that social workers should also wield cameras on a daily basis as a tool of their practice: to document their work and let their opinions be known in order to influence public policy. The following is an excerpt from a 1909 speech he gave to the National Conference of Charities and Corrections, a forerunner of the National Association of Social Workers:

>The greatest advance in social work is to be made by the popularizing of camera work, so these records may be made by those who are in the thick
of the battle... Apart from the charitable or pathological phases of social work, what a field for photographic art lies untouched in the industrial world. There is urgent need for the intelligent interpretation of the world’s workers, not only for the people of today, but for future ages. (Hine, 1909, p. 5)

The idea of social workers carrying cameras to document their work “in the thick of the battle” for the purposes of the world understanding their labor or purposes of political advocacy still sounds radical over a century later. Photography featured prominently in the documentation of a broad array of services by the settlement houses (Bryan & Davis, 1991) and also in environmental assessments of the social surveys during the first few decades of the profession. But as social work moved indoors towards more clinical models of casework, so did its concern with documenting and politicizing its practices.

Outcomes of the Pittsburgh Survey:

In a 1909 publication in the American Journal of Sociology entitled “The Results of the Pittsburgh Survey,” Edward Devine commented,

...our main purpose has been to offer a structural exhibit of the community as a whole and not to make an exhaustive investigation of any one of its aspects...We have dealt in the main with the wage earning population, first in its industrial relations, second in its social relations to the community as a whole...There are certain immediate, tangible results in Pittsburgh. An Associated Charities, an increased force of sanitary inspectors, a comprehensive housing census, a typhoid commission, a permanent civic improvement commission are certainly very tangible and striking results.... (p. 661)

Devine goes on to list a number of conditions that the project uncovered. First, there was a nearly universal state of overwork among wage earning laborers, particularly those working the steel mills and railyards. Second, those laborers, particularly those in the mills, were woefully underpaid in comparison with the cost of living. Third, women
in industrial settings were paid even less than men for comparable work. Devine proceeds to also list “absentee” capitalism, an ongoing flow of immigrant laborers willing to suffer low living standards, typhoid fever, archaic social institutions ill-equipped to manage the challenges created by a growing immigrant population in the wake of industrialization, and ultimately, enormous social disparity between the wealthy and the low income laborers of Pittsburgh (p. 662). In the end, he boils this list down to the “unremitting toil” of 12-hour days and working on Sundays and to “social neglect” resulting in very poor outcomes for families (p. 663).

Other outcomes can also be identified. In the immediate wake of the Pittsburgh Survey research phase, Kellogg reported on the closure of a particularly egregious tenement housing project called Painters Row (1914a). Frank L. Wing’s work on the typhoid that had been endemic to the Pittsburgh water system for 35 years resulted in a commission to address this deadly issue.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, the power brokers of Pittsburgh did not take kindly to the findings of the Pittsburgh Survey. The local press referred to it as a “black eye” to the city (Greenwald & Anderson, 1996). The Chamber of Commerce actually commissioned a competing survey in 1911 regarding similar topics. And never did a political candidate ever refer to the Pittsburgh Survey in Pittsburgh (Greenwald & Anderson, 1996). Ultimately, commented Greenwald and Anderson,

...the Survey failed to arouse Pittsburghers – either influential citizens or the middle class – to improve everyday life for workers in Pittsburgh, solve environmental problems of the area, or meet the immediate “needs of the poor” at the time. Its local accomplishments...resulted in modest efforts in the new field of urban planning. (1996, p. 9)
In the longer term, however, Kellogg’s goal was to impact not just Pittsburgh but all urban communities where industrial laborers were suffering. Several of the case studies conducted under the umbrella of the Pittsburgh Survey were groundbreaking in this regard. For instance, Beardsley-Butler’s *Women and the Trades* was the first study of women working outside of the home in the United States (Greenwald & Anderson, 1996). Crystal Eastman’s research in *Work Accidents and the Law* (1910) would go on to raise national consciousness regarding the high costs to employees of industrial accidents when in the overwhelming majority of cases, the fault lay with employers. Her suggestion that there should be a financial incentive for companies to eliminate hazards to workers became foundational to Workman’s Compensation law (Lubove, 1965).

**CONCLUSION**

From a contemporary perspective, the Pittsburgh Survey remains a valuable as a source of firsthand accounts of the lives of subaltern communities of immigrant industrial laborers at the turn of the last century. Furthermore, Kellogg and his group of expert and community collaborators used an innovative array of data collection techniques to document what he referred to as “truth.” These techniques resulted in richly developed qualitative and quantitative descriptions of the relationship between people and place, vividly documented through maps, photographs, and sketches. The goal of the survey was to formulate an unbiased presentation of facts that made the conditions of poverty apparent to a variety of publics, including community stakeholders, policy makers and industrial leaders, and the mainstream voting public. Kellogg sought not only to advance reform in Pittsburgh to improve the lives of industrial laborers, but also to change policy across the country.
Nonetheless, the Pittsburgh Survey must be assessed through the problematic lens of progressive reform. Though Kellogg and his team’s methods were innovative, and their findings clear and powerful, the resulting changes were mixed in terms of actual outcomes locally in Pittsburgh or nationally. In spite of this, Kellogg spent the remainder of his career devoted to advancing his particular conception of the survey method, which can be summarized as “truth plus publicity.” The following chapter will explore the apparatus Kellogg and his team built for facilitating “publicity”: the ability to call various publics to engagement with the research findings the Survey had generated.
CHAPTER 4.
“PUBLICITY”—DISSEMINATION

INTRODUCTION

In the years leading up to and following the Pittsburgh Survey, Kellogg and his collaborators built an institutional apparatus that supported both his publications and his vision for a social survey movement in which social workers regularly wielded media for purposes of research, community engagement, and political advocacy or, in his own words—“...to get at the facts of social conditions in ways that would count” (1937). Kellogg and his team of collaborators realized a complex organizational infrastructure that though highly significant to the formation of the first 50 years of the social work profession, has now largely been forgotten. Particularly salient were the Russell Sage Foundation (RSF) Department of Surveys and Exhibits, which became an institutional hub for the social survey movement, and Survey Associates, the publishing collective that produced The Survey (1912-1952) and later, Survey Graphic magazine (1921-1952).

This multifaceted apparatus evolved in various stages over the course of a decade or more, beginning with the founding of the Publications Committee of the New York Charity Organization Society (NYCOS) in 1905, which published the journal Charities and the Commons, and later planned (and published) the Pittsburgh Survey (Hammack, 1994). Consisting of influential social reformers and public figures such as the settlement house movement’s Jane Addams and Graham Taylor; photojournalist Jacob Riis; lawyer Robert de Forest; professor of social economy at Columbia University and director of the NYCOS Edward T. Devine; Jewish social services leader Lee Frankel and others, this group had significant influence in policy and philanthropic circles. From its inception, the outcomes of the Pittsburgh Survey were envisioned as resulting in a series
of publications in *Charities and the Commons*, as well as educational exhibits modeled on the successful Tenement House exhibits undertaken by Lawrence Veiller in 1900 (Stange, 1989; Zimbalist, 1977).

A 1907 NYCOS Publications Committee brochure outlining the goals for the Pittsburgh Survey makes some strong claims regarding this commitment to broad dissemination and public education as a route to larger social “betterment”:

The purpose of this Committee is to get at the facts of social conditions and to put those facts in front of the public in a way that will count. In this it has the co-operation on the one hand of individuals, institutions, and organizations throughout the country; and on the other of newspaper editors, ministers and public bodies. There is not a movement for social betterment but is made saner and broader by this interchange of experience and suggestion. (NYCOS Charities Publications Committee, 1907)

Kellogg’s journalistic intentions and methods were likewise always very clearly articulated as the foundation of his approach to the Pittsburgh Survey. In a 1908 issue of *Charities and the Commons*, he commented that “There is the census at one pole; and yellow journalism at the other; and we are on the high seas in between” (1908, p. 1669). This phrase in essence reveals his desire to strike a balance between data gathered and presented on its own terms, without interpretation (e.g., census data), and more sensational, muckraking journalistic methods intended to rouse strong emotions in readers. The “high seas” in between were vast and complex. Kellogg’s claims of “unbiased reporting of the facts” would be complicated not only by journalistic methods but his desire to influence policy.
INSTITUTIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE

In order to spread the new social technology that was the “social survey movement,” as Kellogg dubbed it in 1912, an infrastructure needed to be built. From its 1907 founding through the early 1940s, the RSF provided a vital institutional home, offering both professional expertise and philanthropic support to the fledgling “social survey movement.” Founded in 1907, RSF’s first grantee was the The Charities Publication Committee in order to fund the work of the Pittsburgh Survey. Over the coming four decades, the foundation focused its efforts largely on supporting the growing body of professional social work practice and social research that sought to address social problems (Hammack, 1994; O’Connor, 2007; Zimbalist, 1977).

In its earliest years, the advisory board of the RSF was in fact nearly identical with the group of leaders that made up the Charities Publications Committee, and in 1912, when Kellogg decided to break away from the NYCOS as a free standing publishing collective, Survey Associates, many of these leaders joined him (Hammack, 1994). In providing oversight for the RSF, this group of reformers also gained access to the funding to build the “expertise” of the new profession of social work while the social work academe was in its infancy. Historian of philanthropy David Hammack comments.

Neither the Charities Publication Committee, Survey Associates, Inc., The Survey, nor Survey Graphic...were ever legally part of the Russell Sage Foundation, but they were created and managed by the same set of people, and they all drew financial support from the Foundation. Kellogg’s Survey publications were significantly shaped by the Foundation’s leaders, especially by deForest, who kept up a lively correspondence with Kellogg. (1994, p. 15)

As noted in chapter three, the Pittsburgh Survey’s primary funder, RSF, provided not only the lion’s share of funding for the data collection phase of the project
($27,000), but also an additional $20,000 for its publication in *Charities and the Commons* (Zimbalist, 1977, p. 124).

The politics of this intertwined leadership of the RSF and of “social work journalism” have been interpreted very differently by different scholars, revealing its essentially contradictory nature. On one hand, Hammack, editor of *Social Science in the Making*, a volume of essays on the history of the RSF, comments that RSF founder “Margaret Olivia Sage and her attorney Robert W. de Forest, did not think in terms of social work as the field developed over the next forty years” (1994, p. 2). Rather, their framework was steeped in 19th century notions of charity and private giving.

Historian Alice O’Connor (2007), on the other hand, looks on the early decades of the RSF – and the Pittsburgh Survey in particular – as a model for re-centering the primary concerns of social research on addressing social inequality. She describes,

The animating vision of a purposive, engaged social science the survey represents... a vision the Russell Sage Foundation cultivated and became a leading institutional home for on its founding in 1907 and for much of its first century. (2007, p. 17)

In truth, the politics of the early leadership of the RSF/Charity Organization Society Publications Committee represented a diverse set of ideologies competing for dominance in the larger political sphere shaping the forming field of social work and social welfare. These ranged tremendously even amongst this small group of early social work leaders. Jacob Riis, Margaret Sage, and Robert DeForest emphasized private charity and philanthropy. In contrast, Florence Kelley was a well-known socialist and labor advocate, working tirelessly for policy reform at the federal level. By the 1920s, Jane Addams had a several-inch-thick FBI file regarding her various “dangerous red” activities – as the Lusk Committee later labeled them (Reisch & Andrews, 2002).
Simultaneously, she was literally and figuratively in bed with philanthropic supporters of Hull House, such as fellow settler and life partner Mary Rozet Smith (Fredriksen-Goldsen, Lindhorst, Kemp, & Walters, 2009).

Also indicative of the diversity of political opinions and approaches represented among RSF staff, it was professional home to such early social work luminaries as Mary Richmond, creator of social case work, and Mary van Kleeck, director of RSF’s Department of Labor Studies, leader of the Rank and File Movement during the Depression, and a card-carrying Marxist (Selmi & Hunter, 2001). Kellogg himself may not have been identified as a radical, as evidenced in critiques by leaders such as Van Kleeck during the 1930s of Survey Associates’ support of New Deal legislation (Reisch & Andrews, 2002). That said, his personal politics were left of many. Along with Jane Addams, Lillian Wald, Crystal, Max Eastman, and others, he co-founded the American Union Against Militarism, which protested U.S. involvement in World War I as well as imperialist forays into the Caribbean and Latin America and later evolved into what is now the American Civil Liberties Union (Reisch & Andrews, 2002).

I would argue that Kellogg’s ability to maneuver among all of these individuals and their diverse ideologies was a significant factor in his early success in building Survey Associates and the RSF. As an editor attempting to create a forum facilitating conversations among social workers across the field, this ability was imperative. It was even more imperative in maintaining relationships with the more conservative philanthropic sources Survey Associates relied on for survival.
By what means shall [the public’s] inchoate and amorphous estate be organized into effective political action relevant to present social needs and opportunities? (Dewey, 1927, p. 125)

Kellogg’s plans for the dissemination of the findings of the Pittsburgh Survey seemed to almost answer the question John Dewey asked above in 1927’s *The Public and its Problems*. Dewey was particularly interested not only in how various distinct publics were engaged in social action but also in how they were to coordinate with each other (Cohen, 2013). Kellogg’s multi-pronged approach to dissemination was designed to engage local stakeholders and policymakers in Pittsburgh as well as various national audiences. These included the growing field of professional social workers for whom the social survey would prove to provide a popular methodology. Kellogg also sought to engage a mainstream voting public in an increased concern with the well-being of the low-income industrial workers whose lives were at the center of the Pittsburgh Survey.

The immediate dissemination of the Pittsburgh Survey took several forms. Initially it was published as a series in *Charities and the Commons* and later as six bound volumes published by the RSF. Four primary case studies were published as freestanding monographs: *Women and the Trades* (Beardsley-Butler, 1909), *Work Accidents and the Law* (Eastman, 1910), *The Steel Workers* (Fitch, 1910), and *Households of a Mill Town* (Byington, 1910). An array of many smaller projects and appendices reflecting on the project were published in two volumes: *The Pittsburgh District Civic Frontage* (Kellogg, 1914a), and *Wage Earning Pittsburgh* (Kellogg, 1914b). The former volume included a range of topics – from evaluating the state of schools, libraries, playgrounds, and orphanages, to understanding the Aldermanic court system, to public health battles with Typhoid and Tuberculosis – organized into sections
such as “The Community,” “Civic Conditions,” and “Children and the City” (Kellogg, 1914a). The latter addresses “Race Studies” of “Slav” and “Negro” communities and a focus on industrial conditions in terms of safety and hygiene (Kellogg, 1914b).

In addition to the publications themselves, Kellogg and his team developed a wide array of exhibit materials that could be deployed in a variety of public settings to raise consciousness in their viewers regarding the issues addressed by the Pittsburgh Survey. By 1907, photographic exhibits were already a well-established method of educating the public about reform issues. Popularized by events such as the 1893 World’s Fair in Chicago, other examples of these consciousness-raising exhibits include the American Negro exhibit at the 1900 Paris Exposition, which displayed 363 photographs of African American communities in Georgia collected by W.E.B. DuBois (Smith, 2004). In addition, self-described “professional altruist” Lawrence Veiller and the NYCOS developed the Tenement House Exhibit of 1900, which featured 1,100 images of the conditions amongst the low-income immigrant communities of New York City (Stange, 1989). Documenting the simultaneously dangerous and overpriced housing of the lower classes, the exhibit included over 1000 photos (Stange, 1989). It also included a model tenement design competition reminiscent of contemporary efforts like Architecture for Humanity, which employ design to meet the needs of at-risk populations (Stohr & Sinclair, 2006; Smolker & Lanza, 2011). Veiller and the NYCOS also successfully lobbied for a variety of code reforms in the wake of this project. Veiller went on to be appointed secretary and executive officer of the NYCOS and would play a significant role in the Pittsburgh Survey in regards to housing research.
Figure 4.1. “Girl with outdoor W.C.’s,” In The Tenement House Problem (edited by Robert W. DeForest and Lawrence Veiller, 1903). Columbia University Libraries online exhibitions (ca. 1900).

While similar in approach to earlier exhibits, the 1900 Tenement House exhibit also reflected the influence of the rapidly professionalizing field of social work as well as interventions aimed at policy-making. As Stange has commented, it “signaled to many observers that the [New York] Charity Organization Society was moving beyond its narrow brand of ‘warring against pauperism’ to stake out a newly expansive position as an articulate and activist participant in progressive reform” (1989, p. 31). Following in this tradition, Paul Kellogg collaborated with social photographer, Lewis Hine in
developing exhibits aimed at disseminating the Pittsburgh Survey’s findings. In the process of doing so, Kellogg and Hine developed “innumerable methods” (Hine, 1909) of reaching the public regarding the social problems confronting the poor in America’s industrial cities. As Alan Trachtenberg has commented,

Together with Kellogg, he [Hine] experimented in an extraordinary variety of communication forms—...photo montage, photo-story, photo mosaic, picture essay, centerfold, centerfold pullout, accordion-fold leaflet, post card... Each communication was a transaction, an exchange with the audience: graphic representations (including the media of presentation) offered an exchange for a response—a heightened, sympathetic awareness of the lives of others. (1990 p. 199)

The Pittsburgh Survey team disseminated these exhibit materials most notably at the Carnegie Institute in Pittsburgh in 1908. The enthusiasm for exhibits as a means of public education would also be institutionalized in the Department of Surveys and Exhibits at the RSF several years later (Turner, 1996).

A SOCIAL SURVEY “MOVEMENT”?

The RSF became home to the Department of Surveys and Exhibits in 1912, which became the locus of expertise regarding the social survey methodology and use of media to publicize and raise consciousness regarding social issues throughout the 1910s and 1920s (Hammack, 1994). Kellogg was a close friend and colleague of Shelby Harrison, the department’s director and member of the Pittsburgh Survey team, who directed it from its founding through its dissolution in 1942.

In an August 1913 New York Times article on the work of the Department, Harrison commented that,

The essence of the survey idea rests on a recognition of important changes in human relationships due to tremendous industrial development, the
cityward movement, immigration, the influx of men in industry and other causes. With these changes have come new problems calling for new diagnosis and study to learn whether the old machinery for individual and social advance is fitting the new needs, whether the community has been keeping abreast of scientific progress. (Harrison, 1913).

Reading his description, one is acutely aware of how focused the survey method was on structural interventions into urban environments – in stark contrast to social casework, which in the wake of the 1915 Flexner Report and the devastating impacts of World War One would become dominant as social work’s core methodology (Flexner, 1915).

In the immediate wake of the Pittsburgh Survey and the founding of Survey Associates, a number of social surveys inspired by its methods quickly followed across the country. Notable among these was the Springfield, Illinois, survey led by Harrison himself, which was considered to be closest in form and content to the Pittsburgh Survey, hence Kellogg’s model as laid out in his 1912 paper to the American Academy of Political Science (Kellogg, 1912; 1914a; Turner, 1996).

In a 1919 annual report of the RSF Department of Surveys and Exhibits, the “Department Purpose” is described as intended

to study and develop the social survey and social exhibit as measures for community development—in other words, to help increase the use of investigation method in dealing with social problems related to particular localities, and to assist in improving the methods of disseminating helpful information in the field of social work. (Harrison, 1919, p. 3)

Staffed by a small team of Harrison and a married couple, Evart and Mary Swain Routzahn, the department produced a number of guide books such as the *ABCs of Exhibit Planning* (Routzahn & Routzahn, 1918) as well other resources regarding
surveys and exhibit creation for social welfare and public health in addition to advising on projects and a number of speaking engagements.

In a 1921 letter to Kellogg from Harrison, he reviews the current state of the field, describing survey projects of all sizes, ranging from a survey of the City of Cleveland, the condition of rural schools in upstate New York, to descriptions of federally mandated annual surveys by the U.S. Bureau of Education and the U.S. Department of Public Health. Harrison comments, “Other indications that the survey ‘movement’ is a live and vigorous force at present are: Various national and state organizations are listing surveys among their regular activities” (Harrison, 1921, p. 2). In that same letter, Harrison also mentions that the New York School of Social Work “had announced a course in Social Surveys and Community Studies” to be conducted by none other than himself (p. 3).

In a brief introduction to a 1935 American Sociological Association volume on Regional Research and Regional Planning entitled Some Forerunners of Regional Research, Harrison describes the differences between the social survey the city planning movement, which he claims is organized around increase in use of the automobile and “reversed the social survey process” (p. 83), envisioning new city plans rather than assessing current problems. He comments that “a year or so ago it was possible to list no less than 2,700 different survey projects” (p. 82).

By the late 1930s, however, these numbers began to dwindle or identify themselves as categorically different. The methodologies Kellogg, Harrison, and others had developed in the Pittsburgh Survey for using visual data for research, education, and advocacy were largely left behind, not only by the academic social sciences, but also by social work itself (Bulmer, 1996; Bales, & Sklar, 1996; Turner, 1996; Zimblist, 1977).
By this time, the community-based research and education for democratic participation that characterized the social survey method were largely crowded out by both clinical methods and the political attacks on progressives of the post-World War I period (Chambers, 1971; Reisch & Andrews, 2002). Furthermore, by the 1930s, in addition to social work several professions had emerged out of the social reform era that addressed similar questions, including public health, public administration, and urban planning (Hammack, 1994; Harrison, 1935). By the 1940s, the RSF began to re-organize. They shifted their focus from developing the professionalization of social work towards funding and supporting the growing infrastructure for social science research in universities (Hammack, 1994; O’Connor, 2001, 2007; Zimbalist, 1977).

In spite of Harrison’s upbeat reports of the late teens and early twenties, there is debate among scholars of the social survey as to how successful the social survey movement was. On one hand, welfare historian Sidney Zimbalist comments,

The Pittsburgh Survey started a chain reaction that swept the field like wildfire. The boldness of the conception, the enthusiasm of its leaders, the eloquence of its literature captured the imagination of the field and the public, and the social survey was hailed as a major development in the evolution of social work. It was (modestly) compared with the charity organization society movement and the settlement movement as a major stage in the development of the profession. (1977, p. 127)

Stephen Turner, on the other hand, does not see much evidence of the “movement” Kellogg envisioned (1996). Rather, he argues, the survey methodology outlined by Kellogg was in fact his bid on what social work expertise should resemble at a moment, prior to the 1915 Flexner Report (Flexner, 1915), in which the profession’s signature methodology was still very much up for grabs. Turner perceived Kellogg’s
vision of the “social survey movement” as about positioning a particular form of social work expertise as being recognizable, sought after, and thus marketable.

At stake here was a vision of social workers not just as media producers, but also as significant community leaders. Utilizing imagery from the industrial conditions in which he sought to intervene, Kellogg described the expertise employed by the social surveyor as that of an engineer tinkering in the machinery of “community” and policymaking, rather than that of a therapist or case worker. Kellogg was making a bid for creating a new methodology in social work.

That said, as the social survey movement evolved, very few surveys followed the city-wide model Kellogg laid out in his 1912 talk to the American Academy of Political Science. Instead, moving forward the survey method was applied to different individual systems, such as education or health care (Turner, 1996). In any case, the institutional infrastructure to support the social survey movement was largely gone by mid-century. Kellogg’s publishing career followed a similar trajectory.

FROM CHARITIES AND THE COMMONS TO THE SURVEY AND SURVEY GRAPHIC

SURVEY ASSOCIATES AND THE SURVEY

In the same period that Kellogg worked to disseminate the findings of the Pittsburgh Survey, he also initiated significant changes in the publications he edited. His work as a journalist and editor evolved over several iterations. After the Pittsburgh Survey data collection phase ended in 1908, Kellogg published the findings of the Pittsburgh Survey in Charities and the Commons, (Chambers, 1971; Devine, 1939. On
becoming executive editor in 1909, Kellogg re-branded the journal as *The Survey* in recognition of how transformative he felt the methods of the Pittsburgh Survey were.

In 1912, Kellogg shifted the journal away from the auspices of the NYCOS Publication Committee to become a free-standing, membership-based publishing collective called Survey Associates, assisted by a large grant (and ongoing funding for many years to come) from RSF (Chambers, 1971; Devine, 1939 Hammack, 1994). According to a 1920 fundraising request Kellogg submitted to millionaire, Paul M. Warburg, “Survey Associates” had 15,000 weekly subscribers paying an annual cost of $5.00, 1300 paying for a $10.00 subscription, 120 paying a “sustaining subscription of $25, and “something over 200 contributors of from $50 to $2500,...” (1920, p. 5). In other words, by 1920 *The Survey* had a total of almost 17,000 subscribers who paid a minimum of over $100,000 per year to receive (and support) this publication, confirming its profound popularity among the growing professional community of social workers.

In *The Survey*, Kellogg and a diverse array of illustrious contributors marked out terrain previously uncharted in American journalism, addressing topics such as venereal disease and sex education, industrial conditions, labor reform, and unemployment (Kellogg, 1937). In a 1937 issue of *Survey Graphic* celebrating the 25th anniversary of Survey Associates, for example, Kellogg described a 1911 symposium on labor unrest organized by *The Survey* that resulted in the founding of the U.S. Commission on Labor Relations. In a 1912 essay, Adrienne Chambon comments on the influence Kellogg and contributing social workers exercised via *The Survey*:

...social workers were not thought of as a separate, or distant entity. Instead, they were thought of as active members and leaders of the broader society who were to be informed, and to take a prominent part in
the deliberations on the directions that their society was to take. This is also the period when the leading figures in the discipline held senior public positions and played significant roles in shaping public policy. The format and aim of *The Survey* thus emphasized knowledge for public engagement and mobilization. (Chambon, 2012, p. 5)

Because the leadership of Survey Associates was deeply intertwined with the leadership of the RSF, however, there was diversity amongst the leadership of Survey Associates in terms of their politics and goals. Debates fomented amongst Survey Associates National Council regarding the domain of what the journal should in fact cover – a question that spoke both to the lack of clarity regarding the nature and scope of social work practice as well as to the diversity of political opinions of the leadership of Survey Associates. Representing the more conservative end of the political spectrum, John M. Glenn (lawyer, charity organizationist and early director of the Russell Sage Foundation) wrote a 1916 letter to Kellogg admonishing him to worry less about the successes of other progressive publications, such as *The New Republic*, and focus more on addressing the needs of “that rapidly growing army of social workers (who) are hungry for real professional guidance” (1916, p. 6). He also advised Kellogg to strenuously avoid topics related to reproductive health or the feminist movement, both of which *The Survey* had featured prominently.

A letter from later that year written by Kellogg to Richard Cabot, MD, who would later be credited as the founder of medical social work, speaks eloquently to another set of complexities but also the value of Kellogg’s social work journalism. He comments,

> Sometimes in the still watches of the night, I cringe at the low-brow rawness of *The Survey*... I am not unmindful of the inconsistencies, the half-baked qualities, which mark the pages. But I cherish *The Survey* faculty for eliciting first-hand budgets of testimony from the people who are workers rather than writers. There is an editorial problem back of that
sentence which is larger, more exacting, more inspiring in its possibilities than you would perhaps give it credit at first sight. (1916, p. 3)

This quote reflects how significant it was that Kellogg created a media forum that provided social workers with a public mouthpiece, regardless of their amateur status or writing prowess. This sense of the journal as a platform for exchange of ideas about social issues and social policy amongst social workers also extended to the mainstream public. As Clarke Chambers commented:

Social policy, as the Mid (Survey Midmonthly) saw it, lay in everyone’s domain; but it was the special province of the serving professions to lead the community in the recognition of unmet social needs and in the elaboration of programs that would create an environment in which the self-determination of individuals, families, and natural social groups would be enhanced. (1971, p. 101).

*Survey Graphic*

Kellogg would take this vision of social service professionals as leading pundits on public policy even further in developing *Survey Graphic*, which Survey Associates began publishing in 1921 (Chambers, 1971; Finnegan, 2006).

Survey Graphic is team play when it swings the arc of the professions and reaches wider circles of the lay public. (Kellogg, 1937, p. 621)

*Survey Graphic* allowed him the greatest freedom to carry out his goal of engaging a wider audience of those more broadly interested in social problems (Chambers, 1971, p. 85). In describing the journal’s mission, Kellogg commented,

We chronicle developments...pool experiment and experience...afford a forum for free discussion...carry forward swift first hand investigations with a procedure comparable to that of scientific research...interpret the findings of others...employ photographs, maps, charts, the arts in gaining a hearing from two to twenty times that of formal books and reports. (Kellogg, *Survey Graphic* 25th Anniversary Issue, December 1937, un-numbered centerfold)
In addition to reaching a diverse national audience, *Survey Graphic* also offered the opportunity to address a broader range of topics such as labor conditions, Mexican migrant workers, the Harlem Renaissance, and birth control as well as the arts and literature (Finnegan, 2006a). In effect, as economist and *Survey Graphic* contributor Paul Taylor noted in a 1970 oral history, *Survey Graphic* was “a popular magazine... like *The New Republic* and *The Nation*” (Riess, 1970).

But as Cara Finnegan points out, While Kellogg wanted “*Survey Graphic* to have some similarity to other journals of the time,...” He “also believed that his new journal should be fundamentally different in orientation. While these journals represented themselves as journals of ‘opinion,’ Kellogg wanted his new publication to represent itself as a journal of ‘social fact’” (2006a, p. 15). More than that, he remained stalwart in his longstanding Deweyan goal of using his media platform for publicizing social issues on which he wanted to spur his readership to action regarding the social issues covered in *Survey Graphic*.

The real thrust of *Survey Graphic*’s mission was *interpretation via graphic representation* because, as he noted in the quote above, visual representations of data gain “...a hearing from two to twenty times that of formal books and reports.” Prefiguring the current array of Infographics and digital stories circulating via social media to engage viewers regarding different social issues, *Survey Graphic* featured documentary photography, art, and data visualizations, such as the figure below, that are still quite striking.
THE DECLINE OF THE SURVEY

While Survey Associates’ publications enjoyed a certain degree of success during the twenties and thirties,

Kellogg continued to edit both Survey Midmonthly and Survey Graphic, but gradually even the professional social work readership dwindled for the “Mid.” By the late 1940s, more specialized journals serving the various subsets of social work practitioners and researchers emerged, including The Family (1921-), Social Service Review (1927-), and Social Work Today (1934-), making Kellogg’s journals obsolete. In 1949, Survey Associates closed production of The Mid but continued producing Survey Graphic until 1952, at which point, Kellogg retired due to poor health. Survey Associates also folded due to financial strain at this time.

In a 1963 essay on the relationship between social reform and social work, Clarke Chambers commented,
The demise of Paul U. Kellogg’s *Survey* magazine, for nearly a half-century the primary organ of information and exhortation in the field of social policy and reform, left a vacuum that no other publication could fill. When it ceased publication in 1952, the attachment of the profession as a whole to broad social action was irrevocably weakened. (1963, p. 84)

CONCLUSION

While Kellogg’s survey disappeared from social work and social welfare research at midcentury, his methods carried forward in two distinct locations. First, the types of issues that the social survey movement sought to address were taken up by municipal research and the field of urban planning (Harrison, 1935), even as the social work mainstream “contracted” its knowledge base (Chambon, 2012) and moved “indoors,” emphasizing social case work as its principal methodology (Chambon, 2012, Reisch & Andrews, 2002). Second, Kellogg’s impulse to employ visual media to engage the public regarding social injustice has been critical in the formation of photo journalism and, in the context of social media, is perhaps more relevant now than ever. Prefiguring these contemporary developments, Kellogg’s journalistic methods of employing documentary photography to inform the public regarding health and welfare issues were perhaps most famously carried on in the Federal Farm Security Administration documentary photography project during the Great Depression.

Revealing my own historically constructed understanding of what a social worker is, I initially envisioned the end of the Social Survey movement as the “end” of Kellogg’s role in social work *practice*. But in reality, the role of his publications in the field was more complicated. Thinking again about Adrienne Chambon’s concept of the expansion and contraction of the borders of the knowledge base of the field, Kellogg currently falls
far outside of it. But in fact, in 1939 he was the president of the National Congress of Social Workers, the pre-cursor to the National Association of Social Workers.

This chapter has attempted to provide an analytical overview of the arc of Kellogg’s career as a hybrid practitioner of social work journalism, with special attention to understanding the animating concept of his work, the social survey – a methodology deeply steeped in the Deweyan notion that communities and publics are built by communication. Kellogg summarized this idea as “truth plus publicity” (Kellogg, 1912, p. 480), meaning that once research data is collected, it should be articulated in visually engaging ways to best inform the local community stakeholders as well as the broader voting public regarding complex social problems. In chapter 5, I will consider the impact of Kellogg’s largely forgotten legacy for current social work practitioners and scholars.
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION.
HYBRID PRACTICE: TRUTH PLUS PUBLICITY

INTRODUCTION

I set out in this dissertation to recover and critically analyze the lessons of Paul Kellogg’s innovative hybrid methodology, aptly captured in his phrase, “truth plus publicity” (1912). Addressing several gaps in the interdisciplinary literature on Kellogg, his publications, and the social survey movement, I have aimed to demonstrate that both the Pittsburgh Survey and the publications Kellogg developed and edited are significant genealogical forebears of community-engaged practice and research. I have also made the argument that there is much to learn from Kellogg as a forerunner of multimedia public scholarship, particularly in regards to policy advocacy in social work.

Reflecting Kellogg’s Deweyan ideals of building “the great community” via intentional communication (Cohen, 2012; Dewey, 1927), Kellogg’s hybrid methodology is ultimately rooted in the concept he refers to as “truth plus publicity.” “Truth” in his eyes is research grounded in an objective, scientific approach. Meanwhile, “publicity” for Kellogg meant something quite different than the publicity generated by the public relations industry currently. Instead, the word signified the deployment of journalistic techniques to engage both community stakeholders and the voting public in a democratic process addressing complex social issues.

In this concluding chapter, I will first consider his methods on their own terms as well as their implications for both community-engaged practice and research and multimedia public scholarship in contemporary social work.
Underlying this factor of graphic portrayal is the factor of truth; truth plus publicity.... The philosophy of the survey is to set forth before the community all the facts that bear on a problem, and to rely upon the common understanding, the common forethought, the common purpose of the people as the first great resource to be drawn upon in working that problem out. Thus conceived, the survey becomes a distinctive and powerful implement of democracy. (Paul U. Kellogg, 1912, p. 480)

To structure my concluding thoughts, I will again use as a referent the key elements of the social survey movement laid out in Kellogg’s 1912 paper to the American Association of Political Science. These include:

6. To bring a group of experts together to cooperate with local leaders in gauging the social needs of one city.

7. To study these needs in relation to each other, to the whole area of the city, and to the civic responsibilities of democracy.

8. To consider at the same time both civic and industrial conditions, and to consider them for the most part in their bearings upon the wage-earning population.

9. To reduce conditions to terms of household experience and human life.

10. To devise graphic methods for making these findings challenging, clear, and unmistakable (1912, p. 2-3).

The first four of these criteria – a commitment to bringing outside experts together with local community leaders, a locality-oriented systemic focus, a concern with the combined impact of “civic and industrial conditions,” particularly on working people, and an investment in bringing larger issues into human focus – come together under the rubric of Kellogg’s emphasis on “truth”: rigorous examination of “all the facts that bear on a problem” (1912, p. 480). The fifth criterion – the innovative use of graphic
methods – relates directly to his dual interest in a broad dissemination of the survey findings.

**TRUTH**

1. *A Community-engagement and Collaborative Research Team*: “To bring a group of experts together to cooperate with local leaders in gauging the social needs of one city.”

   At the core of Kellogg’s model is his investment in the “survey idea” being both community-partnered and deeply in service to democratic processes of solving social problems. I would argue that these intertwined characteristics render this model an early forerunner of Community-Based Participatory Research models, particularly those that feature vernacular knowledge and collaboration. Kellogg’s emphasis on pairing research experts with community-based organizations and community leaders to conduct research (Kellogg, 1912) reveals a fairly sophisticated understanding of the limitations of outside experts coming in to gauge the needs of a community. Indeed, this dynamic understanding of subject and agency sounds far more like the community-engaged models that have evolved out of the self-reflexive community-based participatory action research methods since the 1970s, though paradoxically Kellogg’s model was deeply grounded in a modernist perspective that these later models seek to critique (Minkler, 2004; Minkler & Wallerstein, 2008). In spite of these epistemological differences, in intention and practice, there are similarities that I think justify an inclusion of the social survey movement into the genealogy of community-engaged praxis and research.
As discussed in detail in chapter 3, Kellogg worked with leaders of many organizations, including immigrant organizations for the purposes of gathering emic and etic perspectives on the Pittsburgh Survey staff’s immigrant laborer subjects. That said, as Ewa Morawska (1996) has documented, the upper class, educated, Protestant researchers’ perspectives on these Catholic, “Slavic” immigrant communities were hamstrung by a combination of their own classism and ethnocentrism in that they misunderstood many immigrants’ reasons for being present in Pittsburgh – which revolved far more often around improving their lot in their homelands than committing to life in the United States, let alone their far more nuanced and complex perceptions of their surroundings. Ideally, more contemporary postcolonial, feminist approaches that characterize community-based participatory approaches with goals of shared power and concerns regarding listening to subaltern voices would address these types of issues in similar research today.

Another characteristic of Kellogg’s approach that is similar to contemporary community-engaged methods is his emphasis on collaboration. In addition to coordinating many organizations in Pittsburgh, Kellogg also worked with an enormous team of collaborators. Although prior social surveys were also carried out by teams, for example “the residents of Hull House” in the case of Hull House Maps and Papers (1895), the Pittsburgh Survey represented a watermark in collaborative team approaches to social research in terms of both scale and diversity of expertise as well as participation by national and local experts. As noted in Chapter 3, collaboration became a continuing characteristic of Kellogg’s modus operandi throughout his career. His reliance on “team play” (1937) shaped his career from beginning to end.
2. **A Place-based, Systems-Oriented Perspective**: To study these needs in relation to each other, to the whole area of the city, and to the civic responsibilities of democracy.

Also distinctly relevant to the contemporary community-based approach to research was Kellogg’s concern with developing a structural, place-based understanding of the social problems in communities. Early 20th century society was characterized by enormous disparities between the wealthiest few and the overwhelming majority of Americans – particularly in the realm of social and health outcomes. These disparate outcomes were – and remain – very much tied to race and socioeconomic status, as well as place and space (Sutton & Kemp, 2011). The low-income workers and communities featured in the Pittsburgh Survey and other Progressive era studies experienced multiple forms of social and spatial discrimination (Park & Kemp, 2006). For example, a century ago, Pittsburgh Survey Associate Director Frank L. Wing analyzed the spread of typhoid via the Pittsburgh water system (Kellogg, 1914a).

Contemporary U.S. society is characterized by the same disparities. As occurred a century ago, low-income people in urban settings, particularly those of color, are frequent targets of discrimination of all kinds. As Sutton and Kemp note, “too many impoverished communities of color live in neighborhoods abandoned within a globalizing economy” (2011, p. 22). These communities are marginalized not only geographically, but also in terms of economic wellbeing, educational attainment, and access to quality food, health care, and even water. Tragically, in Detroit and Flint, Michigan, as well as other cities of the Rust Belt, contaminated water poses health threats that parallel those being investigated in the Pittsburgh Survey. Krings and colleagues’ (2014) work speaks to the high levels of exposure to industrial toxins low-
income urban residents currently face in Southwest Detroit and their struggle to fight back.

Lamenting the profession’s relative lack of engagement with these pressing socio-environmental justice issues and noting that, as in Pittsburgh a century ago, the burden of environmental injustices “fall most heavily on poor, marginalized and vulnerable people” (p. 199), Kemp (2011) calls for contemporary “social work to revitalize its environmental commitments” (p. 199).

Current conditions welfare scholars face, as neoliberalism collapses under the weight of soaring social inequality and injustice, demand the structural, place-based analysis that Kellogg sought. Although scholars such as Zimbalist (1977) and Bulmer (1996) critique Kellogg’s social survey methodology as too broad and diffuse, I would argue that looking back at the models that Kellogg and other early inventors of social work provided for us is crucial. I would also argue that never have such systemic community-practice models been more significant in the struggles for social justice that low-income communities are facing.

Further, Kellogg’s ecological, place-based model and his concern with locating a survey within a specific geographic community relate to current “Person in Environment” frameworks (Kondrat, 2008). Employing media to facilitate conversations about social issues can also be seen as an important precedent for current methods of participatory mapping and other forms of environmental and space/place-oriented practice (Gjesfjeld & Jung, 2011; Hillier, 2007; Jung, 2011).

3. A Policy and Labor Focus: To consider at the same time both civic and industrial conditions, and to consider them for the most part in their bearings upon the wage-earning population.
The dignity and wellbeing of laborers was at the core of Kellogg’s work. It would also continue to be the focus of his collaborator, photographer Lewis Hine, until his death in 1939. However, since the mid-20th century, the field of social work has been largely disconnected from issues of labor injustice in the wake of “communist witch hunts during the Cold War years” (Ashenberg Strauss & Kolko Philips, 2015, p. 115). Fearing political repression, the field of social work distanced itself dramatically from the labor movement, particularly at the height of McCarthyism (Reisch & Andrews, 2002; Scanlon & Harding, 2005). The roots of early social work and the labor movement were, however, tightly intertwined for five decades. The Pittsburgh Survey as well as Kellogg’s publications and personal advocacy work in the field of labor both in the United States and Europe were particularly outstanding examples of social work practice and research in service to labor justice (Chambers, 1971). In reviewing The Survey and Survey Graphic, I was able to trace a concentration on labor conditions as the key structural cause of social inequality in both written and visual content. Art in different media featuring images of laborers graced many issues of the journal as did visualizations of conditions they faced. Perhaps the most famous and indeed complicated of these was a 1936 Survey Graphic article written by economist Paul Taylor featuring his wife Dorothea Lange’s famed portrait of a migrant farm worker family from Oklahoma known as “Migrant Mother” among other images of migrant laborers taken for the U.S. Farm Security Administration during the Depression (Finnegan, 2000). As Kellogg notes in his introduction to the December 1937 25th Anniversary issue of Survey Associates, the field of “industrial relations” has always been a focus for the publishing collective. He describes not only news stories by labor
scholars and advocates but also “a Survey symposium” intended to move things forward with the U.S. Commission on Industrial Relations (Kellogg, 1937, p. 620).

What are the implications of the type of leadership Kellogg demonstrated relative to labor for contemporary practitioners? Among a wide array of social justice issues related to labor, one particularly poignant parallel with the Pittsburgh Survey exists in the ongoing conditions for Latino immigrant laborers, particularly in the realm of agriculture. Bearing a remarkable similarity to those faced by the Slavic immigrants in Pittsburgh over a century ago, these include poor pay, unregulated hours, low-quality housing, and unsafe working conditions (Breckwich Vasquez et al., 2014; Kim et al., 2014). Meanwhile, undocumented immigrant families who cross the border in order to access labor opportunities are vulnerable to deportation and separation with implications, such as being held in privatized deportation centers that are for all intents and purposes, prisons, while their children enter the child welfare system. Labor and family welfare are as intertwined as they were a century ago. In addition to revitalizing social work’s collective professional memory of the social survey movement as an exemplar of the field’s early engagement with labor justice, I hope that this project also serves to refresh our professional commitment to advocate for fair labor and immigration policies. This commitment would require fortitude in an era of deep hostility towards immigrant laborers.

4. A Relatable Data Set: To reduce conditions to terms of household experience and human life.

Kellogg was deeply committed to making data “digestible” to the common consumer. This goal was foundational to the nature of the data he and his team collected
in the Pittsburgh Survey. Kellogg and his team were particularly concerned with making structural inequalities clear in “terms of household experience and human life.” This goal was articulated clearly and repeatedly in the Pittsburgh Survey through work such as *Homestead: Households of a Mill Town* (1910), which was authored by Pittsburgh Survey team member Margaret Byington with an introduction by Kellogg. *Homestead* literally documented in exacting detail the wages, rent, and household budgets of laborers in relationship to larger trends of immigration and labor conditions in the steel mills. According to historian Margot Anderson, “Byington describes the living situations of steel workers in Homestead, clearly showing that the vast majority did not make enough to support their families” (1996, p. 106). Anderson goes on to argue that Kellogg and his team saw *Homestead* as motivated by a careful analysis of where to apply political pressure to change these conditions. She comments that “…in 1907, the balance of power between labor and capital favored management completely” (1996, p. 108).

Seeing that the labor movement had been squelched during the great strike in Homestead in 1893 and that local policymakers were in the Mills’ “pockets” so to speak, the Pittsburgh Survey team sought to influence the mainstream voters via articulating the cost of steel production to the wellbeing of its laborers.

However, Anderson goes on to critique the data in *Homestead* from a number of perspectives, including that of the ethnocentric framework in which Byington, and by extension Kellogg, evaluated the Slavs’ households, which frequently included boarders and extended family. While her data did bear out that workers were indeed grossly underpaid, the Pittsburgh Survey team’s biases regarding what a healthy standard of living should resemble influenced the outcomes and policy recommendations they made.
The research problems faced in *Homestead* still haunt social welfare researchers in terms of how to evaluate a common standard of living in the context of the profound cultural diversity of the contemporary United States. And, though any consumer of the internet is faced by innumerable bids for their vote on a variety of issues, how does one realistically evaluate the quality of the data being presented or the validity of the emotional narrative being depicted? These questions indeed complicate social work’s relationship with media and political advocacy.

**PUBLICITY**

5. *A Multimedia, Multisensory Graphic Methodology: To devise graphic methods for making these findings challenging, clear, and unmistakable.*

Turning our attention toward the fifth and final element of Kellogg’s model, he indicates a vision of social welfare research as something that should be understood in clear and familiar terms by multiple publics. Publicity implied graphic methods of data collection PLUS a dissemination infrastructure/strategy aimed at broad readership, translation, and social change. This section will explore the implications of both Kellogg’s graphic methods and his disseminations strategies for contemporary practitioners of community-engaged visual praxis in social work.

**GRAPHIC METHODS**

Visitors to the Hull House Museum in Chicago are invited to imagine the sensory experiences that might have typified life a century ago, at the height of the Settlement House movement in urban Chicago. These, the exhibit suggests, would include scents of horse dung, mud, and garbage on a hot day; a cacophony of street vendors’ cries,
children playing, carriage wheels, and all of the other sounds of a densely populated area. This visceral understanding of the environment is crucial to an understanding of what drove Progressive reform and why reformers were drawn towards visual research methods in particular. While sounds and smells were not conveyable, Progressive reformers longed to bring home to the public the absolute need for efforts to reform the working and living conditions of the urban poor. Photography, mapping, and other visual media were highly effective tools in these efforts.

Figure 5.1. Lewis Hine, 1908, National Child Labor Committee Collection, Library of Congress.

Beautifully exemplified by Lewis Hine’s poignant photo of a child laborer taking a moment to look out a window during a day of work at the textile mill (Figure 5.1), documentary photography was used with great effect to depict the human face of life in urban slums and industrial workplaces, providing a powerful interface between people and their environments during the Progressive era.
MULTISENSORY AND EMOTIONAL RESPONSES

In both historical and current examples, the use of photography in particular elicits an emotional response in the viewer. Visual sociologist Stephen Spencer and visual anthropologist Sarah Pink both describe the emotional response of viewers of visual data—particularly photography and art—as grounded in an embodied, sensory experience (Pink, 2006; Spencer, 2011). Spencer comments,

...the visual has an explicitness which delivers a multisensory impact.... There seems to be some accord that there is something indefinable about the visual, grounding it in material reality. It is an immediate and authentic form which verbal accounts are unable to fully encompass. (2011, p. 32)

This visceral and emotional response is what has drawn generations of visual social work researchers to working with images. In 1929, Paul Kellogg spoke to this point regarding the use of graphic images in the Pittsburgh Survey:

In this city of engineers, maps, charts and diagrams were used as modern hieroglyphs to reinforce the text, why the camera was resorted to as a luminous and incontrovertible transcript of life, why Lewis Hine’s ‘work portraits’ told their story of the human wear and tear.... (Kellogg & Deardorff, 1929, p. 792-793)

In both Pink’s “visual interventions” into urban design and the sustainability movement (2015) and Kellogg’s in Pittsburgh a century ago, this emotional response is employed to engage a public regarding the issues at hand — be they the stake holders impacted by an issue or a group of potential allies who might be relied upon to take action to address it in some form. The visual is seen as a means of working more effectively to intervene in systems and amongst organizations in order to reach distinctly non-academic ends (Pink, 2009).
In a strong parallel to early examples of visual research methods, a number of contemporary researchers in allied fields — particularly environmental psychologists such as Roger Hart and Caitlin Cahill—have also handed cameras to children and youth to document and critically interrogate their environmental contexts (Cahill, 2004, 2007, 2008; Hart, 1997, 2008). Public health scholars such as Caroline Wang and others have similarly pioneered the use of Photovoice, a participatory action research strategy to address inequalities in environmental health with impacts for both policy and practice in this arena (Wang & Burris, 1994; Catalani & Minkler, 2010).

During the 1990s and early 2000s, the social sciences were generally marked by shifts towards both the visual (Mierzoff, 1999; Jay, 2002) and spatial (Soja, 1996) epistemologically and methodologically, in concert with the rise of multimedia and GIS technology. These “turns” toward visual and spatial analysis impacted a wide array of disciplines such as history, geography, anthropology, and sociology.

**NARRATIVITY AND COUNTER-NARRATIVITY**

Although the visual evidence generated by the Pittsburgh Survey of its laboring immigrant subjects was complicated by Progressive era ideologies (Anderson, 1996; Morawska, 1996), in fact, Kellogg’s primary visual artist, Joseph Stella was an Italian immigrant who also provided translation services for Italian-speaking communities. Hine was particularly sensitive to portraying the dignity of his subjects, in stark contrast with his predecessors such as Jacob Riis. Nevertheless, their work reified a number of stereotypes regarding the communities they portrayed.

Currently, there is an emphasis on participatory methods that ideally remedy this tendency towards stereotypes. For researchers who seek to understand how their
subjects perceive or feel about an aspect of their lives, visual data can be of great value, particularly in communities whose histories have been subjugated or silenced and for whom the visual better articulates “alternate ways of seeing and knowing” (Dutta, 2011; Spencer, 2011). Scholars working in Indigenous communities have used visual approaches such as digital storytelling with powerful results. Social work scholars, Ramona Beltran and Stephanie Begun noted in their 2014 publication describing a digital storytelling program for Maori youth in New Zealand that,

Recent indigenous scholarship is pointing to the power of narrative in disrupting the transmission of intergenerational trauma in Indigenous populations. The process of creating and sharing (visual) narratives is a transformational tool for reclaiming knowledge and highlighting resiliencies despite legacies of colonisation and ongoing discrimination. (2014, p. 162)

In turn, as Stephen Spencer (2011) remarked, collections or archives of these narratives build powerful counter-narratives to histories that omit communities of color, queer communities, immigrant communities, and many others who have largely been left out of traditional archives. Scholars in trans-disciplinary fields such as the multimodal humanities are designing and building the digital tools and infrastructure to develop multimedia platforms and research methods that facilitate collections of digital material.3

TRUTH PLUS PUBLICITY: KELLOGG’S METHODOLOGY AS A GENEALOGY OF PUBLIC SCHOLARSHIP IN SOCIAL WORK

Kellogg’s methods for disseminating not only the findings of the Pittsburgh Survey but also his later more expansive efforts with Survey Associates and its

---

3 The Ward (Hillier), Scalar (Alliance for Networking Visual Culture), Mukurtu (Christen), Omeka (Center for History and New Media), Chicana Por Mi Raza (Cotera)
publications, *The Survey* and *Survey Graphic* elucidate the legacy of Kellogg’s work for not only for community-engaged researchers more generally, but also for current practitioners of public scholarship in social work in particular.

Though the infrastructure Kellogg and his colleagues created (as described in chapter 4) via both the Russell Sage Foundation and Survey Associates existed entirely outside of the academy, his place-based structural approach to collecting data that was grounded in vernacular knowledge via collaborative methods (truth) and use of multimedia methods to producing broadly accessible results (publicity) still resonate a century later with contemporary conversations regarding public scholarship. In an era of easy access to participatory digital media production, what questions does this early model of publication raise for current public scholarship in social work?

To revisit a definition of public scholarship from Chapter 1, here again is a quote from a 2008 report written for “Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life” on the topic. Authors Julie Ellison and Timothy Eatman comment,

> Publicly engaged academic work refers to the scholarly or creative activity integral to a faculty member’s academic area. It encompasses different forms of making knowledge about, for, and with diverse publics and communities. Through a coherent, purposeful sequence of activities, it contributes to the public good and yields artifacts of public and intellectual value. (p. iv)

Clearly informed by similar goals to Kellogg’s Deweyan commitment to making research findings visible and relevant to diverse communities, the burgeoning conversation regarding public scholarship in universities encompasses many models of community engagement ranging from community service learning to community-based participatory action research to conversations regarding dissemination shaped by
themes of democratization of access to data and other artifacts generated by university-based research.

This conversation has been complex and deeply contradictory in the academic field of social work. On one hand, we are the ultimate applied scholars. We work in deep and long community partnerships to conduct intervention research and deploy our signature pedagogy, the professional practicum. And, as a research community, we have to a limited extent embraced community-based participatory action approaches, particularly in the arenas of health equity, environmental practice, and work with youth and communities of color (Yoshihama & Carr, 2003; Beltran & Begun, 2014).

All of that said, academic social work quite notably lacks a collective public voice in political advocacy on the national stage as a coherent professional public or as a conversation among multiple counterpublics (Karger & Hernandez, 2004; MacKinnon, 2009). As social work scholar Shauna T. MacKinnon (2009) has noted, there is currently a marked absence of public intellectuals in social work academe. MacKinnon cites “a shrinking welfare state with policies that reinforce individualist values over commitment to the collective,” and “institutional pressures to ‘publish or perish’” as critical factors keeping social work scholars from engaging in the public sphere (2009, p. 512). Even more essential, she identifies the impact of neo-liberal policies and privatization on the social sciences in particular and higher education more generally. Within the context of the social sciences and social work, MacKinnon expresses a concern regarding scholars choosing research agendas according to philanthropic trends set by corporate donors as public funding for higher education and research dwindles.

Kellogg’s publications are frequently pointed to as the last period during which social work had such a public platform for influencing policy. Both The Survey and
Survey Graphic facilitated opportunities for social workers to participate in a broad, national conversation about not only their profession but also a variety of social issues. Academic journals do not function in the same way as a monthly magazine did.

Considering the magnitude of the social issues that the field collectively faces and the rise of social media, why aren’t social workers – scholars and practitioners- organizing more online?

Patricia Fronek and Polly Chester’s 2016 article entitled Moral Outrage: Social Workers in the Third Space argues that social workers are indeed navigating the complex waters between their professional and activist identities online, but that this arena requires more research. They document examples of social workers throughout the globe who are utilizing web-based platforms that are intended to facilitate an international network articulating a radical social work agenda, such as Social Work Action Network, in opposition to both cuts in welfare spending and privatization of services that has impacted the profession in many countries. Meanwhile Social Work Helper identifies as a “mission driven progressive news website dedicated to providing information, resources and entertainment related to social work, social justice and social good” (Social Work Helper, About page (n.d). Fronek and Chester also note that social work organizations such as the ISFW and NASW are increasingly using Twitter and Facebook to distribute positions on policies. They also note that policy makers are increasingly sensitive to the power of their own social media presence in relationship to various issues and that this presents new opportunities for social workers to influence policy. Lastly and directly in relationship to the hole that Kellogg left 70 plus years ago, they comment that traditional journalism still holds a great deal of sway regarding
policy advocacy and that few journalists really understand social work practice. A smart use of social media advocacy could change the game in terms of social change.

Overall, new horizons are visible in realms of public scholarship and political advocacy carrying on the legacies of the forms of research and practice Kellogg developed, though there remains much to be done to understand the potential impact of this type of work. This study also raised questions for me regarding contemporary media-based praxis in social work that remain unresolved. These include, wondering about who speaks for the field when it is a mass of specialists in narrow fields or are we a profession of multiple overlapping counter-publics by nature?

It was a pleasure and an honor to explore the professional legacy of Paul Kellogg to social work. I only hope that I have honored his spirit, his enthusiasm, and his ingenuity through this study. I also hope to continue to contribute to expanding social work’s professional and scholarly ability to forward social justice through community-engaged, media-based praxis and public scholarship.
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