

## “Faith at Work”?

They might as well have just posted a sign outside the church: “Corporate types not welcome to worship here.” My friend Steve, the chairman and chief executive officer of a large multinational company, tells the story of being excluded—indeed, derided—within his own congregation, not because of race, ethnicity, gender, sexual preference, or doctrinal disputes, but because of his work. Sitting in an adult education class one Sunday morning, he listened to the pastor berate “the greed of all multinationals” and the “self-serving nature of their executives.” The apex of the pastor’s scolding message left this question hanging in the air: “How could a Christian work at this company?” My friend, a committed and thoughtful Christian, was the head of that company.

Steve is not alone. Hundreds of thousands of women and men around the country have come to feel an urgent need to integrate their faith and their work and, at the same time, have found the church to be of little help. Their stories, which make up the Faith at Work movement, have emerged both within and in response to the dramatically changing social, economic, technological, geopolitical, and ecclesiastical conditions that began in the 1980s and that continue today. During that time, the conditions surrounding work, the employee, and the workplace have changed significantly as a result of several factors. These include large-scale corporate mergers and acquisitions, restructurings, layoffs, plant closures and the resulting relocation of factories to low-cost overseas manufacturing sites, advances in technology and telecommunications, mobile capital, lower global transportation costs, and reduced trade barriers.

In the midst of these changes, many people report feeling that they live increasingly bifurcated lives, where faith and work seldom connect. Many who are Christians complain of a “Sunday-Monday gap,” where their Sunday

worship hour bears little to no relevance to the issues they face in their Monday workplace hours. Though notable exceptions exist, sermon topics, liturgical content, prayers, and pastoral care rarely address—much less recognize—the spiritual questions, pastoral needs, ethical challenges, and vocational possibilities faced by those who work in the marketplace and world of business.

When speaking to clergy gatherings of a variety of denominations around the country, I often ask this question: “Who here prays for and commissions your teenagers as they go off on a mission trip?” Invariably, all hands go up. Then I ask: “Who here prays for and commissions your Sunday school teachers each September as the new church year starts?” Most of the hands go up again. Finally, I ask: “Who here prays for all the certified public accountants in your congregation around April 15, and who here prays for all the salespeople and those working on commission at the end of the month and end of the year, when quotas are due?” Silence. Eyes drop to the ground. Usually, not a single hand is raised.

Whether conscious or unintended, the pulpit all too frequently sends the signal that work in the church matters but work in the world does not. It is perhaps no surprise, then, that workers, businesspeople, and other professionals often feel unsupported by the Sunday church in their Monday marketplace vocations. Increasingly, businesspeople—whether correctly or incorrectly—perceive the clergy’s lack of interest in, unawareness of, and generally pejorative view of the business world and, by association, of those who work in it. Of course, responsible theological and ethical criticism of immoral business structures, practices, and people is certainly in order. But the often presumptive and pervasive suspicion shown by religious professionals blocks consideration of the theological and practical possibility that there could be redemptive, creative, productive, ministerial, and transformative possibilities in the world of business, and in the lives of those called to live out their Christian vocation in the marketplace and other workplaces.

In light of the Sunday-Monday gap and the church’s distancing itself from the world of business, it is not surprising that the FAW movement has arisen largely outside the church and its usual programs. The movement that has emerged is decentralized, with loosely networked clusters of lay-initiated and lay-led activities that focus on integrating spirituality and work. The result has been the spawning of a plethora of voluntary associations throughout America (and increasingly beyond), comprising many different individuals and types and sizes of groups, as well as a range of ways in which these people express themselves. Indeed, not only has this groundswell of decentralized activity formed largely outside the institutional church, but these groups generally shun doctrinal disputes, transcend denominational

boundaries, and include a range of demographic profiles. The people involved in the FAW movement focus on a host of issues, including identity, meaning, purpose, calling, discipleship, ethics, responsibility, witness, evangelization, and transformation in and of the business world. All of these issues can perhaps best be understood and observed through the lens of the following four categories, explained further in chapter 7: ethics, evangelism, experience, and enrichment. This typology, represented by these four categories, illuminates the predominant approaches taken by different individuals and groups within the movement. Like all models, each category functions as an analytical device to observe areas of accent and emphasis; in practice, most people and FAW groups manifest rich combinations, reflecting the multifaceted efforts of people attempting to integrate faith and work.

### **Ethics and the Faith at Work Movement**

Hardly a day goes by when an executive is not faced with an ethical decision that has moral dimensions. For instance, should a CEO (chief executive officer) decide to keep a plant open that employs 25 percent of the residents in a small town, even though high labor costs there result in uncompetitive product pricing, or should she move the plant overseas to save money and let other human beings—who are also created in the image of God—have a chance to gain economic prosperity? Or, should an executive promote a minority female who has less experience but good potential over a majority white male who is currently better qualified for the position? Those drawn to the FAW movement find it insufficient to turn just to lawyers and financial experts for answers to these dilemmas; they increasingly turn to biblical teachings to search for ethical insights and guidance on business matters.

Since any social movement is a response to changing conditions and perceived societal deficiencies, economic or otherwise, a rigorous scholarly analysis can be helpful to reveal and engage those changing circumstances and needs. Specifically, the issues driving and surrounding the FAW movement invite systematic ethical analysis because they are indicative of significant and broader theological, cultural, and economic changes in religion and society. Some scholars distinguish between social ethics—the ethics of setting public policies that impact society as a whole—and personal ethics, the ethics that govern an individual's actions in light of generally accepted conceptions of right and wrong, good and bad, and fitting and unfitting. The question of ethics, both personal and social, is a central part of the FAW movement, and therefore offering an ethical analysis is an essential part of understanding the movement.

Many theologians and sociologists have long recognized that religion and economics, together with government and family, are among society's essential spheres of life.<sup>1</sup> These spheres interact constantly to form society as a whole. The FAW movement finds its primary locus in the economic arena, but it intersects with and has implications for all of these spheres. In an increasingly globalized and interrelated world, such intersection is particularly significant for the field of social ethics, as decisions in the economic sphere wield greater and greater influence on political policy as well as on cultural and family life.<sup>2</sup> If the FAW movement can go beyond personal expressions of piety, virtue, and religious practices, it has the potential to affect and positively alter the larger cultural value system and norms of the economic sphere, both domestically and globally. Conversely, unhealthy manifestations of FAW integration can be the source of conflict and disruption. Indeed, whether someone supports or opposes the growing power of the economic sphere in relation to all others, that influence cannot be ignored—and neither can factors, such as the FAW movement, that affect the choices people make within that sphere.<sup>3</sup>

For these reasons, understanding how the religious sphere fits into this new world order is an urgent ethical need. Many religious institutions and professionals have often sought to remain distinct from and even distance themselves from the economic sphere. However, the dramatic social and economic changes of our times and the issues surrounding globalization challenge ethicists and theologians to renew, rather than deny, their participation in constructively shaping developments in the economic sphere. In particular, Christian ethicists, theologians, and clergy need to understand and engage those involved in the marketplace, so as to assist employees, executives, and professionals as they seek to bring their religious beliefs into the sphere of economics and the workplace. Conversely, it is possible that the church and the academy might also learn from the FAW movement and, in turn, develop fresh ethical resources to guide and support those who seek to integrate faith and work. For these and many other reasons, the FAW movement, which seeks to draw connections between the religious and economic spheres, constitutes a significant phenomenon worthy of ethical reflection—a phenomenon that the church has, so far, largely neglected.

### **Theology and the Faith at Work Movement**

The Faith at Work movement can be linked to a long, rich theological tradition that stresses the doctrine of vocation<sup>4</sup> and the coming kingdom of God,<sup>5</sup> that recognizes work as central to Christian anthropology, and that

claims that someone's faith should be a central and informing part of all spheres of life, including work.<sup>6</sup> Indeed, the FAW movement as we know it today has many antecedents and is part of a tradition from which movements, motivated and guided by theological insights, have emerged that shape economic life.

The FAW groups of wave three that emerged in the mid-1980s and continue today are distinct from and have a different theological focus, logic, and genesis, and they have new modes of expression than those seen in earlier twentieth and late nineteenth-century antecedents. Broadly speaking, the current wave of FAW activity can be seen as an heir of the nineteenth-century Social Gospel movement, the mid-twentieth-century ecumenical movement, and the more recent lay-ministry movement. Yet in contrast to some earlier periods of Christian theology, such as the Reformation, much of twentieth-century Protestant scholarship—as seen in the leading divinity schools and seminaries—has moved away from constructive theological engagement and ecclesiastical support of those called to vocations in the business sphere. Instead, broadly speaking, there has been a turn toward a negative critique of work in general and the business world in particular, accenting its problematic aspects and ignoring its constructive and creative dimensions. Indeed, earlier twentieth-century forms of Christian socialism and more recent forms of liberation theology have stood in strong opposition to the for-profit sector, the business community, and its participants. In spite of this—or perhaps in part because of it—the FAW movement has flourished independently from these theological developments and has grown even though it has been little recognized by or nurtured in the church or the academy.

There are, however, many constructive theologies, Catholic and Protestant, which can be brought to bear on the questions that the FAW movement raises. Over the past century, encyclicals and other statements of Catholic social teachings and the theological perspectives grounded in the Reformed tradition have offered great insights and resources. Indeed, heirs of the Reformation tradition arguably had a significant influence on the development of the modern economic structure and business world. The century-long debate about Weber's *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, on the whole, strongly suggests an unintended connection between faith and work. More specifically, the Reformed tradition accents the doctrines of creation (of both the material world and humanity), sin, providence, and vocation, all of which are, from a Christian standpoint, influenced by the doctrine of salvation in ways that bear directly on the issues and concerns that FAW groups address. The Reformed tradition is supplemented in more recent times by several Christian ethicists, including Reinhold Niebuhr and H. Richard Niebuhr. Reinhold Niebuhr's ethical insights included his

emphasis on theologically informed engagement in societal discourse (i.e., public theology), his accent on “Christian realism,” and a conception of human anthropology having a threefold relationship with God, neighbor, and the self.<sup>7</sup> While his work focused largely on political life, there are many analogues to theologically informed engagement in business life. H. Richard Niebuhr’s ethical insights were many, including his lifelong quest to understand the relationship between Christ and culture.<sup>8</sup> His interest in understanding the spiritual forces and social sources that shape individual and organizational life informs many different approaches to faith and work, inasmuch as attitudes toward and participation in the marketplace can be considered a subset of culture. These theologians and their work, on which this study builds, have been decisive influences on the theologically informed social ethics tradition that sees theology, ethics, and the social sciences as mutually illuminating and correcting. Whereas these ethicists have often focused on the political sphere, here I look at the intersection between the economic and religious spheres, as expressed in the Faith at Work movement.

### **Faith at Work as a Movement**

It is important to recognize at the outset, as Laura Nash and Scott McLennan observe in their study of the church and the Sunday-Monday gap, that “the terrain we cover is notably short of common definitions.”<sup>9</sup> Until a certain degree of maturity enters or a signature book captures the imagination of scholars or the media, movements are often known only to their participants and often under many different names or catch phrases.<sup>10</sup> In general, the various names of the FAW movement seek to convey the growing interest by businesspeople in bringing marketplace issues and religious, spiritual, and ethical teachings into conversation with each other. The movement under study here is known by its participants under several names, each of which is usually about three words in length, where the first word signifies the religious aspect; the second word is a preposition; and the third word references the arena in which the religious aspect is manifest. Examples of some other names include “spirituality and work,” “spirituality in the workplace,” “spirit and work,” “soul at work,” “religion in the workplace,” and “faith in the workplace.” Each name, with seemingly minor or subtle linguistic differences, often represents or points to significant differences in ethical orientation, theology, or practical implications. In the end, selecting an umbrella term for the movement under study is a tradeoff between specificity and vagueness, given the wide theological diversity within the movement. When moving from the general to the particular, each word

has different theological implications and emphases, whether employed in academic discourse or in daily use. Indeed, the groups often signify their theological or economic slant by the names they choose for themselves.

Arguably, the identifier "faith at work" offers the most comprehensive term to describe the movement.<sup>11</sup> Indeed, it is a frequently chosen term of self-reference by participants in the movement.<sup>12</sup> The businesspeople I surveyed for this study liked the open-ended nature and dual meaning of the term *faith at work*. The first meaning locates and legitimizes the spatial presence of faith in the work sphere in general and in the workplace in particular. The second meaning suggests a pneumatological dimension of the activity of God, where God is busy at work—that is, God is working.

We gain further insight into the movement by considering separately each part of the name Faith at Work. There are many terms that could be chosen instead of "faith" to describe the religious or spiritual aspect of the movement. The choice of an umbrella name is complicated by the recognition that many terms have had different meanings over time. These words have distinct historical definitions in Western theological traditions; however, in contemporary American English, many of them have taken on modified or even new meanings, each with different implications.<sup>13</sup> Broadly speaking, however, in a religious context, the term *faith* (and its alternatives) recognizes and acknowledges the existence of and a belief in a "higher power," Creator, theistic being, or divine figure (however broadly or loosely defined) that most people in the West call God. Even if particular conceptions and understandings of God are different, they share the presupposition that how we understand God matters to humanity and should be relevant and applied to daily life. Moreover, in a Western context, many of these terms usually imply the three prominent monotheistic religions of the world: Judaism, Christianity, and Islam.<sup>14</sup>

Of the alternatives to *faith*, the words *spirituality* and *religion* are the most commonly used terms by those in the movement. There is a long tradition of Christian spirituality, particularly in Catholicism, that has affected the Faith at Work movement.<sup>15</sup> Indeed, prior to the twentieth century, the terms *spiritual* and *religious* were used "more or less interchangeably," though this is no longer the case.<sup>16</sup> These two terms typify the issues involved in the debate about what term to choose for the movement. Spirituality, for instance, has become a particularly popular word in public discourse, in part because of its vagueness and perceived inclusiveness. It is often used as a synonym for a belief in God (or a Higher Being) and a yearning for wholeness that transcends the structured dogmatics and doctrines of organized religions. Spirituality does not necessarily imply mysticism or New Age thought, although many adherents of spirituality prefer a personalized,

nonstructured, inward-oriented approach to experiencing and knowing God. In contrast, the word *religion* has fallen out of favor in many circles. Indeed, many contemporary Americans, particularly baby boomers and seekers, increasingly describe themselves as spiritual, shunning the word *religious* altogether.<sup>17</sup> Scholars explain this linguistic shift by suggesting that Americans understand religion today in more rigid, public, and institutional terms, which many people increasingly reject, whereas spirituality is understood as more informal, private, and personal, which most people in or outside of the churches increasingly desire.<sup>18</sup>

Three recent studies of spirituality and religion in the workplace have particular relevance to the FAW movement. First, in their empirical research among businesspeople, Ian Mitroff and Elizabeth Denton found that “respondents generally differentiated strongly between religion and spirituality. They viewed religion as a highly inappropriate topic and form of expression in the workplace. Conversely spirituality was viewed as highly appropriate.”<sup>19</sup> Religion was viewed as formal, organized, dogmatic, intolerant, and divisive. In contrast, spirituality was considered to be informal, personal, universal, nondenominational, and broadly inclusive and tolerant.<sup>20</sup> On the basis of their research, Mitroff and Denton conclude, “Spirituality is the basic desire to find ultimate meaning and purpose in one’s life and to live an integrated life.”<sup>21</sup>

The second study, mentioned previously, by Nash and McLennan, contains similar findings from their empirical research into companies and businesspeople seeking to straddle the Sunday-Monday gap. “Spirituality is not the same as organized religion,” they state.<sup>22</sup> Spirituality is “access to the sacred force that impels life . . . stressing discovery of the inner, sacred self.”<sup>23</sup> Further, they argue, “[t]he parameters of religion include spirituality,” but go beyond the personal and experiential accents of spirituality.<sup>24</sup> Indeed, they note that the “new spirituality” does not try to “replicate an ethic of total selflessness, suffering, and sacrifice as found in some traditional Christian theologies modeled on the suffering of Jesus.”<sup>25</sup> Nash and McLennan recognize religion as containing three essential elements that are generally lacking in definitions of spirituality: (1) source narratives, (2) source disciplines and rituals through which people personally discover these truths and apply them to daily life, and (3) ethical rules and practices that followers believe are demanded by these understandings.<sup>26</sup>

A third study, by management scholar William Judge, is an empirical analysis of values and business leadership.<sup>27</sup> Judge finds similar distinctions between spirituality and religion. However, Judge inverts the conclusion of Nash and McLennan, arguing, “Spirituality is a more encompassing term than religiosity.”<sup>28</sup> Basic differences such as this, even among scholars, high-

light the problem of terminology and the importance of careful attention when selecting and defining the movement's key words. However, from the practitioners' perspective, "a good number of those who embrace spirituality programs have no trouble with the vagueness of the terms; it allows them to customize the new spiritual messages to their own deeper beliefs."<sup>29</sup> Indeed, this customization process results in a form of cafeteria spirituality in which seekers pick and choose what they find pleasing, utilitarian, and helpful, while discarding or ignoring the aspects of a religious tradition they find difficult, offensive, or not useful. Such cafeteria spirituality has a wide range of formulations and adherents, including Christians, but also New Age enthusiasts who sample from Eastern religious traditions, humanist philosophy, and the human potential and self-improvement movements that captivate American pop-culture interest.

Contrary to most of these findings, it is arguable that the term *religion* could provide a larger theological umbrella than *spirituality* and that the attributes generally ascribed to spirituality can also be found in most forms of religious practice. Many who reject the label of religion and prefer spirituality do so out of deficient knowledge of the breadth of religious practices (even in their own tradition) and in reaction to the claims by some Enlightenment philosophers and some social pundits of today that many political and social travesties have been solely due to religion. Moreover, retreat from the word religion is often reactionary and fails to appreciate that religion's pursuit of truth and its formation of disciplined faith communities reflect a "binding together" (*religio*) of believers to the insights of centuries of theological reflection. Such communities of faith often include theological teachings that accent ethical concerns, social justice, and the self-sacrificial act of serving one's neighbor, as opposed to the often inward and narcissistic accent of some forms of modern spirituality.

However, according to current research, the view that religion is a better overarching term to describe the movement is in the minority in the court of public opinion, so it is not the best term to describe the movement under study, particularly as people in the movement generally do not use it themselves. Thus, in light of this seemingly oppositional relationship between the perceptions of the open and inclusive nature of spirituality and the closed and exclusive nature of religion (notwithstanding the argument that religion includes spirituality), I propose here an alternative term—faith—that has both mediating and overarching possibilities, thus transcending the tired debate of religion versus spirituality.

Like spirituality and religion, faith is another commonly used term in the movement under study and is often a synonym for and used interchangeably with spirituality and religion. Faith can have a highly subjective

meaning, as in “my faith” or “her faith.” Faith can also have a highly objective and specifically defined meaning, as in “keeping the faith.” Faith’s simultaneous subjective and objective meanings allow for the inclusion of the various interpretations of both spirituality and religion. For some, the word faith is merely a generic expression of belief in some form of transcendent being and resists location in a specific religious tradition. For others, faith is a synonym for a specific religion, such as Christianity, and a belief in Jesus Christ.<sup>30</sup> Indeed, from a Christian perspective, faith is often defined as “being sure of that which we hope for and certain of that which we do not see” (Heb. 11:1). Thus, the term *faith* recognizes the generalities and openness of spirituality and at the same time includes the particularities of the more codified and institutionalized nature of religion. While faith usually implies belief in a monotheistic God, it seems also a broad enough term to be employed by polytheistic religious systems and more loosely defined New Age adherents.

Just as the theistic part of the faith at work label merits definition, so too does the final term, *work*. Those in the movement employ several meanings for *work* somewhat interchangeably, including a specific job or productive activity and the broader workplace, also known as the marketplace, the economy, business, the business world, the corporate world, and the commercial arena. Broadly speaking, these terms are different ways of referring to human activity that generates income—in other words, the economic sphere of life. While the economic sphere itself can be broken down into various classifications and subsectors and is composed of privately held and publicly traded corporations (small and large), the Faith at Work movement is located across all of these areas.<sup>31</sup> FAW incorporates occupations traditionally thought of as the professions, such as law and medicine, and white- and blue-collar occupations. Yet it also includes those who work in government and non-profit organizations. It seems, however, that the majority of the movement’s activity—and, therefore, the focus of this volume—is composed of people engaged in some form of marketplace activity for which they are paid.<sup>32</sup> Moreover, the word *work* often refers to the location or venue in which one does one’s particular job, which is usually but not exclusively outside the home,<sup>33</sup> such as a factory, a retail store, an office building, or some other facility in which one works, regardless of the industry sector or type of company.

Thus, the work aspect of faith at work is both an activity and an institutional location. And as Keith Thomas, editor of *The Oxford Book of Work*, observes, “Work is harder to define than one might think.”<sup>34</sup> Indeed, “the large *Oxford English Dictionary* gives the noun ‘work’ no less than thirty-four different meanings and the verb thirty-nine.”<sup>35</sup> Over the centuries, many prominent economists, philosophers, social critics, ethicists, and theologians

have ventured different views of the nature of human work.<sup>36</sup> From an ethical perspective, work has been seen in deontological, teleological, and ethological terms.<sup>37</sup> Deontologically speaking—that is, in Kantian terms of obligation and duty—ethical work is seen as having boundaries where right and wrong kinds of work and ways of doing work can be defined. Teleologically speaking—that is, in Millian terms of purpose and utility—ethical work must aim toward a *telos*, a good end, and avoid bad or societally destructive goals or results. And ethologically speaking—that is, in Stackhousian terms of the mores or ethos of a culture—ethical work must discern what is fitting or not fitting in particular circumstances and in accordance with social customs and norms. These and other approaches, such as a Marxist understanding of work, often contain particular philosophical presuppositions or prescribe methodologies of analysis that frequently predetermine the outcome of a given study. At the end of the day, all of these perspectives on work—analytical categories of dialectical materialism, class, liberation, race, gender, and monetary supply—agree that work matters.

Taking these factors and perspectives into account, work can be defined as human activity that has both intrinsic and extrinsic value; that involves physical and emotional energy; that can be both tedious and exhilarating; and that often is done out of necessity and in exchange for financial remuneration but also is done out of joy and in return for self-fulfillment and accomplishment. Work can be drudgery or creative delight, paid or unpaid, voluntary or compulsory, necessary or optional, rewarding or tedious, and intrinsically satisfying and purposeful or destructive and meaningless. What often distinguishes whether it is one or the other is whether one's work is imbued with theological meaning and purpose. Even the most humble of tasks and positions, when seen in a broader perspective of *avodah*—honoring God and serving neighbor—can become holy work. Indeed, as Martin Luther King, Jr., noted, "If it falls to your lot to be a street sweeper, sweep the streets like Michelangelo painted pictures, like Shakespeare wrote poetry, like Beethoven composed music; sweep streets so well that all the host of Heaven and earth will have to pause and say, 'Here lived a great street sweeper, who swept his job well.'"<sup>38</sup>

Consistent with the observation about the historical and cultural conditioning of the word work, from a theological perspective Christians have interpreted work over the centuries in a wide variety of ways.<sup>39</sup> Over time, meaning sets and theological accents for work vary and overlap, including understanding work as a curse (Genesis), a duty of faith (the letter of James), a necessity (the Apostle Paul), a vocation (Martin Luther), a manifestation of being elect (Jean Calvin), as having intrinsic and extrinsic value (Pope John Paul II), a moral calling (Michael Novak), a gift of the spirit in an

eschatological framework (Miroslav Volf), and a divine calling that requires a profession as a response (Max Stackhouse).<sup>40</sup> More recently, theologian Paul Stevens seeks to go beyond the blessing-curse dialectic and defines work simply as “purposeful activity involving mental, emotional, or physical energy, or all three, whether remunerated or not.”<sup>41</sup> Notably, Volf recognizes that “work cries out for a conceptual demarcation of work from other human activities.”<sup>42</sup> In the end, Volf interprets “work as cooperation with God in the eschatological transformation of the world,” which he calls “work in the spirit.”<sup>43</sup> Thus, while the theological accents and interpretations of work may vary, the act of work—its praxis and its *telos*—is central to theological reflection and to life as a Christian.<sup>44</sup>

The final definitional matter to be addressed is my assertion that this FAW activity actually rises to the level of being a bona fide movement. The media and other social commentators use the term *movement* fairly freely and loosely, often failing to distinguish it from fads, temporary popularity, and other forms of collective activity, such as interest groups, political parties, ad hoc protest events, coalitions, mass hysteria, and small-scale religious sects.<sup>45</sup> Sociologists who specialize in analyzing and understanding collective activity often disagree on definitions and the criteria of what constitutes a movement. A full analysis of the historical and contemporary developments of collective behavior and social movement theory within the field of sociology is beyond the scope of this book.<sup>46</sup> Yet an overview of the scholarly literature reveals, as sociologist Mario Diani argues, enough commonality among different theorists to develop a working definition of a social movement.<sup>47</sup> Specifically, Diani suggests that the concept of a movement is sharp enough to differentiate social movements from related concepts, such as interest groups, political parties, protest events, and coalitions, and has a specific identity that can be investigated and theorized upon.<sup>48</sup> Agreeing with Diani, I conclude that bona fide social movements can be defined as “networks of informal interactions between a plurality of individuals, groups and/or organizations, engaged in political or cultural conflicts, on the basis of shared collective identities.”<sup>49</sup> Further, Diani argues that “the characteristics of networks may range from the very loose and dispersed links . . . to the tightly clustered networks which facilitate adhesion,”<sup>50</sup> the former described by Gerlach and Hine and the latter by Della Porta and Diani.<sup>51</sup> Thus, a social movement has three main components: (1) a loosely networked collection of individuals or groups that are (2) reacting against something they find unsatisfactory and unlikely to be resolved by normal cultural institutions or resources, and are (3) grounded in some common identity, world view, or organizing principle.<sup>52</sup> As we shall see throughout the rest of this book, the FAW movement meets all three of these characteristics, thus deserving

recognition as being a bona fide social movement. The FAW movement is a loosely networked group of individual and collective activity, reacting against the church's lack of support for those called to a life in the marketplace, and whose common drive is a deep desire to live a holistic life with particular attention to the integration of faith and work.

In addition to or even independent of how the FAW movement meets these criteria, there is also a plethora of anecdotal evidence that suggests "something is happening." This evidence is found in the frequency of press coverage, informal stories and narratives, books, articles, Web sites, conferences, and other activities that many social observers have begun to notice and record (see chapters 4–7 and the bibliography).

Finally, Diani claims that "movements may also develop" over the course of different stages and that the phase of "collective effervescence" is not necessarily or immediately followed by institutionalization.<sup>53</sup> Indeed, "movements often oscillate between brief phases of intense public activity and long 'latent' periods . . . in which activities involving inner reflection and intellectual development prevail."<sup>54</sup> This observation is consistent with the FAW movement's prior and current waves of activity, each with a certain ebb and flow, containing various levels of intensity, informality, and institutionalization. In addition, as a result of many factors, including inner reflection and intellectual development, the FAW movement has experienced various changes and developments, as the research in the subsequent chapters illustrates. In short, for all of its diversity, the FAW movement's internal coherence and commonalities underline its presence as a social movement and raise the question of its eventual place in history.

