knowledge that one cannot capture in a single chapter all that would go on in any episode of counseling. This is even more apparent with a case as complex as Jake's. So wisdom dictates not focusing too much on what is omitted in any given chapter given the space constraints. It is likely fair to assume that each chapter does contain the prominent points of emphasis for each author, and we can work from there.

The five approaches are not monoliths. They are categorizations of approaches that are as varied as the persons who counsel. This is not unique to Christians, of course, as models of counseling are quite varied. It is important, though, to try to organize thoughts, as that carries important weight in discussing models. While "psychodynamic psychotherapy," for example, can refer to a very wide range of approaches, the term still carries important conceptual weight in knowing that the practitioner will focus on internal psychological dynamics. The individual therapist will identify his or her position within the broader model, be it a self psychology or ego psychology, or other "brand" of psychodynamic therapy. So it is with our five views: they are helpful groupings, but each has a range of options within the overarching family. Or, each is more of a "genus" encompassing a group of "species."

This raises a fundamental issue in evaluating the chapters just read. In choosing spokespersons for the views, we could not represent each nuance of each model. Some fit more neatly within the heart of the views than others. Moreover, like the Olympic rings, certain approaches overlap with others (and some overlap with more than others). In the following paragraphs we will try to position our authors within their broader positions.

Levels of explanation. Thomas Plante explicitly connects his approach to the levels view in noting that one should use the best available information in science (p. 61). Science is the source of knowledge and technique. Plante also neatly sets up a strategy of treatment that is more *intentionally* comprehensive than others are in that it encompasses vital "levels" that include biological, psychological, social and spiritual elements. Secular psychology today concedes that spirituality is important to many individuals, and Plante helpfully demonstrates that research has shown many spiritually based interventions can help. Plante's approach looks to science for diagnosis (using *DSM-IV*) and for assessment methods as well. Keeping with modern professional counseling approaches, it honors Jake's

spirituality without imposing any spiritual ideas from outside his own system. Thus, spirituality is a resource to be utilized in pursuit of psychological health while the objectivity of God and his role in the therapy itself is not addressed. Jake will improve by application of scientifically supported, best-practice techniques that bring his spiritual values to bear on his problems in productive ways.

Plante's approach has the strength of being the only one that could be utilized in a strictly secular setting, and even by a non-Christian counselor. Its appeal to empiricism will also make it the most attractive to third-party payers. However, this also carries a potential weakness vis-à-vis the other approaches where greater emphasis is placed on the spirituality of the counselor in specifically Christian terms, and the more explicit appeal to God's actions as part of the counseling. It also does not address the Bible or Christ as resources for counseling in themselves, but only as valued by the counselee.

Integration. Mark McMinn's plan of treatment for Jake fits squarely within the integration domain that he represents and flows easily from Jones's (2010) description in the *Five Views* book; McMinn praises Jones for maintaining the "rightful authority of Christ and Scripture" (p. 85) in the model. McMinn makes clear his commitment to three primary sources of psychology, theology and spirituality, and to integrating them into a coherent model as he has done in *Integrative Theology* (McMinn & Campbell, 2007) while allowing for other models within this approach. However, his foundation of the model in the purely theological concept of "imago Dei" moves his take on integration from the center of the model's circle toward the Christian psychology and transformational views to an extent, making it more a form of what Johnson (2007) terms "strong integration." His discussion of brokenness and its role in counseling also shows a place of priority for the theological and spiritual, though he then draws freely from secular concepts such as cognitive behavior therapy (CBT). The idea of health toward which CBT and the rest of the model are directed, though, is defined from faith, not modern psychology.

McMinn is then a premier example of the integration position, with strengths in its commitment to Christian theology and spirituality while carefully drawing appropriate techniques and models from modern psychology. His approach also draws on one of the more detailed Christian

integration therapy models that have been developed. Weaknesses might include its lack of empirical validation (something to be said of all the approaches except for Plante), and specifics on how and when to choose from each discipline.

Christian psychology. Langberg acknowledges the role of theory and research in the Christian psychology position as articulated by Roberts and Watson (2010), yet extends this to the work of the mental health professional. Admittedly she may have the greatest clinical challenge of the five approaches, as writers in the Christian psychology approach have had a strength in theory and intellectual models, yet to this point less attention has been given to translating these into clinical work (though see McFee and Monroe [2011] for a recent example of movement in this direction). The Christian foundation Langberg builds on is the impact of transformation by Christ on the therapist, and the therapist as representative of Christ in the session. Health is defined by Christ as its model, consistent with several other views. In the family of Christian psychology, Langberg may lean toward the integration side with her not tapping into the writings of the Christian tradition while looking to secular models for treatment techniques. Still, her focus on the presence and power of Christ as central in therapy echoes a stress of Christian psychologists who tend toward more explicit use of Christian language. She thus pioneers in this approach in thinking out practical counseling application.

Strengths for Langberg include her very clear focus on Christ (shared with the transformational view to follow) and movement into Christlikeness for counselor and counselee alike. The therapeutic process ultimately furthers kingdom-oriented character development and righteousness in daily routine. Secular techniques are placed in service of this goal. Yet this may have weaknesses in lacking a more comprehensive theory of change from within the Christian tradition and a lack of connection to historic Christian texts.

Transformational psychology. Gary Moon is forthright in his desire to avoid "silo building" and being confined to a single approach. This is more pertinent in the transformational psychology approach than the others, as it has been defined in detail by Coe and Hall (2010a) as the most precise and specific of all the approaches. A focus of their model, and the transformational approach in general, is the importance of spiritual formation and spiritual

disciplines in transforming persons in counseling. It overlaps more with spiritual direction (as traditionally understood) than the other views. Here is the core of commonality that Moon shares with Coe and Hall, putting his approach more within this camp than any of the others. Yet he is also careful to distance himself from their approach, as he sees it as "too ambitious, optimistic and somewhat exclusive of the other four positions" (p. 135).

Moon is correct in seeing his position overlapping with others. His focus on Christ is explicitly shared with all the views except levels of explanation, and his focus on spiritual formation through the disciplines clearly overlaps with the levels view (where several of the disciplines are shown to have empirical evidence as helpful) and the biblical counseling view, though the other two would likely give place to these as well. But the transformational approach stresses these more than any of the others, and movement beyond counseling to spiritual formation and transformation is more explicit here than in other models. Therefore, Moon's model does fit within the transformational mold, despite numerous divergences from many of the specifics of Coe and Hall (2010b).

Strengths of Moon's approach are his focus on Christ and the centrality of living in fellowship with him, and his clarification of psychotherapy versus spiritual direction on the road to optimal health. A point of interest is that Moon endorses the application of numerous standard procedures and techniques for the early phase of treatment and reserves the most overt formative efforts for the later stages. He freely draws from psychology to organize his approach to therapy yet cites spirituality authors more than psychologists or theologians in incorporating faith into Jake's counseling. Weaknesses for this approach might include a need for more specific rules on incorporating empirical and other modern psychological material into the model and a need for more specifics in the treatment approach.

Biblical counseling. Our colleagues in the biblical counseling approach are evolving and changing, and the term now encompasses a variety of styles while maintaining the distinctive of a focus on the sufficiency of Scripture for counseling needs. Scott may draw more from the tradition of Jay Adams than directly from Powlison's (2010) description in the *Five Views* book. The consultant in his chapter is defined as a fellow in the National Association of Nouthetic Counselors (NANC), and he uses materials developed by Jay Adams. This would place Scott in what Johnson

(2007) calls the traditional (rather than progressive) camp of biblical counselors. While many biblical counselors might reject Johnson's categories, there would likely be consensus on the assertion that Scott's approach is more strictly nouthetic (using the term coined by Adams [1986/1970] drawn from Romans 15:14 and used to summarize his approach to biblical counseling) and more strongly authoritative than that of other biblical counselors. This is seen, for example, in his stating that "Jake's counselor must eventually prevail upon him to recognize the historical objects of his affections and to seek the help of God's Spirit to forsake practically any idolatrous pursuits" (p. 169). Powlison and others in this tradition might dedicate more attention to deep listening and to the relational engagement with the counselee. Thus, Scott is certainly representative of a mainline strand of biblical counseling, but he may be further away from the other four approaches than some of his contemporary colleagues in this area.

A definite strength for Scott's presentation is his thorough use of the Bible and appeal to its authority, an obvious bookend to Plante, who uses no Scripture. Yet this strength may also relate to a weakness in that the approach is more directive and sermonic than the other approaches. It also leaves little or no room for input from secular psychology in either understanding or treating Jake, though Scott makes place for the cognitive impacts of Jake's head injury.

It is apparent, then, that the five approaches overlap and interweave to quite an extent, yet there are distinct emphases in each that carry through. Many counselors generally would label their approach to counseling as eclectic in some sense; Christian counselors may glean from each of the approaches to form their own. The explicit strategy for how the reader might do that will depend on the nature of training (psychology/counseling versus pastoral ministry/theology) and the context where he or she counsels (private practice versus church versus public or parachurch agency). Individuals vary in their training to use the different models, and the models vary in how well they can adapt to different settings. For example, the majority of biblical counselors would not seek the governmental endorsement of a professional license, would not bill insurance companies and could not work in secular counseling agencies as a rule. Practitioners within the other approaches may be limited in how they involve faith in counseling because of licenses that subject them to limits in their practice.