

2006 International Human Science Research Conference

John F. Kennedy University, Pleasant Hill, California, USA

*Anonymization and Fictionalization in WRITING Clinical Psychological
Practice Reports.*

Akihiro YOSHIDA, Ph.D.

Shukutoku University, Psychology Professor

Professor Emeritus of the University of Tokyo

Introduction

In the Clinical Psychological Practice Reports, when WRITING the facts of the clinical practices, the anonymization of the real names of the persons appearing in the reports has become already a matter of taken-for-grantedness and has become almost habitualized. Let me notice here that the word WRITING is used as a kind of acronym signifying: W: Writing, R: Reporting, I: Informing/ Identifying, T: Telling, Translating, Thinking-of, I : Interpreting, N: Narrating, and finally, G:Generating. Therefore, I am using not writing but WRTIING.

Among the rationales given for practicing this taken-for-grantedly habitualized Anoyimization is that of protecting the interests of those concerned, particularly the privacy of the clients. Indeed these rationales

are valid and reasonable and the practice of anonymization would be quite understandable, as you might say. In this report, the Anonymization in Clinical Psychological Practice Reports will be considered as the first main theme, then the Fictionalization as one of its developed forms will be taken up as the second theme.

For the Protection of Privacy, the Anonymization is not sufficient.

I have had an personal experience of encountering the incident of a clinical practice case, in which the mere anonymization turned out not to be sufficient to protect the interests of those concerned with the case, particularly the privacy of the clients. For the purpose of protecting the privacy, let me not to describe the details. In the WRITING of the particular case report, the WRITER naturally adopted the consistent anoymization of the clients' names to such a degree that, in the usual common sense, nobody would doubt the sufficiency of the anoynmization for the claimed purposes. However, the real, not anonymous, name of the report WRITER was given, just as usual, and the summary report of the case was published in a book form for the general public. It just happened that a member of the client's family had an access to the the WRITER's book. When the member read the report part, the person became convinced,

despite the anonymization, that the report was on their family member, perhaps because the member saw the real name of the known WRITer and the circumstances described in the report, which were so much like their own. In addition, the member, naturally, read also the interpretation of the meaning of the case given by the WRITer. The book was fairly widely read in the public. Consequently, the circumstances of the family and also the clinical psychological interpretation given by the WRITer became also widely known. The family members become secretly furious against the WRITer, that is the former therapist of the family member client, for what they understood as the leakage to the public of their private family circumstances, which they did not want to be disclosed, and also because of the nature of the psychological interpretation that they would never favorably accept and approve. I happened to know this incident from one of the family members. What I learned from this incident, among others, was that there would be cases where the mere anonymization is insufficient for the purpose of (1) protecting the privacy of the client and his/her family members and also (2) securing the possibility and the freedom, on the part of the WRITer, of publishing the psychological interpretations on the cases, however genuine the good intention of giving them out to the public may be.

Anonymization could take many varied forms.

Evidently, the possibility of anonymization in WRITING a case is not limited only to that of the client. Here, let us denote Client (C), Therapist (T), WRITer (W) and Reader (R), to help ourselves to keep the whole in view. Then, the event we are going to thematize will be formulated as: "C narrates, T listens, W WRITes and R reads". Regarding the event, we could consider the possibilities of anonymizing each of the names of C, T, W and R.

If we wish to consider all the possible cases of anonymization of all 4 of CTWR, then we will find the $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 = 16$ cases, from the case of all four given in real names (CTWR)=(1111) to the one of all four made anonymous (0000)(Table 1). Not all cases could possibly be discussed here in detail. A few cursory comments are given for some cases in clinical psychological practices. The case1;(1111) is where all concerned are described in real names. The reader(s) are specified in real names, we might consider the case would be where the reader(s) are determined so that, for instance, the report should be kept "top secret" and be read only by those given in their real names. The case2;(1110) is where readers are general public and all the people, C,T,W, are described in real names,

which would be almost always inappropriate for the purpose of protecting the privacy of the Client. The case $10;(0110)$ would be the most general case, where C and R are made anonymous, and T and W are given in real names. The general public will be able to read the published report given in such a form. Interesting is the case $16;(0000)$, where all the CTWR are anonymous. This case is interestingly observed to approach without limits the case of a fictional novel, written by an anonymous writer.

Needless to say, the anonymization could be practiced by not just one method but by many varied ones, such as using alphamets, pseudonyms, different real names and so on.

The WRITER cannot escape from the constraint of the perspectivity. The choice of whether to anonymize or not depends upon the perspective of the WRITER, the person's accompanying motives and reasons for the WRITING.

Besides, there occurs the fusion and the separation between C , T , W and R . For example, T and W could be the identical person, when the fusion occurs between the two. The fusion between W and R would be observed when W and R is the same person and the document is the "strictly confidential" diary. However, in later years, after the person's death, the diary could be read by some other R , which case would be interpreted as the occurrence of the separation " $R \neq W$ " after the original fusion " $R = W$ ".

Here, the case of separation among the four C, T, W, R, will be adopted as the typical model case.

Even when the WRITer W chose the anonymization at the WRITING, as time passes, a change can occur in which the anonym lose its function of being anonymous. First of all, the anonymity cannot be protected unless there are ceaseless strong efforts to keep the secrecy. We might say that a secret exists to be disclosed, since it is protected against the wishes of those people who wish to know it if possible. Therefore, generally speaking, even with the real name initially kept anonymuos, the time will inevitably come, in the very long run, when it is openly and publicly disclosed. The pressure of the motive of the WRITer to keep the real name anonymous will also weaken as time passes by. When the WRITer passes away, the original motive itself also will have to pass away all together.

The insight is obtained that the mere anonymization will be able to keep the real name(s) in secrecy not forever. The pseudonym of a WRITer could ironically turn out to become later the very clue to open up the way to the research study on the person of the pseudonym which had once served to keep the real name unknown.

Among the motives for WRITING, the public, the altruistic and/or the

egoistic ones could distinguishably be imagined.

*At this point, let us consider the motives to “WRITE” and “publish” the clinical psychological practice reports in the derivative case 10;(0110). Then, imagining what kind of “Care/Sorge” is directed to what and to whom will help us to see the various possibilities of the motives. Fundamentally, three kinds could be distinguished. The first is the *public motives*. To contribute: for example, 0) to the welfare of human kind, 1) to the advancement of sciences, 2) to the cause of clinical psychological science, 3) to the cause of the research activities of the practice/research group one belongs to. The second is the *altruistic motives*, for the interests of others. To contribute: for example, 1) to transmit the wisdom obtained from one’s own practices to the other Ts, 2) possibly to enhance the qualities of the practices of the next generation, 3) to provide higher quality of practices to be enjoyed by the Cs in the future. The third is the *egoistic motives*, just for the W’s own personal, private selfish interests. To contribute: for example, 1) to have a higher reputation as a practitioner, 2) to increase one’s own financial conditions, 3) to get a better job, 4) to get promoted, 5) to feel one’s worth and the reason for being.*

*These three kinds of motives partially overlap and cooperatively encourage, sustain and actualize an act of WRITING. At times, the *egoistic**

motive may be defended and covered up by the pretence of the *public* and/or *altruistic* motives.

The motive of choosing Anonymization: in the case $10;(0110)$, where $T=W$.

Corresponding to the multiplicity of motives to *WRITING*, the motives to choosing Anonymization become multiple.

The first motive to anonymize is usually claimed to be the protection of the *C*'s Privacy. However, the actual motives may not necessarily limited to that first *altruistic* motive. Suppose, for instance, that a *W* should publish a report without anonymizing the *C*'s name, naturally the invasion of privacy might result. In addition, however, even the possibility of being protested and legally sued by the *C* might also have to be anticipated. Thus, the second *egoistic* motive to avoid the second possibility is also hidden in the act of anonymization. Fortunately, both the first motive and the second one seem to be satisfied, without serious conflict and contradiction, just by the anonymization of *C*'s name.

However, we have already seen that the anonymization of *C*'s name is not sufficient for the protection of *C*'s privacy. Even if the perfect anonymization of *C*'s name were practiced, the cases could often times happen that the identification of anonymous *C* turns out to be not too

difficult for the people who knows both the personal situations of *C* and the relationship with *C* of *T* whose name is given by the real name.

When the a practice report is published, it would be impossible to exclude the *C*(lient) only from the possible *R*(eader)s of the report. Then, it appears as if it is better to obtain beforehand the permission, from the *C*(lient), to publish, to fulfill the in-order-to motive (1) of the protection of privacy and also (2) of prevention of possible lawsuit by the *C*(lient). This would seem to be a kind of “informed consent”. Although this “prior consent” by the *C* for publication is effective for fulfilling the third *egoistic* motive to prevent the possible protest and/or lawsuit by the *C*(lient) and those concerned, it is useless for fulfilling the *altruistic* motive to protect the privacy of the *C*(lient). “Prior consent” is no guarantee to strengthen the anonymization to protect the privacy of the *C*(lient) more effectively. For example, if the *C*(lient) ever told some others that s/he made the “prior consent” to the particular *T*, then these others will immediately know, after the publication, that the published clinical report deals with the case of that *C*(lient) who made the prior consent. And if these others further tell the private story to some more others, then the secrecy of the story could be broken down and will gradually be known to the public. Furthermore, the *C* as an naïve amateur in psychological practices, the *C*

will never have sufficient insight to foresee the various kinds of the “invasion of privacy” as possible consequences, at the time of giving the “prior consent”. Thus, it will follow that the T should inform the C of detailed concrete explanations on the variety of the possible “invasion of privacy”, at the very time of requesting the “prior consent”. However, will there be any C at all who is willing to give “prior informed consent” after having known fully the concrete possibilities of the danger of the “invasion of privacy”. Thus, the “prior consent” may fulfill the *egoistic* motives of the W(RITer), but it does not work effectively to fulfill the claimed *altruistic* motives of protecting the privacy of the C(lient). In addition, if the C should later be identified and the clear case of the “invasion of privacy” because of the report should happen, the C will not be allowed to protest and/or sue the T and/or W. In this sense, the naively given “prior consent” will have the meaning of the prior deprivation from the C of the right to protest and/or to sue against the T. Therefore, in this case, in the act of requesting the “prior informed consent” is hidden the *egoistic* motive of the T to protecting oneself from the C’s protest and/or lawsuit, while the anonymization itself is evidently insufficient, at least, to actualize the *altruistic* motive of protecting the privacy of the C. Suppose again that, for the purpose of protecting the privacy of the C, the “prior consent” should

be made an essential prerequisite for publishing the report, then another serious problem necessarily comes up. The problem is whether or not to include the clinical psychological and/or psychopathological interpretation of the case by the T/W into the content of the "prior consent". The C knows that the case is his/her own. If to exclude, i.e., if the C did not know the content of the interpretation before the publication, then there may possibly occur the cases where the C gets furious/angry/offended by the interpretation. If the W/T wishes to avoid such a case, then s/he may have to make cautions to limit the interpretation within that which will never offend the C. However, if to include, i.e., the C is to know the content of the interpretation at the time of "prior consent", then the "prior consent" will begin to function as a kind of censure by the C, who is possibly an a naïve amateur ignorant of clinical psychology, and consequently, the range of the interpretation will have to be undesirably restricted. Therefore, the WRITING is an act full of conflict difficult to simultaneously satisfy both of the altruistic and the egoistic motives. The conflict becomes very serious when the motive of the publication of the report, in the self-understanding and self-disclosure of the W/T, should happen to be the egoistic motives pretending to be the public and/or altruistic motives. Then, could our conclusion be that no clinical practice reports should be

published? However, the abolishment of publication of practice reports will result in the impossibility of traditional succession of clinical wisdom to the wide range of practitioners, the wisdom solely obtainable through clinical practices.

Here, we will have to ask new questions. Are there any other methods than anonymization that fulfill the three kinds of motives simultaneously; public, altruistic and egoistic? However, much more essential question would be: what is it that is to be transmitted and succeeded by the publication of the practice reports in clinical psychology?

Is the anonymization the only method to make it possible to transmit and succeed the wisdom of the clinical practice?

What is the motive of presenting the WRITer by the real name?

Let us ask about what kinds of motives are to be found behind the act of presenting the WRITer by the real name.

First, there could be the answer that there is no special motive at all. Giving the real name for the author, the W(RITer), is already a habitualized taken-for-granted act, which needs no reason. However, this does not mean that there is no problem in the habitualized act.

We notice that the possible range of case reported will be narrowed down,

if the real name of the W(RITer) is given. Particularly, in the case of an inexperienced young T with only a few cases dealt with in the whole professional history, the real name of the T raises the possibility of identifying the case in question. In other words, even when the C's name were anonymized, the people around the young T will be able to identify the case with relative ease, since the number of the possible cases would be limited in the first place. This is a situation vividly depicted by the proverb: "The head hidden, yet the tail exposed".

The motives and/or the reasons the W(RITer) presents the real name to the public will be varied.

The first, the *public* motive: for example, 1) to clarify the locus of the responsibility of WRITING, and to assure the trustworthiness of the facts reported. 2) to maintain the continuity and integrity of the identical WRITer. 3) to locate the individual W publicly in the society. The second, the *altruistic* motive: for example, 1) to make the responsibility to the public in case any damage is caused to the C. 2) to make it clear to the public whom to seek further information regarding the case. 3) to provide the basic information, when considering the possibility of seeking any help from the W, regarding the appropriateness of asking W in his/her expertise. The quality of the report as the work of the W will help to

identify the merits /demerits of W as a specialist. The third, the *egoistic* motives of the W: for instance, 1) to obtain a good reputation as a practitioner. A bad reputation could result sometimes. 2) to leave one's own name to the future. 3) to secure the W's own interests by using the real name.

Evidently, both sacred and profane motives could be working in the act of making W's own real name public.

The anonymization of R(eaders) means not to limit, in publishing, the range of the readers. This act may contain the motive to get wider and more Readers. However, to offer the opportunity of reading the report to the many and unspecified readers, would increase the possibility of the danger of leakage to the public of the secret and of the invasion of the privacy, which the anonymization originally intended to prevent to occur. The motives of WRITING and those of the anonymization are noticed to be closely related each other.

Which motives really encourage WRITING the report, the public, the altruistic or the egoistic? If the motives were really the public and altruistic ones, then why the W(RITer) publish the reports venturing the possible danger of damaging the interests of the C, by the "invasion of privacy"?

Here, let us dare to attempt to listen to the following extremely vulgar

and sarcastic remarks: "Clinical psychological practitioners are publishing the personal and private talks and/or the secret affairs, which the C(lients) personally confided with them, while, in their professionalism, believing and claiming their obligation to protect the privacy of their C(lients). Those WRITers are doing this with the excuses to have adopted such a simple superficial routine operation of what they call the anonymization, that is simply to hide the C's name and give some other name in its place. However, you should notice, the C(lient)s never wanted to have their confidential stories disclosed and exposed to the public. They just wanted to have their secrets kept secret and confidential. The W(RITer)s are, just out of their vulgar egoistic motives to accumulate the researches/practices reports of their own achievement, choose to disclose and reveal the others' secrets to the public, with no sense of shame, guilty and pain, while carelessly betraying the deep trust of the C and endangering the welfare of the C. I wonder what kinds of people WRITers are!"

Increasingly important is how the C perceives the motives of the W when s/he WRITes and Chooses. If the C perceives the motives are *public* and *altruistic* in nature, the C might be expected to tolerate and accept the pain caused by the WRITING. However, if the C perceives and is convinced that the motives are egoistic without doubt, then certainly the C will not

forgive the WRITer. Thus, the act of anonymization or choosing to use the real name should never be done as an act of just a formal routine. Rather, Clinical psychological practitioners are expected to take the action with the responsible determination, while, imanining the possible serious consequences of the “invasion of privacy” incurred by the leakage of secrets, anticipating the worst possible case, with most careful consideration.

The C is not mere object of research and practice. The C is the other who is socially living as a subject together with us. Needless to say, the dialogues between the C and the T/W must be carried out with the highest respect to the human dignity of both the C and the T/W.

Conflicts exist between the Confidentiality and the Publication. Confidentiality is the right as well as the obligation of the T(herapist)/W(RITer).

Should the very fact be known to the general public that the secrets confided by the C to the T will not necessarily be kept confidential for long, then the Cs in the future will become hesitant to disclose his/her own secrets of heart and/or private secrecy in life at the clinical psychological interviews. Furthermore, this possible distrust in the practice may result in keeping away many of the potential C(lien)t)s from visiting the

T(herapist)'s room for counselling. If this turns out to be the case, then the confidentiality required of T may be considered not only as the obligation of T but also as the right of T to make it possible to continue the clinical practices. As said before, the anonymization of C's name only is not enough to protect the "invasion of privacy". The anonymization is not at all the sufficient measure to protect the secrets from those who might attempt to disclose them with atmost efforts. When T=W, the W should make the very relationship with the C absolutely confidential.

If a W(RITer) believes that the obligation of confidentiality is fulfilled only if the name of C is anonymized, then the W must be criticized for taking the matter too easy.

How could we solve the problem of the conflicts between the confidentiality and the publication?

Now, between the confidentiality (to keep the secrets of a case from the public) and the simultaneous publication (to let the case be known to the public) is evidently the fundamental contradiction. The publication of the secrets, in any form whatsoever, makes the confidentiality difficult to maintain. The publication in itself is an act of endangering the confidentiality from itself. In addition, it is an act involving the danger of

corroding the very foundation of the clinical psychological practices. Publication, in this sense, is an act that should be actualized with responsible resolution after very careful consideration.

Are there no ways to solve this difficult problem of the conflict between confidentiality and publication?

Among the possible solutions that occurred to my mind were the following:

1) *Stop publishing.* Make the act of transmission and succession esoteric.

You might recall the Japanese esoteric tradition of the secrets of martial art.

2) *Never leave the recordings.* After the esoteric transmission of the wisdom, completely erase the recordings so that there will be no trace of the transmission. You might recall the American TV “Mission Impossible”.

3) *Always prepare for the possible leakage of the secrets.* Naturally, the R should be selectively nominated and strictly limited.

4) *When you dare to report to the general public (i.e., to anonymize R), never fail to do anonymize not only C, but also T, W.* However, this practice would make it impossible to accumulate personal achievements, thus also impossible to fulfill the afore mentioned

egoistic motives.

5) Publish only the reports on those cases many years ago, always with anonymized C. This will certainly delay the dissemination of information and wisdom.

However, none of these solutions were satisfactory. After a while, I happened to find a hint for the solution of the problem.

The possible solution suggested by a lived experience.

In my life, I have worked for a number of universities, domestic and abroad, with the result to know many of the inside stories therein as well as many others. After a while, I began to believe that there is no university that has nothing to improve and reform. Today, among Japanese universities, “university reform” is loudly advocated, many committees for university reform are organized, and the reform reports are “published” one after another. However, when you skim through those published reports, each of the reports, without exception, claims that the university reported is an excellent one and reports that there is no serious problem to be improved. Every university seems to be wonderful, and nothing is to be desired.

I have served as a member of the committees for improvement/reform

of some the universities I worked for, and served even as the chairperson of the committees for searching for the problems to be improved and for WRITING the final reports proposing the suggestions for the possible improvements and reforms.

In many cases, most of the committee members seemed to expect, with negative feelings, the tedious discussions and time-consuming WRITING works of the inter-rim as well as the final reports. At one university, where I had take the responsibility of the chairperson, I succeeded to encourage the committee members to talk frankly about our own negative attitudes and to begin to talk openly the problems of the university, from the insider's perspectives. The talks in the committee soon got heated to discover numerous problems awaiting the urgent improvement. However, soon we became aware of a deadlock: the more serious the problem becomes, the more difficult it become to WRITe in our report. The reason was obvioius: the report had the same problem as the clinical psychological practice reports. If the committee openly, vividly and concretely WRITes in its report and then publicize the serious problems to be improved, as they actually are, then it will be R(ead) by people both inside and outside the university. Now, if the people outside Reads it, the social reputation of the university will inevitably go down. If read by the inside people, the

report in details will be taken as personal attacks and malicious criticisms, and, as a result, the inside human relationships will deteriorate. The anonymization does not work well, because the circle of the persons to be described are small and the identification will be too easy. Therefore, the frank and open WRITING was expected more probably to deteriorate, rather than to improve, the present situations. Besides, a report on the real facts will always come with a certain time lag, so that the report will be useless if it get published after the improvement has been actualized. Therefore, the report evidently should function, at the time of publication, as inviting the university members to become aware of the possibility of the facts and encouraging to change these facts toward the improvement of the situation, rather than just WRITING on these facts exactly as they are. Thus the task was redefined as how to elicit and share, among the members of the university, the awareness of the possible existence of the problematic facts and how to encourage to participate the improvement of the situations. Then, instead of the "Direct Method" that describes the situational facts as discovered facts, the so-called "Indirect Method" was imaginatively invented. The Direct Method would require the anonymization. The Indirect Method includes the following variants. A) Hypothesis method, B) Fictional method, C) Third person method, or

By-stander method, or Out-sider method, D) Prevention method, E) Hope method, F) Mixed method, G) Total negation method and/or Partical negation method. Let me give brief explanation to each of the methods with funny-looking names.

A) *Hypothesis method*: To WRITE the matter as a hypothetical one. A hypothetical WRITING would be; "If this should happen, then the following problems would follow as a result."

B) *Fictional method*: To WRITE the matter as a case in a fictional world. A fictional WRITING would be; "This is not the real fact of the matter, but only an possible imaginative story taken from a fictional world."

C) *Third person method, or By-stander method, or Out-sider method*: To WRITE the event/matter that happens to the person living in an unspecifiable time and space, to a person in a distant time and space, such as in a foreign country or in ancient Greece or China, for instance.

D) *Prevention method*: To WRITE not as a past event/fact, but as a possible danger in the future, and then propose the realistic ways of its prevention .

E) *Hope method*: To WRITE as that which is hoped for in the future, or as a "dream" or someone's hope.

F) *Mixed method*: To WRITE by mixing the methods from A) to E) . This is

a cocktail method, extracting the best from each. A mixed WRITING would tell the story as a dream of a person in a fictional world.

G) *Total negation method*: To WRITe to characterize the total set of the stories reported as not the real facts but as an imaginative fiction, an interesting lie, and/or probable false.

H) *Partial negation method*: To WRITe that, among the stories reported, some are said to be the serious real facts of the matter but some are reputed to be just fictional stories, but, fortunately or unfortunately, nobody knows which is which.

By making full use of all the methods introduced above, our report was able to WRITe many of the facts evidently impossible to WRITe if the WRITING were in the "Direct Method". In addition, the report itself was actually read by many colleague staffs and was welcomed with warm smiles, with no antagonism or hostility. The reason of this success, if we may call it a success, was that the report was based upon our sincere good faith to improve the situation and contained no atmosphere of personal attacks on anybody.

From this lived experience of mine, the following little insight was obtained. On the one hand, if one attempts to WRITe something while saying this something is a fact, then there are cases where, in reality, the

WRITING of this something becomes impossible or extremely difficult. On the other hand, if one attempts to WRITe something while saying this something is a fiction, then the WRITING of this something becomes possible or even relatively easy. A little violently and simpistically stated, the insight was that there are cases where “If you are to say this is a fact, then you cannot tell the fact, but if you say this is a fiction, then you can tell the fact”. The discovery of the insight reminded us of the “fictional” story of the “xxxx” by Nicolaus Copernicus(1473-1543).

The Indirect Method is applicable to the Clinical Psychological Practice Reports

Usually, we might say, the Fiction method would be “To set up those matters to look like a real fact which are in reality not facts”. However, the Indirect Method here is, we might say, “To WRITe those matters as a fiction which are in reality facts”.

In Clinical Psychological Practice Reports, even those matters impossible to WRITe either with the real names or with the anonymization, would become possible to WRITe by the Indirect Method proposed above.

Closing remarks

I have a question: In WRITING Clinical Psychological Practice Reports, does the “fact” really matter? Who could ever verify the particular fact of the particular case? Rather, does not the “meaning and structure” of the case matter?

Many difficult problems have been noticed in WRITING “Facts as facts” in the Clinical Psychological Practice Reports . The simple Anonymization method commonly adopted to respond these difficult problems unfortunately contain the hidden serious conflict between Confidentiality and Publication. Thus, the question arises as to what is essential to WRITE and communicate by the reports.

We could establish the Minimax principle that we should maximize the merits and minimize the demerits of either the Direct Method or the Indirect Method.

The Anonymization has been necessitated by the circumstances that the Clinical Psychological Practice Reports, as a part of the human science researches, are practicing and researching the human person subject who is just the same social existence as the practitioners/ researchers subjects themselves. This is very much in contrast to the natural science researches in which the human subjects are practicing and researching the material object, but not the human person subject as subject. However, the

anonymization is, at least, insufficient to fulfill the claimed objective of Privacy protection of the clients. Therefore, the Indirect Method is proposed in contrast to the Direct Method. The author believes that the greatest possibility of the power to solve the problems resides in the Fiction method among the Indirect methods. However, the fictionalization is an act of trespassing (i.e. crossing the border) from the real world to the fictional world and, therefore, belongs to the different dimension from where the anonymization belongs to. The anonymization stays in reality through and through. In order that the trespassing should have the positive meanings in the Clinical Psychological Practice Reports as well as in the Human Science Research Reports, our understanding of the huge possibility of the fictionalization must be deepened and enriched further. In order to actualize that, we must explicate in detail the lived experiences of the R(eader)s who read the reports WRITING by fictionalization. I believe, this would be an urgent task which needs be solved for the continuing development of Clinical Psychological Practices, and possibly also of Human Science Research Practices.

I am filled with the feeling of wonder to have discovered the huge task implicitly hidden in the seemingly trivial and tiny act of Anonymization.

Thank you for your kind listening.

NB: This report is a summarized version of the first two of the three lengthy papers already published in Japanese; Yoshida(2004),(2005) and (2006).

References

Bok,Sessela(1978) *Lying; Moral Choice in Public and Private Life*, Vintage Books.

Bok,Sessela(1983) *Secrets; On the Ethics of Concealment and Revelation*, Pantheon Books.

Natanson, Maurice (1986) *Anonymity: A Study in the Philosophy of Alfred Schutz*. Indiana UP.

吉田章宏 2004 匿名化を「選ぶ」の構造 :心理臨床実践報告におけるその意味、
淑徳心理臨床研究、創刊号、11-24

Yoshida, Akihiro(2004) The structure of choosing anonymity: its meaning in reporting clinical psychological practices. *Shukutoku Studies in Clinical Psychology*. Vol. 1. 11-24. In Japanese.

吉田章宏 2005 匿名化から虚構化へ :実践報告の存在理由に即して、淑徳心理
臨床研究、第2巻、1-12

Yoshida, Akihiro(2005) *From anonymization to fictionalization: b ased*

upon the raisons de'être of clinical practice reports. Shukutoku Studies in Clinical Psychology. Vol. 2. 1-12. In Japanese.

吉田章宏 2006 心理臨床実践報告における「匿名化」の限界と「虚構化」の必要性発生の一素描、淑徳心理臨床研究、第3巻、1-18

Yoshida, Akihiro(2006) A sketch on the limits of the anonymization and the genesis of the necessity of fictionalization in the Clinical Psychological Practice Reports. *Shukutoku Studies in Clinical Psychology. Vol. 3. 1-18. In*