



Associazione  
Italiana  
di Psicologia



UNIVERSITÀ  
DEL SALENTO

Dipartimento  
Storia  
Società  
Studi  
sull'Uomo  
**SHS**  
History  
Society  
Human  
Studies  
Department

*Proceedings*

XXII NATIONAL CONGRESS  
ITALIAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION  
CLINICAL AND DYNAMIC SECTION  
LECCE -SEPTEMBER 17-19 2021

*Department of History, Society and Human Studies  
University of Salento, Lecce, Italy*



**XXII** CONGRESSO NAZIONALE **LECCE** dal 17 al 19  
SETTEMBRE 2021  
Associazione Italiana di Psicologia Sezione di Psicologia Clinica e Dinamica

**OPEN DISCUSSION****NATIONAL SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE**

Renata Tambelli (Università “La Sapienza” di Roma)  
Mario Fulcheri (Università degli Studi “G. D’Annunzio” di Chieti)  
Claudia Mazzeschi (Università degli Studi di Perugia)  
Silvia Salcuni (Università degli Studi di Padova)  
Maria di Blasi (Università degli Studi di Palermo)  
Eleonora Volpato (Università ‘Cattolica del Sacro Cuore’ di Milano)

**LOCAL SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE***Coordinators*

Claudia Venuleo (Università del Salento)  
Omar Gelo (Università del Salento)

*Components*

Maria Fara De Caro (Università degli Studi “Aldo Moro” di Bari)  
Sergio Salvatore (Università “La Sapienza” di Roma)  
Alessandro Taurino (Università degli Studi “Aldo Moro” di Bari)

**ORGANIZING COMMITTEE***Coordinators*

Claudia Venuleo, Omar Gelo e Tiziana Marinaci

*Componentes*

Karen Bruschi, Lucrezia Ferrante, Gloria Lagetto, Annalisa Levante, Oronzo Mazzeo,  
Giulia Piraino, Matteo Reho, Simone Rollo, Serena Verbena, Matteo Jacopo Zaterini

**EDITORS**

Karen Bruschi, Omar Gelo, Oronzo Mazzeo, Claudia Venuleo  
Dipartimento di Storia, Società e Studi sull’Uomo, Università del Salento

**Personality disorders: guidelines and best practices towards the definition of an Italian model****Proposer:***Fabio Madeddu*<sup>1</sup><sup>1</sup>Department of Psychology, University of Milan – Bicocca**Participants:***Alexandra Maria Piraino*<sup>2</sup>, *Cesare Maffei*<sup>3</sup>, *Antonello Colli*<sup>4</sup>, *Claudia Mazzeschi*<sup>5</sup><sup>2</sup>Department of Psychology, University of Milan – Bicocca<sup>3</sup>Faculty of Psychology, Università Vita-Salute San Raffaele, Milano<sup>4</sup>Department of Humanities, Università degli Studi di Urbino "Carlo Bo"<sup>5</sup>Department of Philosophy, Social Sciences and Education, Università degli Studi di Perugia**Abstract**

Beginning from an overview of the state of the art of international guidelines regarding personality disorders, we will aim to bring attention to the specific situation in Italy, where no official guidelines at a national level have yet been published. The repercussions of this absence will be discussed and some virtuous attempts to implement the diffusion of empirically supported approaches – including but not limited to evidence-based therapies - will be highlighted.

The guidelines for evidence-based clinical practice should constitute tools at the service of the clinician but also of patients and policymakers to limit the use of useless or harmful clinical practices, and instead promote decisions based on the best available scientific evidence, integrated with clinical experience and patient preferences and values. The therapeutic efficacy of treatments based on scientific evidence is widely documented in the literature, and much can be learned from the systematic study of non-specific factors in psychotherapy as well. Still, the implementation of approaches based on these scientific findings in the Italian healthcare context encounters several challenges. These range from the lack of adequately trained therapists to the very structure of mental healthcare in Italy, which makes it almost impossible to provide the proper care to those who are affected by personality disorders.

The purpose of this discussion will be to investigate the tools officially available and those routinely adopted to support clinical choices when taking care of patients with personality disorders. Based on this analysis, the most critical aspects will be investigated, and best practices will be highlighted in order to elaborate a proposal regarding the drafting of Italian guidelines for the treatment of personality disorders, identifying in this tool an important laboratory for the integration and development of scientific paradigms, clinical models and health policies.

## Post pandemic...: the construction of a new systemic and individual normality, psychodynamic unsaturation processes and cultural construction

### Proposer:

*Giuseppe Mannino*<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Università di Roma "Lumsa"

### Participants:

*Gianluca Lo Coco*<sup>2</sup>, *Raffaele De Luca Picione*<sup>3</sup>, *Viviana Langher*<sup>4</sup>, *Sergio Salvatore*<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Università di Palermo

<sup>3</sup> Università telematica "Giustino Fortunato", Benevento, Italy

<sup>4</sup> "Sapienza" Università di Roma – Dipartimento di Psicologia Dinamica, Clinica e Salute

### Abstract

Puppies of the species sapiens is generated in a state of Neothernia, physiological immaturity; adults remain characterized by incompleteness: this characteristic stimulates our species to the relationship with each other by itself, the world, the environment, the context, generating flexible modes of interaction. Neothernia is the principle of the cultural nature of sapiens for which they come to connote the environment in which they live. Humans exist only within a socio-relational environment, but through its cultural formation. **Relevance:** in the (still) pandemic and immediately post-pandemic period it is and will be increasingly essential to deepen the "search for meaning": the "need for meaning", the need to discover and build the genesis of reality, generate a sense and an explanation to the whole that includes the changeability, uncertainty and incidentality of the whole. "Representing and organizing reality" generates resilience. Meanings are dynamic forms of the relationship partially crystallized: crystallizations of relational patterns that culture can shape, modify: are symbolic attempts to create new dynamic forms of the relationship, to arrive at new flexible and unsaturated crystallizations. **Specific focus:** 1) what are the social forms of unsaturation? The genesis of health? 2) Is a certain amount of crystallization, saturation useful? When does this saturated dimension become pathologizing? Is it possible to walk backwards? Is it possible to make crystallizations unsaturated? 3) Is it possible to arrive at the definition of a formal algorithm of unsaturation, decrystallization, both at the individual and social level? 4) What role has the pandemic played in decrystallizing saturated forms and generating new forms of relationship, or in crystallizing new psychopathological or psychopathogenic saturations? 5) what resilience mechanisms can we extract and consolidate from this global experience?

## Open questions and critical issues in parenting skills assessment

### Proposer:

*Paolo Roma*<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Human Neuroscience, Sapienza University of Rome

### Participants:

*Maria Cristina Verrocchio*<sup>2</sup>, *Silvia Mazzoni*<sup>3</sup>, *Rossella Procaccia*<sup>4</sup>, *Giancarlo Tamanza*<sup>5</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Department of Psychological, Health & Territorial Sciences, University “G. D’Annunzio”, Chieti-Pescara, Italy

<sup>3</sup> Department of Dynamic and Clinical Psychology, and Health Studies, Sapienza University of Rome, Rome, Italy

<sup>4</sup> Faculty of Psychology, eCampus University, Novedrate, Italy

<sup>5</sup> Department of Psychology, Catholic University of Milan, Brescia, Italy

### Abstract

The assessment process in child custody evaluation – requested by the judge when the parents don’t reach the agreement after separation or divorce – aims to assess the psychological wellbeing of both children and parents, the relationship between the members of the family unit and the parenting skills, in order to prevent children distress and other forms of psychopathology that can emerge especially when the conflict between the parents becomes chronic and alight. Often parents accuse each other of not being good parents and each try to be recognized as the most valid parent. Thus, the custody evaluator needs to conduct a targeted and precise assessment, which allows to suggest the most suitable judicial measures and psychological treatments for children and parents.

The procedure usually implemented to assess parenting skills is centered on clinical evaluation and also on psychodiagnostics assessment. However, during the custody evaluation procedure, many of the psychological questionnaires that are administered have not been conceived for the assessment of the parenting skills or the children-parent relationship, but for the evaluation of psychopathological characteristics or personality features, not always directly involved in parenting and coparenting. This represents a remarkable issue that cause inevitable criticism and mistakes in the child custody evaluation field. Thus, it must be deepened further with more research studies, in order to obtain greater judicial consent for the use of psychodiagnostics tests and then, make the assessment of parental skills more reliable and in line with the questions raised in the judicial process.

## **Psychologists' attitudes toward test and testing in assessment and psychological assessment online. Results and discussion of an online investigation**

### **Proposer:**

*Adriana Lis*<sup>1,3</sup>, *Filippo Aschieri*<sup>2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Università di Padova

<sup>2</sup>Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milano

<sup>3</sup>AIP Group of Assessment

### **Participants:**

*Claudia Mazzechi*<sup>4</sup>, *Piero Porcelli*<sup>5</sup>, *Alessandro Zennaro*<sup>6</sup>

<sup>4</sup>Università degli Studi di Perugia

<sup>5</sup>Università "G. D'Annunzio" di Chieti-Pescara

<sup>6</sup>Università di Torino

### **Abstract**

The European Federation of Psychologists Association Board of Assessment (EFPA-BoA) took the initiative to investigate psychologists' attitudes toward various aspects of testing in European countries (EFPA 2000, 2009) and worldwide (EFPA 2012). In 2019, the BoA decided to re-propose the investigation using the same tool of the ten years ago investigation. The AIP group of assessment coordinated by Adriana Lis as member of the BoA accepted to participate in the investigation. The aim of the group was (a) to administer the EFPA questionnaire already administered in 2009, (b) to add more information about psychologists' attitudes about online assessment. A total of 2412 Italian psychologists participated in the current study, a percentage of 2% of the psychologists registered in the Order of Psychologists (120.601 psychologists). However, just 1474 protocols were completed. The aim of this round table is to discuss the first results of this investigation. As in the previous investigations, the following areas will be focus on: Knowledge and training relating to tests and testing; Appreciation of tests, Regulations on tests and testing and Qualifications for test use; Internet tests and testing.

## Open science during current pandemic: reflections on scientific communication and clinical psychology figures

### Proposers:

Salvatore Settineri<sup>1</sup>, Emanuele Maria Merlo<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Università degli Studi di Messina

### Participants:

Santo Di Nuovo<sup>2</sup>, Francesco Gazzillo<sup>3</sup>, Silvia Salcuni<sup>4</sup>, Adriano Schimmenti<sup>5</sup>

<sup>2</sup>Università degli Studi di Catania

<sup>3</sup>Università di Roma “La Sapienza”

<sup>4</sup>Università di Padova

<sup>5</sup>Università “Kore” di Enna

### Abstract

The current pandemic, like any event or series of events that changed the worldview of people, will produce in the subjects the classical *before and after* balance, typical of traumatic experiences. The scientific communities have found themselves in the presence of very different needs, specifically scientific communication has undergone considerable pressures. In the case of clinical psychological assistance, the increase in psychopathological conditions due to the pandemic or past and increased in quantitative terms, mental health professionals have faced enormous clinical challenges. What we have witnessed in terms of scientific communication makes us reflect with respect to trends assumed by scientific communities for decades and which bear the name of *open science*. The need for rapid scientific communication has in fact confirmed what the *open science communities* have been promoting for decades. Rapid, effective, rigorous research, available to all those who want and above all know how use the emerged contents. The relevance that *open science* and *open communication* assumed within this pandemic context has allowed the emergence of the relevant role of open approaches as strongly founded. In the clinical psychological context, the rapid proliferation of specialist and scientific contents has allowed mental health professionals to guide diagnostic and therapeutic practice. The objective of the debate referring to the above-mentioned themes, essentially consists in a scientific exchange, always constructive and multidisciplinary that summarizes the very essence of clinical psychology. In order to allow the experiences of professionals clinically involved in this complicated period to emerge, the exchange will produce reflections and new perspectives useful for the purposes of the discipline.

## The Ethical Dimension of Psychology Research

### Ethics Committees and open data in Clinical and Dynamic Psychology

#### Proposers:

*Gianmauro Manzoni*<sup>1</sup>, *Caterina Lombardo*<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Università eCampus di Novedrate (Como)

<sup>2</sup> Università di Roma “La Sapienza”

#### Participants:

*Gianluca Castelnuovo*<sup>3</sup>, *Daniela di Riso*<sup>4</sup>, *Maria Catena Ausilia Quattropani*<sup>5</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Università Cattolica di Milano

<sup>4</sup> Università di Padova

<sup>5</sup> Università degli Studi di Messina

#### Abstract

The so-called replication crisis that is affecting research in psychology has decreased trust in research findings but the highest impact has been on research practices, which have been severely questioned along the last six years. One of main responses to the crisis has been the open science movement, which is asking for more transparency and openness in research, including open data. Indeed, more and more funding agencies and peer-review journals ask for data deposition in public repositories when approving research projects or accepting research papers. This is often a problem for researches in psychology, who may be reluctant for several reasons or do not know how to treat data before uploading them. A further response to the crisis has been the strengthening of research ethics and the proliferation of ethics committees, whose approval has become mandatory for doing and publishing research. The AIP working group on research ethics assessed the experience of submitting research projects to ethics committees in a recent survey involving researches in psychology and found that most of them faced problems, showing thus some critical aspects to be addressed in ongoing and future actions.



©2021 by the Author(s); licensee Mediterranean Journal of Clinical Psychology, Messina, Italy. This article is an open access article, licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 Unported License. Mediterranean Journal of Clinical Psychology, Vol. 9, No. 2 Supplementum (2021).

International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

**DOI:** 10.13129/2282-1619/mjcp-3225