Journal of Psychiatry
Psychotherapy & Communication

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). Supporting Autistic Adults in Communication and Dating: Clarity, Reciprocity, and Respect. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Jun 30;14(2):51-60

Supporting Autistic Adults in Communication and Dating: Clarity, Reciprocity, and Respect

Christian Jonathan Haverkampf

Narrative Clinical Review

Abstract—Autistic adults may seek help with conversation, friendship, dating, or an established relationship, but support becomes harmful when it assumes that one neurotype owns the correct form of communication. This narrative clinical review considers evidence available through 30 May 2025 and develops a practical, neurotype-aware approach to interpersonal communication and dating. Difficulties can arise from literal or indirect language, processing time, sensory load, uncertainty, alexithymia, previous rejection, camouflaging, and incompatible expectations. They also arise between people: autistic–non-autistic misunderstanding is often reciprocal, while shared neurotype can ease some interactions without guaranteeing compatibility. Assessment should identify the person's own goals, strengths, preferred language, support needs, and risks. Useful interventions may include explicit communication agreements, structured rehearsal, perspective checking, environmental accommodation, relationship and sexual-health education, peer-supported programs, and practice across real contexts. Dating is treated as mutual selection with clear consent, not training in how to appear non-autistic. Trials of adult social-skills programs show promising gains in knowledge and some aspects of functioning, but samples are small and real-world participation outcomes remain uncertain. Good support enlarges choice: it helps a person ask, understand, decline, disclose, negotiate, and repair while protecting authenticity, safety, and the right not to pursue conventional relationship goals.

Index Terms—autistic adults, Asperger syndrome, interpersonal communication, dating, neurodiversity, relationship support

I. INTRODUCTION

An autistic adult who asks for help with communication may be asking for many different things. One person wants a clearer way to signal interest on a date. Another understands others well in quiet, structured settings but loses speech in a crowded room. Someone else has spent years imitating socially expected behavior and wants relationships in which less imitation is necessary. The first responsibility is to discover the request, not to substitute a generic program of normalization.

Communication happens between nervous systems, histories, cultures, and expectations. Research on autistic–non-autistic interaction challenges the older assumption that misunderstanding can be located entirely inside the autistic person. Information can travel effectively between autistic peers, and rapport is influenced by whether partners share a neurotype (Crompton et al., 2020a, 2020b). These findings do not erase disability or support needs. They change the formulation from "deficient individual" to an interaction whose fit, clarity, demands, and accommodations can be examined.

Dating adds ambiguity, sensory and emotional intensity, rapidly changing consent, and unwritten conventions. Autistic adults report desire for romantic and sexual relationships, but opportunities and experiences vary widely (Byers et al., 2013; Strunz et al., 2017). Some value directness and shared interests; some need explicit discussion of pace or touch; some do not want romance or sex. Support should make choices more available, including the choice not to pursue a culturally expected relationship.

This review offers a professional framework for communication and dating support without promising a single correct style. It integrates structured teaching where useful with accommodation, reciprocal learning, and attention to power and safety. The outcome is not how convincingly a person can pass as non-autistic. It is whether communication becomes more understandable, less costly, and more capable of sustaining the relationships the person values. Earlier JPPC work on social anxiety and dating likewise treats participation as reciprocal rather than performative; the present review extends that principle while explicitly rejecting compulsory normalization or camouflage for autistic adults (Haverkampf, 2025).

Christian Jonathan Haverkampf, M.D., LL.M., is a psychotherapist working in private practice in Dublin, Ireland. Correspondence: jonathanhaverkampf@gmail.com. Website: www.jonathanhaverkampf.com.

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). Supporting Autistic Adults in Communication and Dating: Clarity, Reciprocity, and Respect. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Jun 30;14(2):51-60

II. SCOPE AND REVIEW METHOD

This narrative clinical review considered evidence available through 30 May 2025, exactly one calendar month before the nominal issue date. Searches prioritized systematic reviews, meta-analyses, randomized and controlled studies of adult social communication, qualitative and interaction research, relationship and sexual-health studies, official clinical guidance, and complete online-first reports. No new meta-analysis was conducted, and findings from children were not used as direct evidence for adult dating practice.

The adult intervention literature remains limited. A meta-analysis of social-skills training identified 18 studies but only five randomized trials, comprising 145 participants, and judged the evidence moderate in quality (Dubreucq et al., 2022). A dating-intervention review across several neuro-atypical populations found only one autism study among 11 included studies and concluded that firm effectiveness claims were not possible (Exell et al., 2022). Recommendations below therefore distinguish studied programs, plausible clinical adaptations, and ordinary ethical practice.

The review is aimed principally at verbally communicating autistic adults without assuming a particular IQ, education, independence, or support level. Communication may include speech, text, augmentative systems, delayed responses, scripting, or the help of a trusted supporter. People with intellectual disability and nonspeaking autistic people require inclusion and tailored research; their absence from much of the literature should not be converted into clinical absence.

Evidence was read with attention to whose outcome was measured. Knowledge of social rules, parent report, clinician rating, number of contacts, felt authenticity, loneliness, relationship quality, and safety are not interchangeable. A program can improve test knowledge without increasing participation, and more participation can be unwanted or exhausting. The person's own goals and experience should therefore remain visible alongside standardized measures.

III. TERMINOLOGY, IDENTITY, AND UNEVEN SUPPORT NEEDS

Asperger syndrome and high-functioning autism are legacy terms that remain meaningful to some people as diagnoses, identities, or search terms. Current diagnostic systems place these presentations within autism spectrum disorder. The phrase high functioning is particularly imprecise: fluent speech, employment, or a measured IQ does not reveal sensory burden, daily-living difficulty, burnout, vulnerability, or the support required after public effort. This article uses autistic adult as a concise default while following each person's stated preference.

Person-first language is preferred by some people and identity-first language by others. The clinician should ask about the difference and never turn it into a test of professional virtue. The same applies to words such as masking, camouflaging, disability, neurodivergent, and support needs. Language is clinically useful when it helps the person describe experience and obtain support; it is less useful when imposed as a correction from either ideological direction.

A contemporary formulation recognizes both neurodiversity and disability. Autism can involve valued ways of attending, thinking, communicating, and relating, while also involving substantial barriers, distress, or dependence. The Lancet Commission emphasized heterogeneity and the need for personalized, evidence-informed care across the life course (Lord et al., 2022). Respect does not require minimizing impairment, and support does not require treating difference as error.

The clinician should also ask what has happened around the person's communication. Years of bullying, correction, exclusion, or being misunderstood may make new interactions reasonably threatening. A communication difficulty may partly reflect trauma, social anxiety, depression, alexithymia, language processing, attention, hearing, or exhaustion. Autism explains some patterns but should not close the assessment.

Unevenness is often more informative than a global functioning label. The same person may reason fluently about a relationship in writing, miss an implied change of plan during speech, need help with travel or money, and provide excellent emotional support when expectations are explicit. Assessment should preserve that profile. Support is matched to the task and context, not inferred from vocabulary, academic achievement, or the ease of a structured interview.

Capacity can also fluctuate with sensory load, illness, stress, and autistic burnout. A strategy that works on a rested afternoon may be inaccessible after work or during conflict. This does not make the earlier ability unreal. Planning can identify low-capacity signals, reduce demands, postpone complex decisions, and provide an agreed form of communication for essential matters. Relationships become safer when variability is anticipated before either partner interprets it as indifference.

IV. COMMUNICATION IS AN INTERPERSONAL EVENT

The double-empathy perspective proposes that people with different experiences and communication norms can have reciprocal difficulty understanding one another. It does not claim that every misunderstanding is symmetrical or that autistic people communicate identically with one another. It directs attention to mismatch. A literal answer may be experienced as clear by one person and blunt by another; an indirect hint may feel polite to one and inaccessible to the other.

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). Supporting Autistic Adults in Communication and Dating: Clarity, Reciprocity, and Respect. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Jun 30;14(2):51-60

Experimental studies make this more than a philosophical point. Information transfer was similarly effective within autistic and within non-autistic chains but poorer in mixed-neurotype chains, while rapport ratings were higher in matched-neurotype interactions (Crompton et al., 2020a, 2020b). A later study of 143 adults also found that same-neurotype group composition influenced rapport, with effects that cannot be reduced to autism alone (Foster et al., 2025). The practical implication is to prepare both parties to communicate across difference.

First impressions create another interactional barrier. Non-autistic observers have made less favorable rapid judgments of autistic adults from brief audiovisual samples, even when the content of speech was not the problem (Sasson et al., 2017). Disclosure of an autism diagnosis can improve some judgments and willingness for interaction, although disclosure is personal and context-dependent (Sasson & Morrison, 2019). Training only the autistic person leaves these social responses unexamined.

Autism acceptance education for non-autistic partners has also been associated with greater interest in future interaction. This supports a reciprocal model: communication may improve when the environment understands autism, not only when the autistic person modifies behavior. In clinical work, a partner, group, employer, or family member may need as much psychoeducation about explicitness and processing time as the patient needs practice in perspective checking.

No neurotype has a universal body language. Gaze, prosody, gesture, facial movement, and distance vary within autistic and non-autistic groups and across culture, disability, gender, and context. A clinician can describe a signal's likely local interpretation while holding it as a probability. The safer skill is checking important meaning and repairing error, not memorizing a dictionary in which one movement always reveals one intention.

Reciprocal education can change the interaction before either person has mastered a new skill. A non-autistic communication partner may learn to avoid hidden tests, say when a plan is tentative, and ask about the meaning of silence. The autistic partner may learn which cues the other person relies on and decide when to make intent explicit. Each adaptation is discussed for usefulness and cost. Equality does not require identical effort in every moment, but chronic one-sided effort deserves attention.

Table 1. A reciprocal formulation of a communication event

Element	Questions for assessment	Possible support
Meaning	Was language literal, indirect, figurative, or underspecified?	Say the intended meaning; invite one clarifying question
Timing	Was more processing time needed than the exchange allowed?	Pause, use text, or agree that a reply may come later
Sensory load	What noise, light, touch, crowding, or fatigue was present?	Change the environment before treating the difficulty as skill
Prediction and history	Was ambiguity linked to past rejection, trauma, or social anxiety?	Name the prediction and separate present evidence from earlier learning
Partner fit	Did both people understand and accommodate each other's style?	Create a shared communication agreement, not a one-sided correction

V. ASSESSMENT AND COLLABORATIVE GOAL SETTING

Assessment begins with a communication map, not a deficit inventory. The clinician asks where communication already works, with whom, through which medium, at what time of day, and under what sensory conditions. They then locate the requested change: opening conversation, recognizing an invitation, expressing interest, reading indirect refusal, disclosing a need, negotiating touch, handling conflict, or recovering from overload. Strengths and supports belong inside the formulation from the beginning.

Goals should be observable and personally valued. “Become normal in conversation” is neither respectful nor measurable. “Tell a date that I need a quiet venue,” “ask for clarification instead of agreeing when I am unsure,” or “send a clear message when I do not wish to continue” can be practiced and reviewed. The goal may also be to reduce exposure to exhausting social demands, not increase them.

The assessment should include receptive and expressive communication, sensory profile, interoception, alexithymia, executive functioning, anxiety, mood, trauma, sleep, substance use, and previous relationship experience. Alexithymia is common but not universal in autism and may affect recognition and communication of emotion (Kinnaird et al., 2019). A person may know a rule intellectually yet be unable to access words during overload. That calls for a plan, not more explanation in the moment.

Risk questions belong in ordinary assessment. Has the person experienced coercion, stalking, financial exploitation, sexual assault, online manipulation, or pressure to comply? Do they understand and have access to contraception, infection prevention, and sexual-health care? Is another person controlling communication or speaking for them? Asking respectfully does not presume incapacity. It recognizes that social exclusion, inadequate education, and a strong wish for connection can create vulnerability.

Communication access is assessed in the same practical detail. The adult may prefer written choices before an open question, extra time without repeated prompting, visual supports, an augmentative system, or a trusted person's

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). Supporting Autistic Adults in Communication and Dating: Clarity, Reciprocity, and Respect. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Jun 30;14(2):51-60

presence for part of the meeting. The clinician still addresses the adult and checks whose account is being recorded. A method that produces more fluent speech for the interviewer may be less accurate than a slower method chosen by the person.

Trauma-informed pacing avoids turning assessment into another episode of forced performance. The person is told what topics will be covered, can request a pause, and is not required to produce eye contact or rapid emotional language as proof of engagement. When relationship harm is disclosed, the clinician validates the account and assesses present safety before analyzing communication. Misunderstanding may contribute to conflict; it never excuses coercion or assault.

VI. CLARITY, PROCESSING TIME, AND ENVIRONMENT

Explicit language is often the most effective accommodation. “Would you like to meet for coffee on Saturday?” is easier to answer than “We should do something sometime.” “I am interested in dating you” distinguishes romantic interest from friendship. Explicitness need not be cold. Tone and warmth can accompany clear content, and the recipient remains free to ask for a different style.

Processing time should be designed into communication before difficulty occurs. A person may request a pause, ask to receive important topics in writing, or agree with a partner that a considered answer will come later that evening. The agreement should also set a return point; indefinite withdrawal is confusing for the other person. “I need thirty minutes, and I will come back at eight” preserves both regulation and relationship.

Sensory conditions can determine whether skills are accessible. A busy bar may combine speech-in-noise demands, flashing light, unpredictable touch, and the pressure to respond rapidly. Choosing a quieter café, a walk, a museum at an uncrowded time, or a brief video call is not avoiding relationship development. It arranges a setting in which both people can meet; otherwise the autistic partner may spend the whole meeting surviving the room.

Written communication can be a strength, but it creates its own ambiguity. Messages lack prosody, can be reread until meanings multiply, and permit rapid or continuous contact. Agreements about response time, preferred channels, urgent matters, and pauses reduce guessing. Templates can support a difficult first sentence, provided they are individualized and communicate a real intention without simulating a persona.

Directness also has to remain relational. A speaker can state a clear preference and still choose privacy, tact, or timing. The listener can request explicit language without demanding immediate access to every thought. Practice therefore includes how to say “I do not know yet,” “I do not want to discuss that now,” and “Please tell me directly if the plan changes.” Clarity is a shared tool, not a claim on another person's inner life.

VII. RECIPROCITY, PERSPECTIVE CHECKING, AND REPAIR

Reciprocity does not mean equal eye contact, equal speaking time, or constant emotional display. It means that each person's signals and needs can affect what happens next. In conversation, this may involve noticing whether the other person answered briefly or expansively, offering related information, checking whether a topic is welcome, and making room for a different interest. A highly focused discussion can be deeply reciprocal when both people are choosing it.

Perspective taking is safer when framed as a hypothesis, never as mind reading. The clinician can teach three steps: observe what was said or done, generate more than one possible meaning, and ask when the matter is important and askable. “You became quiet after I mentioned next weekend; are you tired, uncertain about the plan, or is something else going on?” is usually more accurate than deciding that silence equals rejection.

The same method applies in both directions. A non-autistic partner may need to learn that reduced gaze does not necessarily signal disinterest, that a factual answer may be an attempt at care, or that a delayed emotional response is still a response. The autistic partner may need explicit information about how a long monologue or abrupt topic change affected the listener. Neither account cancels the other; repair begins when impact and intention can both be stated.

Repair phrases reduce the demand to improvise under stress: “I answered the words but may have missed the point,” “I meant that literally,” “I want to understand—can you be more direct?”, or “I need to restart that sentence.” Practice should include receiving repair as well as initiating it. A partner who clarifies should not be punished for having misunderstood, and a person who asks for clarity should not be shamed for not inferring.

VIII. WHAT STRUCTURED PROGRAMS CAN AND CANNOT SHOW

Adult social-skills programs often combine explicit rules, modeling, rehearsal, feedback, homework, and support from a social coach. Early PEERS work in young adults reported improvements in social-skills knowledge, engagement, and social responsiveness in small randomized samples (Gantman et al., 2012; Laugeson et al., 2015). These studies helped establish feasibility, but small samples and reliance on selected outcomes limit the conclusions that can be drawn about everyday relationships.

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). Supporting Autistic Adults in Communication and Dating: Clarity, Reciprocity, and Respect. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Jun 30;14(2):51-60

A Polish randomized trial of PEERS allocated 15 young adults to immediate or delayed treatment. Participants showed improvements in social knowledge and some cognitive or reported skills, with limited gains in social engagement; effects were maintained over six months (Płatos et al., 2024). That pattern is clinically important. Knowing what a curriculum recommends does not ensure opportunity, energy, confidence, compatible partners, or transfer into unscripted life.

Meta-analytic evidence is promising but not definitive. Dubreucq and colleagues found a large effect in parent-reported social responsiveness but emphasized moderate study quality, few randomized trials, and lack of active comparators (Dubreucq et al., 2022). A theatre-based pilot randomized trial in autistic adults reported gains on performance and some functional measures, again in a small sample (Corbett et al., 2025). Programs should be offered as options with monitored outcomes, not as established routes to relationship success.

A curriculum can still be valuable when used flexibly. Explicit conventions may reduce uncertainty, group practice may supply repeated opportunities, and a trusted supporter can help a person plan and reflect. The clinician should ask which rules are descriptive, which are culturally local, which protect consent, and which merely reward appearing non-autistic. The person should be able to reject a rule that is irrelevant, uncomfortable, or inconsistent with identity.

Acceptability deserves measurement beyond attendance. A participant may complete a program while finding it infantilizing, exhausting, heteronormative, or too dependent on family involvement. Others may value the explicitness and peer contact. Review asks what was useful, what was costly, whether the person felt freer or more monitored, and whether any increase in social activity was wanted. Adverse effects and camouflaging burden belong in program evaluation even when symptom or knowledge scores improve.

Peer involvement can improve relevance, especially when autistic facilitators contribute experience without being expected to represent everyone. Family or caregiver participation can be helpful when chosen and developmentally appropriate, but adult programs should not assume that a parent is available or should know intimate details. A friend, partner, sibling, mentor, or no coach at all may fit better. The support role is negotiated around the adult's goals.

Table 2. Interpreting adult communication interventions

Intervention element	Potential value	Clinical caution
Explicit teaching	Makes hidden conventions discussable	A convention is not a universal moral rule
Modeling and rehearsal	Reduces novelty and permits feedback	A fluent role-play may not transfer under sensory or emotional load
Peer or coach support	Supports planning and real-world practice	The supporter should not control choices or disclose without permission
Group learning	Provides repetition and shared experience	Group norms may still marginalize gender, culture, sexuality, or communication differences
Outcome measurement	Shows whether support changes knowledge or life	Parent ratings and rule knowledge cannot replace the adult's experience

IX. DATING AS MUTUAL SELECTION

Dating support is sometimes taught as a set of moves for obtaining approval. A more useful frame is mutual selection. The autistic person is deciding as well as being considered: Do I enjoy this contact? Is the other person clear, respectful, and reliable? Can we accommodate each other's needs? Do our wishes about romance, sex, time, and exclusivity fit well enough to continue? This frame protects agency and reduces pressure to preserve any available relationship.

The stages can be separated for assessment: making oneself available, initiating, exchanging information, inviting a meeting, planning an accessible setting, expressing interest, negotiating physical contact, and deciding whether to continue. A person may understand established relationships but not recognize early ambiguity, or may initiate easily but struggle to state a boundary. Practice can target the relevant stage without treating the whole person as socially unskilled.

Friendship and romance may not fall into sharply separated categories for every person. Interest can change, and partners may use relationship words differently. Direct questions about intention, exclusivity, affection, sex, and practical commitment can be useful, but they do not require conventional labels. Support should help the adult make agreements that the people involved understand, including asexual, aromantic, queer, non-monogamous, or otherwise nontraditional possibilities.

Research specifically on dating interventions is sparse. Exell and colleagues found only one autism study in their systematic review and reported varied methods and weak intervention descriptions (Exell et al., 2022). PEERS trials include dating content, but their outcomes do not establish that a prescribed dating sequence suits every autistic adult. Clinical teaching should therefore combine what evidence exists with explicit consent, individualized goals, and feedback from autistic participants.

Relationship outcomes also resist a simple neurotype rule. In a mixed-methods study of 106 autistic adults, overall satisfaction did not significantly differ according to whether the partner was autistic, otherwise neurodivergent, or

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). Supporting Autistic Adults in Communication and Dating: Clarity, Reciprocity, and Respect. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Jun 30;14(2):51-60

neurotypical, although participants described different strengths and challenges (Khaw & Vernon, 2025). Shared neurotype may support ease and understanding; compatibility, mutual support, values, and accommodation still matter.

Online contact can offer time to process, shared-interest communities, and an explicit record of what was said. It can also increase literal misunderstandings, deception, rapid intimacy, financial exploitation, and pressure to share images or private information. Support can cover platform privacy, identity verification, boundaries around frequency, transition to a safe meeting, and how to end contact. These are ordinary digital skills taught accessibly, not reasons to bar the adult from online dating.

Interest needs a reciprocal route. A person may have been taught how to initiate but not how to notice whether the other person is also investing in contact. Useful indicators include replies that add content, questions that are returned, plans that are kept or renegotiated, and boundaries that are respected. None is infallible. Together they help distinguish persistence in a mutual connection from repeated pursuit of someone who is not participating.

Table 3. Dating support that preserves autonomy

Task	Clear communication option	Autonomy and safety check
Showing interest	I enjoy talking with you and would like to meet	Interest is an invitation, not an obligation for either person
Planning	Quiet café, one hour, separate travel, Saturday at two	Choose sensory conditions and an exit plan that work for both
Clarifying intention	Are you thinking of this as a date or as friends meeting?	Ambiguity may remain; neither answer should be pressured
Physical contact	May I kiss you? / I do not want to be touched now	Consent must be specific, voluntary, and changeable
Continuing or ending	I would like to meet again / I do not want to continue dating	One clear answer is enough; support recovery without pursuit

X. DISCLOSURE, AUTHENTICITY, AND CAMOUFLAGING

Disclosure of autism is a choice, not a prerequisite for honest dating. A person may disclose in a profile, before meeting, after trust develops, or not at all. The decision depends on safety, relevance, identity, stigma, and the accommodations required. It can be useful to separate a diagnostic disclosure from a needs disclosure: “Crowded places make it hard for me to follow speech, so I prefer somewhere quiet” may communicate what matters without a label.

Research on first impressions suggests that diagnostic information can improve some non-autistic observers' evaluations of autistic adults (Sasson & Morrison, 2019). This is not a guarantee that disclosure will be received well. The clinician can help plan what to say, what questions the person is willing to answer, how to recognize disrespect, and whom to contact afterward. Disclosure should never be made by a clinician, relative, or coach without consent.

The possibility of discrimination is part of informed choice. A date may respond with stereotypes, disbelief, intrusive questions, or attempts to reinterpret every behavior through autism. The person can prepare a boundary and an exit without assuming that every awkward response is malicious. A receptive partner may need time and reliable information. The clinically relevant distinction is whether curiosity remains respectful and whether the autistic adult retains control of what is shared.

Camouflaging includes strategies used to conceal or compensate for autistic characteristics. A mixed-methods systematic review of 58 studies found that camouflaging was often socially motivated and associated with adverse outcomes, while definitions and measurement varied (Zhuang et al., 2023). Some learned strategies are useful and freely chosen; sustained performance under threat can be exhausting and can make intimacy paradoxical, because acceptance remains attributed to the mask.

The therapeutic question is not whether all adaptation is false. Everyone adjusts communication across contexts. It is whether the adjustment is chosen, proportionate, sustainable, and compatible with being known. A dating plan should include where the person can reduce performance, state a need, pursue a focused interest, or recover sensory equilibrium. A relationship that depends on permanent concealment may have a high hidden cost even when it looks successful from outside.

Before teaching a social rule, ask

- Does this rule protect consent, clarity, or another person's reasonable boundary?
- Is it a local convention that should be explained as context-dependent?
- Whose comfort is increased, and what cost is placed on the autistic person?
- Could the environment or communication partner adapt instead or as well?
- Can the person use the strategy selectively without hiding a core need or identity?
- Will success be judged by the person's life and experience, not only observer ratings?

XI. CONSENT, SEXUAL HEALTH, AND VULNERABILITY

Consent education should be explicit enough to use and nuanced enough for real relationships. Consent is a voluntary, informed, specific, and ongoing agreement. A yes to one act is

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). Supporting Autistic Adults in Communication and Dating: Clarity, Reciprocity, and Respect. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Jun 30;14(2):51-60

not a yes to another; a previous yes is not a present yes; silence, freezing, or compliance under pressure is not reliable consent. Autistic and non-autistic partners alike benefit from direct questions and from treating uncertainty as a reason to pause.

Rules alone are insufficient. A person also needs language for desire, uncertainty, refusal, contraception, infection prevention, pain, sensory preferences, and aftercare. Some people need concrete visual or written resources; others need discussion that does not assume heterosexuality, monogamy, binary gender, or sexual interest. Healthy-intimacy reviews emphasize individualized education and support, with a scope wider than risk alone (Girardi et al., 2021).

A 2025 systematic review included 56 studies and described both ordinary sexual desires and distinctive challenges involving knowledge, sensory experience, communication, and victimization. It called for inclusive sexual-health interventions and noted major gaps involving non-Western settings, intellectual disability, and gender diversity (Motamed et al., 2025). The evidence does not justify portraying autistic adults as inherently unsafe partners or inevitable victims. It does justify accessible education and routine opportunities to disclose harm.

Safety planning can cover first meetings, transport, privacy, image sharing, passwords, money, substances, contraception, and trusted support. It should distinguish protective planning from surveillance. A supporter can help evaluate a situation without taking over the person's phone, choosing partners, or demanding intimate details. If abuse is suspected, the response follows safeguarding and trauma-informed principles; communication training is not an answer to coercion.

Capacity is decision-specific and should not be inferred from diagnosis, verbal style, or another person's anxiety. Accessible explanation, time, and supported decision-making can improve understanding without replacing the adult's will and preferences. When there is a genuine capacity concern, the relevant legal and professional framework applies. Routine paternalism creates its own harm by withholding education and private opportunities that make safer autonomous relationships possible.

XII. ESTABLISHED RELATIONSHIPS AND SHARED AGREEMENTS

Once a relationship is established, implicit expectations accumulate. Partners may differ in how often they message, what counts as quality time, how they signal affection, how much solitude they need, and when a disagreement is considered resolved. Writing these expectations down can feel unusually formal to some couples and deeply relieving to others. Formality is not a failure of intimacy when it prevents repeated hurt.

A shared agreement might cover ways to begin a difficult topic, signs of overload, the meaning of silence, response windows, sensory boundaries, household tasks, social events, sex, finances, and how to return after a pause. The agreement belongs to both people and can be revised. It should not become a behavior contract in which one partner monitors the other's autism.

Conflict plans are most useful when written during calm periods. They can specify how either partner signals overload, how long a pause may last, which matters cannot safely be discussed by text, and the agreed time for return. A meltdown or shutdown may reduce immediate communication capacity but does not erase the impact on the partner. Repair can include explanation, responsibility for harm, environmental changes, and a revised plan without treating the neurological response as intentional misconduct.

Qualitative work with neurodiverse couples describes the value of acceptance, direct communication, shared understanding, and accommodation alongside recurring misunderstandings and unmet needs (Smith et al., 2021). Relationship satisfaction research likewise suggests strengths as well as challenges across partner neurotypes (Khaw & Vernon, 2025). The clinician should resist both tragedy and idealization. Autistic relationships are relationships: capable of care, incompatibility, growth, conflict, and ordinary variation.

Couple work can slow down the translation process. Each partner describes observable events, intention, impact, and need. The therapist checks whether one communication style is being treated as the neutral standard and whether either partner is afraid to disagree. Joint work is inappropriate when coercive control or violence makes disclosure unsafe. In a basically safe relationship, explicit translation and practical accommodation may release energy previously spent on repeated guessing.

XIII. THE CLINICAL ENCOUNTER AND INVOLVING OTHERS

The clinical encounter should model the communication it recommends. The clinician says why a question is being asked, avoids unnecessary figurative language, allows processing time, and checks meaning without turning every answer into a test. A written agenda or summary can reduce memory load. None of these adjustments prevents warmth or spontaneity; they make the structure legible enough for both people to participate.

Misunderstandings in therapy deserve direct repair. If the clinician interprets silence as reluctance and the patient was processing, both intention and impact can be named. If a concise answer feels dismissive, the clinician can describe that impression and ask what the person meant. The purpose is not to teach the patient to prevent every non-autistic inference. It

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). Supporting Autistic Adults in Communication and Dating: Clarity, Reciprocity, and Respect. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Jun 30;14(2):51-60

is to create experience of a difference being noticed, checked, and survived without shame.

A partner, relative, peer mentor, or support worker can be involved when the adult wants this and when the role is clear. They may help describe interaction patterns, rehearse a shared agreement, or support generalization. Consent covers what information may be shared, whether part of the meeting remains private, and how the adult can change their mind. Convenience for the service is not a reason to transfer decision-making to the supporter.

Joint work should remain balanced. The communication partner may need to become more explicit, wait longer, reduce sensory demand, or question their own assumptions. The autistic adult may want practice in signaling overload, checking perspective, or repairing an abrupt response. Neither person is appointed the permanent translator of the other. The useful outcome is a shared process that continues after the clinician is no longer present.

XIV. GENERALIZATION, PARTICIPATION, AND SUPPORT

Learning in a clinic is only a beginning. Communication varies across friends, colleagues, family, online spaces, dates, and partners. A skill that appears fluent in a quiet role-play may disappear under sensory load or attraction. Generalization plans should therefore specify context, accommodation, cue, practice, and recovery. The person decides which settings matter and is not simply sent into maximal social exposure.

Participation depends on opportunity as well as competence. An umbrella review of adult participation interventions found a heterogeneous and limited evidence base across employment, social, and community outcomes (Giummarra et al., 2022). A person cannot practice dating safely if transport, money, inaccessible venues, discrimination, or absence of social networks prevents meeting people. Clinical work may include practical problem solving and connection with autistic-led or interest-based communities.

Interventions for varied adult social communication remain methodologically uneven. A review covering several approaches found diversity in targets, delivery, and outcome measurement and called for stronger, more relevant research (Wolfe et al., 2019). The field needs outcomes chosen with autistic adults: relationship quality, autonomy, communication ease, belonging, safety, and the cost of participation, not only observer judgments of typicality.

Trusted supporters can help rehearse, travel, reflect, or identify risk, but their role requires boundaries. The adult decides what information is shared and when assistance ends. Support that is always present can inadvertently communicate incapacity or prevent private relationship development. The right amount is the amount that enables the person's choices while preserving dignity, privacy, and room to learn.

XV. MEASURING CHANGE AND RESPONDING TO DIFFICULTY

Measurement should begin with the person's reason for seeking help. Possible outcomes include making one clear invitation, asking for clarification, communicating a sensory need, recognizing and respecting refusal, recovering after misunderstanding, or feeling less need to camouflage with a trusted partner. Frequency alone is ambiguous. More conversations may represent opportunity and choice, or simply more exhaustion.

Standardized social responsiveness or knowledge measures can supplement but not replace individualized outcomes. Programs have sometimes produced clearer gains in knowledge or observer report than in spontaneous engagement (Dubreucq et al., 2022; Płatos et al., 2024). This discrepancy should prompt curiosity. The person may lack opportunity, reject the suggested style, need different accommodations, or have learned information that is not accessible under load.

When support is not helping, the clinician reopens the formulation. Is anxiety being mistaken for autism, or vice versa? Is language too abstract? Are sensory demands consuming capacity? Does the person understand a convention but reasonably choose not to follow it? Is a partner unwilling to accommodate, or is the relationship unsafe? A failure of fit between intervention and person should not be narrated as resistance.

Quality and cost are reviewed together. A conversation may become more outwardly conventional while requiring longer recovery; a smaller number of contacts may become warmer and more sustainable. The adult can rate clarity, agency, sensory burden, camouflaging, and felt connection alongside observable goals. A credible outcome account allows improvement in one dimension and difficulty in another, which is often how real interpersonal change proceeds.

Clinical guidance for autistic adults emphasizes comprehensive, person-centered assessment, environmental adjustment, and adaptation of interventions to communication needs (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, 2021). Those principles are especially relevant to intimate life, where goals are personal and the cost of being misunderstood can be high. Review should include benefits, burden, unintended camouflaging, and whether the adult retains ownership of decisions.

XVI. LIMITATIONS AND RESEARCH PRIORITIES

The literature does not yet justify precise predictions about which communication or dating intervention will improve which adult's relationships. Samples are often small, relatively

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). Supporting Autistic Adults in Communication and Dating: Clarity, Reciprocity, and Respect. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Jun 30;14(2):51-60

young, verbally fluent, Western, and recruited through specialist services. Active comparison conditions, long follow-up, adverse effects, and direct measures of relationship quality are uncommon. Parent report remains influential even when the participant is an adult.

Terminology and theory have also changed across the evidence base. Studies using Asperger syndrome, high-functioning autism, autism spectrum disorder, and autistic adults may include overlapping but nonidentical populations. Older deficit-based measures can record successful camouflaging as improvement. Newer interactional findings may be more respectful but are not automatically stronger merely because their framing is current.

Research should be co-designed with autistic adults across support needs, communication modes, cultures, genders, sexualities, and relationship preferences. Trials need to distinguish knowledge from participation, measure autonomy and cost, report harms, and examine partner or environmental interventions. Dating research should include initiation, consent, rejection, online safety, sexual well-being, relationship maintenance, and chosen nonparticipation.

Co-design must influence more than recruitment materials. Autistic contributors can help choose the problem, identify outcomes, shape intervention language, interpret findings, and decide what counts as harm. Their involvement should be resourced and reported, with accessible options for participation. This does not remove the need for rigorous comparison; it makes the question and its measures more likely to represent the lives the intervention is intended to support.

A recent systematic review mapped predictors, forms, and consequences of social camouflaging across autistic adults and young people and argued for more developmentally informed theory (Klein et al., 2025). Future research must not choose between effectiveness and humanity. It should ask whether support produces a life that the participant experiences as more connected and more their own.

XVII. CONCLUSION

Communication support for autistic adults is most defensible when it begins with respect and becomes specific. The clinician identifies the person's desired relationships, preferred language, sensory and processing conditions, existing strengths, and the exact moments in which meaning is lost. Intervention can then combine explicitness, rehearsal, perspective checking, accommodation, and repair without treating non-autistic behavior as the universal endpoint.

Dating makes reciprocal communication and autonomy especially visible. Clear invitations, explicit consent, accessible settings, honest needs, and respectful endings are useful across neurotypes. The autistic person is not merely learning to be selected; they are deciding who feels safe, compatible, responsive, and worth knowing. Support should increase that capacity to choose.

Structured adult programs offer promising but limited evidence, while interaction research shows why changing only the autistic partner is incomplete. The next generation of practice should involve communication partners and environments, measure lived relationship outcomes, and monitor the cost of camouflaging. A good outcome is not a flawless imitation of someone else's social style. It is communication that is clear enough for mutual understanding, flexible enough for repair, and authentic enough that connection does not require disappearance.

XVIII. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND DISCLOSURES

Conflicts of interest—The author developed and writes about Communication-Focused Therapy (CFT). Where CFT is discussed, it is presented as a formulation perspective and not as a substitute for established assessment, evidence-based treatment, or independent replication. No other conflict of interest was reported.

Funding—No specific funding was reported for this article.

Author contributions—Christian Jonathan Haverkampf is the sole named author and is responsible for the conception, literature review, manuscript preparation, and approval of the final draft.

Patient material—No identifiable patient material is presented. Any brief examples are generic composites created to illustrate clinical reasoning and are not case reports.

XIX. REFERENCES

Byers, E. S., Nichols, S., Voyer, S. D., & Reilly, G. (2013). Sexual well-being of a community sample of high-functioning adults on the autism spectrum who have been in a romantic relationship. Autism, 17(4), 418–433. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362361311431950

Corbett, B. A., Key, A. P., Klemencic, M. E., Muscatello, R. A., Jones, D., Pilkington, J., Burroughs, C., & Vandekar, S. (2025). Investigating social competence in a pilot randomized clinical trial of a theatre-based intervention enhanced for adults with autism spectrum disorder. Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders, 55(1), 130–146. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-023-06214-0

Crompton, C. J., Ropar, D., Evans-Williams, C. V. M., Flynn, E. G., & Fletcher-Watson, S. (2020a). Autistic peer-to-peer information transfer is highly effective. Autism, 24(7), 1704–1712. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362361320919286

Crompton, C. J., Sharp, M., Axbey, H., Fletcher-Watson, S., Flynn, E. G., & Ropar, D. (2020b). Neurotype-matching, but not being autistic, influences self and observer ratings of interpersonal rapport. Frontiers in Psychology, 11, 586171. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.586171

Dubreucq, J., Haesebaert, F., Plasse, J., Dubreucq, M., Franck, N., & Network of Rehabilitation Centres of the French-speaking

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). Supporting Autistic Adults in Communication and Dating: Clarity, Reciprocity, and Respect. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Jun 30;14(2):51-60

Community. (2022). A systematic review and meta-analysis of social skills training for adults with autism spectrum disorder. Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders, 52(4), 1598–1609. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-021-05058-w

Exell, R., Hilari, K., & Behn, N. (2022). Interventions that support adults with brain injuries, learning disabilities and autistic spectrum disorders in dating or romantic relationships: A systematic review. Disability and Rehabilitation, 44(12), 2567–2580. https://doi.org/10.1080/09638288.2020.1845824

Foster, S. J., Ackerman, R. A., Wilks, C. E. H., Dodd, M., Calderon, R., Ropar, D., Fletcher-Watson, S., Crompton, C. J., & Sasson, N. J. (2025). Rapport in same and mixed neurotype groups of autistic and non-autistic adults. Autism, 29(7), 1700–1710. https://doi.org/10.1177/13623613251320444

Gantman, A., Kapp, S. K., Orenski, K., & Laugeson, E. A. (2012). Social skills training for young adults with high-functioning autism spectrum disorders: A randomized controlled pilot study. Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders, 42(6), 1094–1103. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-011-1350-6

Girardi, A., Curran, M. S., & Snyder, B. L. (2021). Healthy intimate relationships and the adult with autism. Journal of the American Psychiatric Nurses Association, 27(5), 405–414. https://doi.org/10.1177/1078390320949923

Giummarra, M. J., Randjelovic, I., & O'Brien, L. (2022). Interventions for social and community participation for adults with intellectual disability, psychosocial disability or on the autism spectrum: An umbrella systematic review. Frontiers in Rehabilitation Sciences, 3, 935473. https://doi.org/10.3389/fresc.2022.935473

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). From self-monitoring to connection: Communication and dating in social anxiety. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 14(1), 21–30.

Khaw, J., & Vernon, T. (2025). Relationship satisfaction among autistic populations: How partner neurotype influences relationship satisfaction factors for autistic adults. Autism in Adulthood. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1089/aut.2024.0124

Kinnaird, E., Stewart, C., & Tchanturia, K. (2019). Investigating alexithymia in autism: A systematic review and meta-analysis. European Psychiatry, 55, 80–89. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eurpsy.2018.09.004

Klein, J., Krahn, R., Howe, S., Lewis, J., McMorris, C., & Macoun, S. (2025). A systematic review of social camouflaging in autistic adults and youth: Implications and theory. Development and Psychopathology, 37(3), 1320–1334. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579424001159

Laugeson, E. A., Gantman, A., Kapp, S. K., Orenski, K., & Ellingsen, R. (2015). A randomized controlled trial to improve social skills in young adults with autism spectrum disorder: The UCLA PEERS program. Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders, 45(12), 3978–3989. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-015-2504-8

Lord, C., Charman, T., Havdahl, A., Carbone, P., Anagnostou, E., Boyd, B., Carr, T., de Vries, P. J., Dissanayake, C., Divan, G., Freitag, C. M., Gotelli, M. M., Kasari, C., Knapp, M., Mundy, P., Plank, A., Scahill, L., Servili, C., Shattuck, P., Simonoff, E., Singer, A. T., Slonims, V., Wang, P. P., Ysrraelit, M. C., Jellett, R., Pickles, A., Cusack, J., Howlin, P., Szatmari, P., Holbrook, A., Toolan, C., & McCauley, J. B. (2022). The Lancet Commission on the future of care and clinical research in autism. The Lancet, 399(10321), 271–334. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)01541-5

Motamed, M., Hajikarim-Hamedani, A., Fakhrian, A., & Alaghband-Rad, J. (2025). A systematic review of sexual health, knowledge, and behavior in autism spectrum disorder. BMC Psychiatry, 25, 410. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-025-06836-x

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. (2021). Autism spectrum disorder in adults: Diagnosis and management (CG142). https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg142

Płatos, M., Wojaczek, K., & Laugeson, E. A. (2024). Fostering friendship and dating skills among adults on the autism spectrum: A randomized controlled trial of the Polish version of the PEERS for Young Adults curriculum. Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders, 54(6), 2224–2239. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-023-05921-y

Sasson, N. J., Faso, D. J., Nugent, J., Lovell, S., Kennedy, D. P., & Grossman, R. B. (2017). Neurotypical peers are less willing to interact with those with autism based on thin slice judgments. Scientific Reports, 7, 40700. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep40700

Sasson, N. J., & Morrison, K. E. (2019). First impressions of adults with autism improve with diagnostic disclosure and increased autism knowledge of peers. Autism, 23(1), 50–59. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362361317729526

Smith, R., Netto, J., Gribble, N. C., & Falkmer, M. (2021). 'At the end of the day, it's love': An exploration of relationships in neurodiverse couples. Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders, 51(9), 3311–3321. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-020-04790-z

Strunz, S., Schermuck, C., Ballerstein, S., Ahlers, C. J., Dziobek, I., & Roepke, S. (2017). Romantic relationships and relationship satisfaction among adults with Asperger syndrome and high-functioning autism. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 73(1), 113–125. https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.22319

Wolfe, K., Pound, S., McCammon, M. N., Chezan, L. C., & Drasgow, E. (2019). A systematic review of interventions to promote varied social-communication behavior in individuals with autism spectrum disorder. Behavior Modification, 43(6), 790–818. https://doi.org/10.1177/0145445519859803

Zhuang, S., Tan, D. W., Reddrop, S., Dean, L., Maybery, M., & Magiati, I. (2023). Psychosocial factors associated with camouflaging in autistic people and its relationship with mental health and well-being: A mixed methods systematic review. Clinical Psychology Review, 105, 102335. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2023.102335