Journal of Psychiatry
Psychotherapy & Communication

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). From Self-Monitoring to Connection: Communication and Dating in Social Anxiety. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Mar 31;14(1):21-30



Christian Jonathan Haverkampf

# From Self-Monitoring to Connection: Communication and Dating in Social Anxiety

*Narrative Clinical Review*

**Abstract—**Social anxiety can make communication feel like a performance conducted under observation. Attention turns inward, ordinary uncertainty is read as evidence of failure, and protective behaviors reduce the very reciprocity on which conversation and dating depend. This narrative clinical review considers evidence available through 28 February 2025 and translates cognitive-behavioral and interpersonal findings into a practical account of communication change. The central aim is not polished social performance. It is greater freedom to notice another person, express a view, ask directly, tolerate an imperfect response, and repair misunderstanding. Assessment should distinguish anxiety-driven inhibition from differences in communication style, skill, preference, culture, neurodevelopment, trauma, depression, and actual interpersonal danger. Treatment can then combine attention training, behavioral experiments, graduated exposure, role-play, video feedback, assertiveness, and post-event processing work. Dating is approached as a sequence of consent-based decisions, not a test of personal worth. Evidence supports psychotherapy for social anxiety, although relationship initiation, dating outcomes, and durable participation remain less studied than symptom reduction. Progress is best judged by valued action, reciprocity, clarity, and recovery from awkward moments alongside established symptom measures. A humane intervention helps a person become more available for contact without demanding charm, constant disclosure, or a socially approved personality.

**Index Terms—**social anxiety disorder, interpersonal communication, dating, behavioral experiments, self-focused attention, relationship participation

## I. INTRODUCTION

Conversation can become unusually hard when part of the mind is talking and another part is grading the performance. The person tries to follow what is being said while monitoring eye contact, facial color, pauses, posture, voice, and the possibility that an ordinary hesitation has exposed something unacceptable. Dating concentrates these pressures. Interest matters, intentions are uncertain, and a reply may arrive later or not at all. The understandable wish to avoid embarrassment can make communication careful, brief, indirect, or absent.

Social anxiety is not simply shyness and it is not a shortage of topics. Cognitive models describe a shift toward self-focused attention, threatening images of how one appears, overestimation of social cost, and safety behaviors intended to prevent rejection (Rapee & Heimberg, 1997; Clark et al., 2006; Hofmann, 2007). These processes consume working attention and reduce access to the information that could correct a feared prediction. A quiet response is interpreted through the feared image, and its meaning in the relationship goes unexamined.

Interpersonal consequences can then maintain the anxiety. Guardedness may be read as disinterest; rehearsed speech can feel less spontaneous; limited disclosure gives the other person little to respond to; repeated reassurance seeking can exhaust both people. None of this means that the anxious person causes every difficult encounter. Rejection, incompatibility, prejudice, poor behavior, and unsafe relationships are real. The clinical task is to separate avoidable protective habits from reasonable judgment and from the other person's contribution.

This review is a practical companion to broader work on social anxiety and dating. Its focus is the communication process: how to become more available to another person without turning treatment into etiquette instruction or personality correction. The aim is flexible participation—speaking, listening, asking, declining, repairing, and choosing. No extroverted ideal is imposed.

## II. SCOPE AND REVIEW METHOD

For this narrative clinical review, the literature search closed on 28 February 2025, exactly one calendar month before the nominal issue date. It prioritized systematic reviews, meta-analyses, randomized trials, established cognitive models, official guidance, and studies that addressed interpersonal functioning, close relationships, disclosure, feedback, or behavior during interaction. Complete online-first

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). From Self-Monitoring to Connection: Communication and Dating in Social Anxiety. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Mar 31;14(1):21-30

publications were eligible when available by that date. No new meta-analysis was undertaken.

The evidence base is asymmetric. Psychotherapy for social anxiety disorder has been studied extensively, whereas dating initiation, mutual relationship quality, and communication outside the clinic have received much less direct attention. A scoping review found recurring themes involving communication, conflict, disclosure, support, intimacy, and relationship quality, but also noted how little work examines the beginning of relationships (Casey et al., 2023). Clinical recommendations below are therefore marked by the strength and directness of their support.

The review concerns adults and does not assume that every communication difficulty is caused by social anxiety. Differential formulation may need to consider autism, attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder, language and hearing differences, trauma, depression, obsessive concerns, substance use, cultural expectations, sexual or gender minority stress, and limited opportunity for safe practice. Communication also occurs between people. An intervention that treats the patient as the only variable will miss context, power, compatibility, and harm.

The term dating is used broadly for consensual attempts to explore romantic or intimate compatibility, including online contact and relationships that do not follow conventional scripts. The intervention principles are applicable across orientations and relationship structures, but the literature has not represented them evenly. Preferences about disclosure, eye contact, messaging, physical affection, monogamy, and pace require conversation; there is no preset formula.

Unless otherwise stated, all tables and boxed frameworks in this article are author-developed clinical syntheses intended to organize assessment and discussion; they are not validated instruments or substitutes for clinical judgment.

## III. COMMUNICATION UNDER SOCIAL THREAT

In the Rapee–Heimberg model, the person constructs a mental representation of how they appear to an audience and compares it with an assumed standard. Internal sensations and fragments of external behavior are recruited as evidence for that representation (Rapee & Heimberg, 1997). Clark and Wells-derived treatment similarly targets self-focused attention, negative self-imagery, safety behaviors, and biased pre- and post-event processing. Individual cognitive therapy has shown substantial benefit in randomized work, including comparison with medication-based management (Clark et al., 2006; Stangier et al., 2011).

The communication effect is easy to overlook. Attention that is occupied with monitoring cannot fully track the other person's words, timing, expression, and changing meaning. A delayed answer may follow not from lack of interest but from internal checking. The person may then notice the delay, treat it as evidence of incompetence, and increase monitoring. What looks like deficient skill can be a temporary loss of access to skills under threat.

Safety behaviors are equally interpersonal. Speaking softly, avoiding a personal view, overpreparing a message, laughing automatically, filling every silence, drinking before a date, asking repeated questions without sharing, or never initiating can reduce immediate anxiety. They also prevent learning. If an interaction goes reasonably well, success is credited to the precaution; if it goes poorly, the feared self-explanation survives. Some precautions, however, are ordinary safety or courtesy. The test is not whether a behavior reduces anxiety but what function it serves and what it costs.

Alden and Taylor's interpersonal account adds an important loop: expectations of rejection can shape behavior in ways that limit positive responses and confirm the original expectation (Alden & Taylor, 2004). Later experimental work showed that interpersonal processes are plausible targets of treatment, not merely consequences that must wait for symptom reduction (Alden & Taylor, 2011). Formulation should therefore connect private prediction, visible behavior, the partner's likely experience, and the meaning assigned afterward.

***Table 1. Turning a communication episode into a testable formulation***

| Moment | Threat prediction | Protective response | More informative experiment |
|---|---|---|---|
| Beginning a conversation | I will have nothing worth saying | Wait for certainty; use a rehearsed opener | Use one simple observation or question, then attend to the reply |
| A pause | They can see I am awkward | Fill it rapidly or apologize | Allow several seconds and notice what each person does next |
| Expressing interest | Directness will humiliate me | Hint repeatedly; seek reassurance | Make one respectful invitation that permits an easy no |
| Disagreement | Any difference will end the relationship | Agree, withdraw, or overexplain | State one view, ask theirs, and observe whether repair is possible |
| After contact | The awkward detail proves rejection | Replay, check messages, interrogate friends | Record facts, alternatives, valued action, and the next useful step |

## IV. ASSESSMENT: FROM GLOBAL DEFECT TO SPECIFIC PROCESS

The statement “I cannot communicate” is too global to guide treatment. Assessment should locate the difficulty in time. Is it initiating, sustaining, disclosing, reading ambiguity, expressing disagreement, ending a conversation, inviting another meeting, responding to a message, or recovering afterward? Does the difficulty occur with strangers, authority

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). From Self-Monitoring to Connection: Communication and Dating in Social Anxiety. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Mar 31;14(1):21-30

figures, friends, desired partners, established partners, or everyone? A narrow description often reveals abilities that the global verdict concealed.

A useful event review begins with what actually happened before moving to interpretation. The clinician asks what was said, what could be observed, where attention went, what image or prediction appeared, what the person did to protect themselves, how the other person responded, and what happened next. Fact and inference are distinguished collaboratively, without a prosecutorial tone. “They looked away twice” is an observation; “they were bored by me” is one hypothesis among several.

Communication goals should belong to the patient. One person wants to begin dating, another to tolerate dates without alcohol, another to speak more honestly within a relationship, and another to decide that dating is not currently a priority. Frequency is not the same as quality. A person may choose a small social world and still want more freedom within it. Therapy is not successful because a clinician can count more events if those events are unwanted or depleting.

Actual deficits and contextual barriers deserve direct attention. Limited conversational practice, inaccessible settings, harassment, poverty, caregiving, racism, disability, or minority stress cannot be reformulated away. Likewise, coercive or contemptuous partners should not become exposure exercises. The formulation asks which part of the difficulty is anxiety-maintained, which part calls for learning or accommodation, and which part calls for protection, exit, or social change.

Cultural formulation is essential because directness, gaze, silence, emotional expression, courtship, family involvement, and disclosure do not carry the same meanings everywhere. A clinician who mistakes their own local style for neutral competence can turn difference into pathology. The patient can examine whether fear is narrowing their choices within the communities that matter to them, while also deciding when crossing a cultural boundary is desired, necessary, or not worth the cost.

The assessment setting can conceal as much as it reveals. A structured interview supplies topics, turn-taking, and a partner whose role is to keep the conversation going. Someone who speaks fluently there may struggle with peer ambiguity; someone who is terse with a clinician may be warm with trusted people. Examples should therefore come from several settings, and any conclusion about skill should be tested against anxiety level, familiarity, power, and opportunity.

## V. MOVING ATTENTION TOWARD CONTACT

Attention training is not a command to stop feeling anxious. It is practice in choosing where limited attention goes while anxiety is present. Early exercises can use neutral tasks: summarizing a short story, noticing three features of a room, or tracking the content of a recorded conversation. The clinician then introduces live interaction and asks for concrete recall of what the other person said, not a rating of personal performance.

During conversation, an external task needs to be meaningful enough to compete with monitoring. Listening for one point of agreement and one genuine difference is more useful than staring at eye color. Noticing whether an answer opens or closes a topic is more useful than trying to maintain prescribed eye contact. Eye contact norms vary, and forced gaze can itself increase self-consciousness. The target is responsive attention, not a visual quota.

Afterward, the person compares the predicted catastrophe with observable outcomes. If the prediction was “My mind will go blank and they will leave,” the record notes whether a blank occurred, its duration, how the person responded, and whether the other person left. Partial disconfirmation matters. The person may have paused and still continued. That result is more clinically useful than the vague reassurance that everything was fine.

Video feedback can help when mental imagery is markedly distorted. Controlled studies and clinical trials suggest that viewing behavior after predictions are made can correct negative self-impressions and improve treatment processes (Smits et al., 2006; Wild et al., 2023). The recording should be brief, consensual, securely handled, and reviewed against specific predictions. Repeated scrutiny for attractiveness or minor movements can become another checking ritual and should not be presented as therapeutic observation.

Memory review can provide a lower-technology form of attentional retraining. Immediately after a short conversation, the patient records three things the other person communicated and one point whose meaning remains genuinely uncertain. This exposes whether attention was available for contact and discourages a review made entirely from the observer image. Over time, richer recall is evidence that attention can move outward even before anxiety falls.

Moving attention outward does not create certainty about another mind. Facial expressions are ambiguous, politeness varies, and attraction is rarely readable from one cue. The patient learns to gather broader information and ask when appropriate, not to replace negative mind reading with confident positive mind reading. This distinction protects against disappointment and keeps curiosity alive: a response can be encouraging, discouraging, or simply insufficient to decide.

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). From Self-Monitoring to Connection: Communication and Dating in Social Anxiety. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Mar 31;14(1):21-30

## VI. BEHAVIORAL EXPERIMENTS WITHOUT SOCIAL THEATRE

A behavioral experiment asks a question. Exposure that is described only as staying until anxiety falls can miss the belief that gives an interaction meaning. The question might be whether a pause reliably makes others leave, whether disagreement always causes anger, or whether one can survive a declined invitation without weeks of collapse. The task is designed to generate information while remaining ethical and ordinary enough to generalize.

Dropping safety behaviors works best one behavior at a time. A person who normally scripts every sentence might prepare only the first line. Someone who asks questions continuously might offer one related fact or opinion before the next question. Someone who conceals all nervousness might allow a small, non-apologetic acknowledgment: “I am a little nervous; I am glad we met.” The experiment is not a demand for maximal disclosure. It tests whether less concealment permits more reciprocal contact.

Virtual reality and simulated interaction can broaden practice, especially where live opportunities are scarce. A small randomized study combining virtual exposure with cognitive and biofeedback elements reported benefit, but it does not establish that technology is necessary or superior for all patients (Premkumar et al., 2024). Simulation is most useful as a bridge to valued situations, not a parallel world in which the patient becomes highly skilled while real invitations remain indefinitely postponed.

Experiments should never recruit another person as an unwitting instrument for provocative behavior. The patient can practice being clearer, warmer, more direct, or more tolerant of uncertainty without violating boundaries. Deliberately arriving very late, pressing after a refusal, or manufacturing jealousy would test the other person's tolerance; it would not answer the patient's feared prediction. The ethical constraint improves the experiment by keeping the learning relevant to sustainable relationships.

Real partners are not standardized examiners, and an experiment can yield an unfavorable result without being a failure. A person may speak clearly and still meet indifference, incompatibility, or rudeness. Review asks whether the feared process occurred, whether the patient's action was congruent with their values, and what the response reveals about this relationship. Effective communication improves the quality of information available; it does not control another person's character or interest.

**A communication experiment in six lines**

- Situation: name one bounded interaction, person, and time.
- Prediction: state what is expected to happen and how strongly it is believed.
- Protection to vary: choose one safety behavior that obscures the result.
- Valued action: define what the person will say or do, including respect for consent.
- Observation: record visible and audible events before interpreting them.
- Learning: include mixed evidence and decide what the next experiment should refine.

## VII. OPENING AND SUSTAINING CONVERSATION

Conversation is easier to practice when it is understood as coordination, not display. An opening only needs to make response possible. Shared context, a practical question, a modest observation, or a reference to something already discussed will usually do more work than an ingenious line. In dating, a specific comment linked to the person's profile is generally clearer than generic praise. The response then supplies information about whether and how to continue.

Sustaining contact involves a rhythm of asking, responding, and contributing. Question-only conversation may feel safe because attention stays away from the self, but it can resemble an interview and deny the other person a route toward mutual knowledge. Disclosure-only conversation can leave little space for response. A simple practice is to follow an answer with one sentence that connects to it, then notice whether the other person takes up that thread.

Disclosure becomes intimate through responsiveness, not volume alone. Experimental and meta-analytic work links appropriate self-disclosure with liking, although direction and context matter (Collins & Miller, 1994). In established relationships, responsive reactions to positive disclosures are associated with well-being and relationship quality (Gable et al., 2004). The useful clinical question is not “How much should I reveal?” but “What degree of mutual knowledge is appropriate at this point, with this person, and what happens when either of us responds?”

Prepared phrases can reduce cognitive load without becoming a mask. Examples include “I need a moment to think,” “I do not know much about that—what interests you about it?”, and “I enjoyed tonight; would you like to meet again?” Practice should include variations so that the phrase remains a usable tool, not a test of perfect recall. If the conversation departs from the script, that departure becomes material for flexibility and does not prove failure.

Humor and spontaneity cannot be prescribed safely as techniques. A rehearsed joke can increase monitoring, and advice to “be playful” offers no usable action. The clinician can instead help the patient notice what they genuinely find amusing and whether they permit that response to be visible. Warmth may appear in curiosity, steadiness, shared attention,

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). From Self-Monitoring to Connection: Communication and Dating in Social Anxiety. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Mar 31;14(1):21-30

or a quiet smile. Communication becomes more natural when it is allowed to use the person's own range.

## VIII. ASSERTIVENESS, BOUNDARIES, AND REPAIR

Social anxiety often narrows communication toward compliance or disappearance. Assertiveness is a middle position in which a person makes their perspective available while recognizing the other's freedom. A workable statement identifies the situation, gives the speaker's view or feeling, makes a specific request where needed, and leaves room for an answer. It does not guarantee agreement and does not require a courtroom case for every preference.

Boundaries are especially important in dating because fear of negative evaluation can make refusal feel dangerous. Treatment should include saying no, slowing the pace, leaving, and asking for clarification. Consent is active, specific, and revisable; anxiety about disappointing someone does not turn acquiescence into desire. A patient who can initiate but cannot decline has not gained full interpersonal freedom.

Misunderstanding is not evidence that communication has failed. Repair can be brief: “I think that came out differently from how I meant it,” “Can I check what you heard?”, or “I was quiet because I was anxious, not because I was uninterested.” An apology is appropriate when harm occurred; automatic apologizing for existing, pausing, or having a preference is not. The aim is proportionate responsibility.

Assertiveness also includes receiving another person's preference without converting it into a verdict. A partner can dislike a venue, need more time, or decline physical contact while remaining interested in the relationship. Conversely, politeness does not necessarily signal romantic interest. Treatment helps the patient ask when clarification is appropriate and tolerate the limits of clarification when the other person is undecided or does not wish to explain.

Conflict needs the same two-person frame. Research on social anxiety and close relationships associates anxiety with lower perceived support, difficulties with intimacy, and maladaptive interaction patterns, but findings do not establish that the socially anxious partner is always the source of strain (Davila & Beck, 2002; Porter & Chambless, 2014). Couple work, individual work, or both may be indicated when reciprocal cycles have become established.

## IX. DATING AS A SEQUENCE OF DECISIONS

The word date can collapse many different tasks into one threatening event. In practice, dating consists of stages: deciding whether to make oneself available, noticing possible interest, beginning contact, exchanging enough information to assess basic compatibility, proposing a meeting, negotiating place and pace, responding to attraction or its absence, and deciding whether to continue. A person may need practice at one stage and not another.

This sequence shifts the criterion from being chosen to making mutual decisions. The patient is not only an applicant. They are also learning whether they feel safe, respected, interested, and able to be themselves with the other person. That stance counters the assumption that any acceptance must be preserved at all costs. It also makes rejection less global: one person has declined one possibility under conditions that may remain partly unknown.

Behavioral goals should be under the patient's control. “Ask one person whether they would like coffee” is actionable; “get a second date” depends on someone else. A graded plan can begin with maintaining an accurate profile, sending a message related to shared content, making one clear invitation, or attending a time-limited meeting. Personally relevant predictions determine difficulty; a clinician's idea of what ought to be easy does not.

The modern abundance of apparent alternatives can increase evaluative pressure and encourage rapid dismissal. Online dating research has described how choice architecture changes courtship, but platform-level findings do not tell an individual whom to choose (Finkel et al., 2012). One illustrative, author-developed plan—not a validated protocol—is to set boundaries around use: a realistic period for browsing, a small number of thoughtful messages, movement toward a safe live or video meeting when appropriate, and permission to stop when use becomes compulsive or demoralizing.

Messaging also delays feedback and removes many contextual cues. Social anxiety can fill that gap with adverse explanations, while the ease of editing can turn one sentence into a prolonged performance. A useful plan distinguishes an ordinary reread from repeated reconstruction, identifies when a direct question would be appropriate, and accepts that no wording can secure a desired answer. The goal is a message that represents the person accurately enough for the next decision.

Dating occurs within social identities that affect both opportunity and danger. Sexual and gender minority people may need to assess disclosure, community visibility, and prejudice; disabled people may need to negotiate access and assumptions; racialized patients may encounter stereotypes that a therapist does not share. Anxiety treatment should widen action where fear has overgeneralized while remaining credible about discrimination. Exposure is not a request to ignore evidence or educate every potential partner.

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). From Self-Monitoring to Connection: Communication and Dating in Social Anxiety. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Mar 31;14(1):21-30

***Table 2. Communication tasks across a dating sequence***

| Stage | Useful communication | Common anxiety trap | Practice target |
|---|---|---|---|
| Profile or introduction | Accurate, selective self-description | Trying to prevent every possible dislike | Write for fit, not universal approval |
| Early messages | Respond to content and offer content | Endless editing or generic questioning | Send one clear, respectful message within a set time |
| Invitation | Specific proposal with an easy route to decline | Hinting, repeated checking, or never asking | Make one invitation and accept the answer |
| First meetings | Curiosity, contribution, boundaries, and pacing | Continuous self-rating | Track compatibility and the other person's actual responses |
| Continuation or ending | Direct interest, uncertainty, or respectful closure | Ghosting to avoid discomfort or pursuing reassurance | Use a brief honest message when contact has been established |

## X. INVITATION, REJECTION, AND UNCERTAINTY

A good invitation is clear enough to answer and modest enough to decline. “Would you like to have coffee after the seminar next week?” communicates more effectively than a long confession or a series of hints. The person's fear may remain high because clarity makes the possibility of refusal real. That is precisely why the practice concerns both expression and response tolerance.

Rejection can hurt without proving defect. The clinician should not rush to make it painless or insist that it means nothing. It means that this invitation or relationship will not continue in the hoped-for form. What it does not reveal is a complete account of the other person's reasons or a universal judgment by future partners. Grief, embarrassment, disappointment, and resumed valued action can coexist.

Ambiguous nonresponse is often harder than a direct no. Repeated checking, consulting multiple friends, or sending escalating messages promises certainty but usually prolongs activation. An illustrative, adaptable default is one invitation, perhaps one ordinary follow-up where context and safety warrant it, and then no further pursuit without reciprocal contact; this is not a validated universal rule. This is both an anxiety intervention and respect for the other person's autonomy.

Ending contact calls for judgment about relationship stage and safety. After an established exchange, a brief direct message can reduce unnecessary ambiguity: “Thank you for meeting; I do not think we are the right match.” A person is not required to debate the decision or continue contact that feels unsafe. Therapy can distinguish avoidance of ordinary discomfort from a protective decision to disengage, and it should never make access to the patient a reward for another person's persistence.

Romantic desire does not suspend ordinary safety. Early meetings may be held in public, travel and alcohol considered, and a trusted person informed if the patient wishes. These are not pathological safety behaviors merely because they reduce risk. The distinction is functional and proportionate: sensible precautions address plausible danger while rituals seek impossible protection from all discomfort, judgment, or uncertainty.

## XI. ROLE-PLAY, FEEDBACK, AND REAL-WORLD PRACTICE

Role-play is most useful when it is anchored in a real upcoming situation and followed by descriptive feedback. The clinician can first reproduce the patient's usual protective style, then vary one element such as volume, contribution, directness, or tolerance of silence. Feedback begins with what was observable and what effect it had on comprehension. Global praise may feel kind but offers little that can be tested outside the room.

Feedback should not smuggle cultural conformity into treatment. Warmth can be conveyed through words, timing, facial expression, action, or explicit explanation; it does not require one prescribed gaze or gesture. A clinician's preference for animation, small talk, or rapid response may not be the patient's goal. The standard is whether communication is understandable, consensual, and sufficiently reciprocal for the relationship the person wants.

Video-assisted work benefits from prediction before playback. The patient records how flushed, inaudible, trembling, boring, or hostile they expect to appear, and then watches once with the clinician while describing the whole interaction. Selected replays can address a specific discrepancy. The exercise stops if it becomes compulsive appearance checking. Recent work continues to support video feedback within cognitive therapy, although the evidence concerns social anxiety treatment more directly than dating outcomes (Wild et al., 2023).

Between-session practice should be frequent enough to build memory and small enough to be repeatable. One substantial date is not the only unit. Sending a timely message, expressing a preference to a friend, asking a colleague a follow-up question, or allowing a pause can each train the same process. Variation across people and settings helps prevent the learning from becoming tied to a single rehearsed encounter.

Supportive feedback and reassurance are not the same. Feedback describes an observable moment, offers one person's experience, and leaves room for difference. Reassurance tries to settle an unknowable global question such as whether everyone found the patient attractive or competent. Friends and group members can be invited to give specific feedback

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). From Self-Monitoring to Connection: Communication and Dating in Social Anxiety. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Mar 31;14(1):21-30

without becoming a panel that certifies social acceptability. The patient remains responsible for deciding which feedback is relevant.

***Table 3. Feedback that supports learning without increasing performance anxiety***

| Feedback focus | Helpful form | Less helpful form |
|---|---|---|
| Observability | Your final sentence was quiet and I asked you to repeat it | You were awkward |
| Prediction | You expected a 20-second silence; it lasted about 3 seconds | See, there was nothing to fear |
| Reciprocity | When you shared your view, I had something personal to answer | Talk about yourself more |
| Choice | Which degree of directness felt both honest and respectful? | This is the correct way to flirt |
| Next step | Repeat the invitation once without the apologetic preface | Be confident next time |

## XII. POST-EVENT PROCESSING AND DIGITAL REASSURANCE

The interaction may end while the internal audience continues. Post-event processing selects awkward fragments, replays them from an observer perspective, and treats feelings as proof. Experimental and clinical research identifies this process as a contributor to persistence (Cuming & Rapee, 2010). Dating technologies add material: message timestamps, read receipts, profile changes, and the possibility of rereading every sentence.

A structured review is preferable to forced positive thinking. The patient records the feared prediction, observable facts, evidence for and against the most threatening interpretation, safety behaviors used, what mattered to them, and what they would do differently. The review is time-limited. When no new evidence is being generated, continued analysis is named as repetition, not problem solving.

Reassurance can also become distributed across friends, online forums, and the therapist. Asking one trusted person for perspective may be reasonable; repeatedly polling others until uncertainty disappears is unlikely to work. The clinician can answer the process instead of the unknowable question: “I cannot know why they have not replied. I can help you decide what respectful action fits your values while that uncertainty remains.”

Compassion matters here because rumination often attacks a real human wish for belonging. The patient is not corrected for caring. They are helped to notice that the mental review has stopped serving contact and is now consuming it. Returning attention to sleep, work, friendship, movement, or another valued activity is not denial; it is a decision not to let one ambiguous encounter occupy the whole field.

## XIII. ESTABLISHED RELATIONSHIPS

Social anxiety does not end when dating becomes a relationship. Fear of burdening the partner can lead to hidden needs, avoidance of social events, difficulty introducing the partner to others, reluctance to discuss sex, and delayed conflict. The partner may respond by taking over, guessing, reassuring, criticizing, or withdrawing. These responses can become part of a cycle even when each person is trying to protect the relationship.

Relationship studies associate social anxiety with lower intimacy and poorer relationship functioning, while daily-process work suggests that felt security and responsiveness vary within people and interactions (Bar-Kalifa et al., 2015; Kashdan et al., 2007). Positive emotion and intimacy may also be constrained by avoidance and inhibited expression (Kashdan et al., 2013). These are group findings, not a portrait of every couple. They justify asking about the relationship instead of assuming that symptom change automatically repairs it.

A communication plan can externalize the cycle. One partner says what tends to trigger anxiety, what protective behavior follows, and what support is actually helpful. The other describes the impact without diagnosing motive. They agree on a small alternative, such as stating when a pause is needed instead of disappearing, or offering encouragement once without repeated reassurance. The aim is collaboration, not recruitment of the partner as therapist.

Where conflict is entrenched, couple assessment may be useful. It should include coercion and safety, because conjoint disclosure can be dangerous in an abusive relationship. When the relationship is basically safe, joint work can clarify misread signals and support experiments in directness, appreciation, disagreement, and repair. Individual social-anxiety treatment and couple work answer related but nonidentical questions.

Sexual communication may carry a particularly high fear of evaluation. The person may avoid naming desire, uncertainty, pain, contraception, preferred touch, or a wish to stop. Treatment can rehearse specific language and examine feared consequences, but consent stays primary: exposure is never a reason to continue unwanted intimacy. A partner's disappointment can be tolerated; pressure, retaliation, or disregard for a boundary requires a safety response.

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). From Self-Monitoring to Connection: Communication and Dating in Social Anxiety. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Mar 31;14(1):21-30

## XIV. THE THERAPEUTIC RELATIONSHIP AS COMMUNICATION PRACTICE

The therapy room is a live social setting, but it is not automatically a fair test of communication elsewhere. Roles are defined, the clinician is paid to remain interested, and the topic is the patient. Even so, moments of hesitation, agreement, disagreement, reassurance seeking, and misunderstood intent can be examined with unusual care. The clinician asks permission to slow the exchange and treats what happens between them as information, not a demonstration that the formulation was correct.

Therapist behavior can unintentionally maintain the problem. Filling every pause confirms that silence must be rescued. Offering repeated reassurance teaches the patient to return uncertainty to the clinician. Praising every contribution as brave can make ordinary speech feel hazardous. A more useful response is warm and proportionate: allow the pause, answer a reasonable question once, notice what the patient did, and remain genuinely open to being affected by the conversation.

Feedback works in both directions. The patient may practice saying that a question felt vague, an interpretation felt too certain, or the pace made thinking difficult. The therapist models receiving that information without defensiveness and clarifies their intention while taking responsibility for impact. This is not a contrived social-skills exercise. It is a real repair in a relationship with unequal roles, and it can supply a credible memory that direct communication does not inevitably end contact.

Boundaries make the practice transferable. The clinician does not simulate romance, encourage personal dependence, or offer disclosure that serves the therapist's needs. Role-plays are named and time-limited; recordings require specific consent; between-session contact follows agreed rules. Within that frame, the patient can try a clearer request, tolerate a different view, or return after embarrassment. The clinical relationship supports experimentation precisely because its purpose and limits are explicit.

Group treatment adds useful complexity when it is well facilitated. Members can compare predictions, offer descriptive feedback, and discover that a pause or visible anxiety does not have one universal meaning. The group must not become a popularity contest or an audience for coerced disclosure. Clear norms, attention to inclusion, and opportunities to pass protect the setting's clinical purpose while allowing real reciprocity to develop.

## XV. TREATMENT EVIDENCE AND ITS LIMITS

Psychological treatment for social anxiety disorder is supported by a substantial randomized literature. Network meta-analysis has found several psychological interventions effective, with individual cognitive-behavioral approaches among the better-supported options, and clinical guidance recommends disorder-specific individual CBT as a principal treatment choice (Mayo-Wilson et al., 2014; National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, 2013). These conclusions concern disorder outcomes more directly than communication competence or dating success.

A 2024 systematic review of 66 randomized trials involving 5,560 participants found a large pooled psychotherapy effect while also reporting substantial heterogeneity and risk-of-bias concerns (de Ponti et al., 2024). The size should therefore not be treated as a guaranteed benefit for a particular patient. Absolute outcomes across mental disorders likewise remind clinicians that relative efficacy can coexist with nonresponse and the need for a next step (Cuijpers, Miguel, Ciharova, et al., 2024).

Mechanism research supports attention, safety behavior, imagery, and interpersonal processes, but mediation is difficult to establish conclusively. Changes can occur together, measures overlap, and temporal order is not always clear. A recent review of vulnerabilities in social anxiety reinforces the relevance of cognitive, emotional, interpersonal, and contextual factors without reducing the disorder to one universal pathway (Ginat-Frolich et al., 2024). Formulation should be evidence-informed and revisable.

Dating-specific evidence is thinner. Social-anxiety research has often measured symptoms, general impairment, or established relationship quality; invitations, consensual communication, sustained participation, and recovery after rejection are rarely primary outcomes. It is reasonable to adapt established treatment processes to these goals, but the adaptation should be described honestly. The clinician is applying supported principles to an undermeasured outcome, not claiming that every practical step has its own trial.

Access affects what effectiveness means. Individual disorder-specific therapy may be difficult to obtain, and group, guided digital, brief, or generalist care may be the available route. The clinician should preserve core processes—testable predictions, attention, safety behavior, behavioral learning, and review—even when the format changes. Preference, privacy, language, technology, cost, and the availability of suitable real-world practice can determine whether an efficacious intervention becomes usable care.

## XVI. MEASURING CHANGE AND DECIDING WHAT COMES NEXT

A validated disorder-specific symptom measure can track severity, but it should sit beside individualized participation goals. A brief weekly record might include one valued communication action, degree of self-focused attention, one safety behavior, recovery time after interaction, and whether

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). From Self-Monitoring to Connection: Communication and Dating in Social Anxiety. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Mar 31;14(1):21-30

the person acted clearly and respectfully. Outcome measurement should not create another performance score.

Success may first appear as willingness, before comfort arrives: sending a message without an hour of editing, expressing a different opinion, remaining present after a pause, or accepting a no without further pursuit. Anxiety may fluctuate as the person enters situations previously avoided. The clinician looks for broader behavioral freedom and more accurate learning, not uninterrupted calm.

When progress is limited, inquiry is more useful than exhortation. Was the formulation correct? Were exercises too large, too rare, or still protected by subtle rituals? Is depression reducing energy, trauma changing the meaning of vulnerability, alcohol doing the exposure, or an unrecognized communication difference making the task inaccessible? Is the environment rejecting or unsafe? Treatment can be intensified, adapted, combined, or changed without construing nonresponse as lack of courage.

Relapse planning identifies early signs such as renewed rehearsal, cancellation, reassurance seeking, or prolonged review. The plan names small restoring actions and people who can support them. It also protects choice. A person who decides not to date for a period has not relapsed merely because the behavior count falls. The relevant question is whether anxiety has again taken decision-making away.

Maintenance should include variation. A person who can speak freely with one therapist or one accepting partner may still be constrained elsewhere, while competence across many brief contacts does not prove intimacy is easy. Follow-up samples different relationship tasks and levels of personal importance. It also notices gains that symptom scores may miss, such as shorter recovery after awkwardness, clearer selection of partners, and earlier exit from a poor fit.

## XVII. CONCLUSION

Interpersonal communication in social anxiety improves when treatment stops treating conversation as a performance and begins treating it as contact under uncertainty. Self-focused attention, threatening imagery, safety behaviors, indirectness, and post-event processing can all reduce the information and reciprocity available in an encounter. They are understandable protections, not character defects, and they can be tested in specific, respectful ways.

Dating makes the work vivid because hopes and risks are real. A humane approach does not promise immunity from awkwardness or rejection. It helps the person make clear invitations, listen for an actual response, contribute enough to be known, set boundaries, tolerate a no, and decide whether the other person is a good fit. Consent and safety are part of skilled communication, not qualifications added afterward.

The evidence supports psychotherapy for social anxiety more strongly than it supports any particular dating protocol. That distinction should remain visible. Clinicians can combine established cognitive-behavioral methods, interpersonal formulation, feedback, and graded real-world practice while measuring the outcomes the patient values. The goal is neither flawless delivery nor universal approval. The aim is sufficient freedom to meet another person and decide whether to pursue a relationship without allowing fear to make that decision in advance.

## 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

Alden, L. E., & Taylor, C. T. (2004). Interpersonal processes in social phobia. Clinical Psychology Review, 24(7), 857–882. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2004.07.006

Alden, L. E., & Taylor, C. T. (2011). Relational treatment strategies increase social approach behaviors in patients with generalized social anxiety disorder. Journal of Anxiety Disorders, 25(3), 309–318. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2010.10.003

Bar-Kalifa, E., Hen-Weissberg, A., & Rafaeli, E. (2015). Perceived partner responsiveness mediates the association between social anxiety and relationship satisfaction in committed couples. Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 34(7), 587–610. https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2015.34.7.587

Casey, K., King, R., Banner, J., & Fuller-Tyszkiewicz, M. (2023). Romantic relationship quality and functioning for individuals with clinical and sub-clinical social anxiety: A scoping review. Journal of Mental Health, 32(3), 670–698. https://doi.org/10.1080/09638237.2022.2091755

Clark, D. M., Ehlers, A., Hackmann, A., McManus, F., Fennell, M., Grey, N., Waddington, L., & Wild, J. (2006). Cognitive therapy versus exposure and applied relaxation in social phobia: A randomized controlled trial. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 74(3), 568–578. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.74.3.568

Collins, N. L., & Miller, L. C. (1994). Self-disclosure and liking: A meta-analytic review. Psychological Bulletin, 116(3), 457–475. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.116.3.457

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). From Self-Monitoring to Connection: Communication and Dating in Social Anxiety. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Mar 31;14(1):21-30

Cuijpers, P., Miguel, C., Ciharova, M., Harrer, M., Basic, D., Cristea, I. A., de Ponti, N., Driessen, E., Hamblen, J., Larsen, S. E., Matbouriahi, M., Papola, D., Pauley, D., Plessen, C. Y., Pfund, R. A., Setkowski, K., Schnurr, P. P., van Ballegooijen, W., Wang, Y., Riper, H., van Straten, A., Sijbrandij, M., Furukawa, T. A., & Karyotaki, E. (2024). Absolute and relative outcomes of psychotherapies for eight mental disorders: A systematic review and meta-analysis. World Psychiatry, 23(2), 267–275. https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.21203

Cuming, S., & Rapee, R. M. (2010). Social anxiety and self-protective communication style in close relationships. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 48(2), 87–96. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2009.09.010

Davila, J., & Beck, J. G. (2002). Is social anxiety associated with impairment in close relationships? A preliminary investigation. Behavior Therapy, 33(3), 427–446. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0005-7894(02)80037-5

de Ponti, N., Matbouriahi, M., Franco, P., Harrer, M., Miguel, C., Papola, D., Sicimoğlu, A., Cuijpers, P., & Karyotaki, E. (2024). The efficacy of psychotherapy for social anxiety disorder, a systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of Anxiety Disorders, 104, 102881. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2024.102881

Finkel, E. J., Eastwick, P. W., Karney, B. R., Reis, H. T., & Sprecher, S. (2012). Online dating: A critical analysis from the perspective of psychological science. Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 13(1), 3–66. https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100612436522

Gable, S. L., Reis, H. T., Impett, E. A., & Asher, E. R. (2004). What do you do when things go right? The intrapersonal and interpersonal benefits of sharing positive events. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87(2), 228–245. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.87.2.228

Ginat-Frolich, R., Gilboa-Schechtman, E., Huppert, J. D., Aderka, I. M., Alden, L. E., Bar-Haim, Y., Becker, E. S., Bernstein, A., Geva, R., Heimberg, R. G., Hofmann, S. G., Kashdan, T. B., Koster, E. H. W., Lipsitz, J., Maner, J. K., Moscovitch, D. A., Philippot, P., Rapee, R. M., Roelofs, K., Rodebaugh, T. L., Schneier, F. R., Schultheiss, O. C., Shahar, B., Stangier, U., Stein, M. B., Stopa, L., Taylor, C. T., Weeks, J. W., & Wieser, M. J. (2024). Vulnerabilities in social anxiety: Integrating intra- and interpersonal perspectives. Clinical Psychology Review, 109, 102415. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2024.102415

Hofmann, S. G. (2007). Cognitive factors that maintain social anxiety disorder: A comprehensive model and its treatment implications. Cognitive Behaviour Therapy, 36(4), 193–209. https://doi.org/10.1080/16506070701421313

Kashdan, T. B., Ferssizidis, P., Farmer, A. S., Adams, L. M., & McKnight, P. E. (2013). Failure to capitalize on sharing good news with romantic partners: Exploring positivity deficits of socially anxious people with self-reports, partner-reports, and behavioral observations. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 51(10), 656–668. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2013.04.006

Kashdan, T. B., Volkmann, J. R., Breen, W. E., & Han, S. (2007). Social anxiety and romantic relationships: The costs and benefits of negative emotion expression are context-dependent. Journal of Anxiety Disorders, 21(4), 475–492. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2006.08.007

Mayo-Wilson, E., Dias, S., Mavranezouli, I., Kew, K., Clark, D. M., Ades, A. E., & Pilling, S. (2014). Psychological and pharmacological interventions for social anxiety disorder in adults: A systematic review and network meta-analysis. The Lancet Psychiatry, 1(5), 368–376. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(14)70329-3

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. (2013). Social anxiety disorder: Recognition, assessment and treatment (CG159). https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg159

Porter, E., & Chambless, D. L. (2014). Shying away from a good thing: Social anxiety in romantic relationships. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 70(6), 546–561. https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.22048

Premkumar, P., Heym, N., Myers, J. A. C., Formby, P., Battersby, S., Sumich, A. L., & Brown, D. J. (2024). Augmenting self-guided virtual-reality exposure therapy for social anxiety with biofeedback: A randomised controlled trial. Frontiers in Psychiatry, 15, 1467141. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2024.1467141

Rapee, R. M., & Heimberg, R. G. (1997). A cognitive-behavioral model of anxiety in social phobia. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 35(8), 741–756. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0005-7967(97)00022-3

Smits, J. A. J., Powers, M. B., Buxkamper, R., & Telch, M. J. (2006). The efficacy of videotape feedback for enhancing the effects of exposure-based treatment for social anxiety disorder: A controlled investigation. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 44(12), 1773–1785. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2006.01.001

Stangier, U., Schramm, E., Heidenreich, T., Berger, M., & Clark, D. M. (2011). Cognitive therapy vs interpersonal psychotherapy in social anxiety disorder: A randomized controlled trial. Archives of General Psychiatry, 68(7), 692–700. https://doi.org/10.1001/archgenpsychiatry.2011.67

Wild, J., Warnock-Parkes, E., Stott, R., Kwok, A. P. L., Lissillour Chan, M. H., Powell, C. L. Y. M., Leung, P. W. L., Clark, D. M., & Thew, G. R. (2023). Video feedback to update negative self-perceptions in social anxiety disorder: A comparison of internet-delivered versus face-to-face cognitive therapy formats. Journal of Affective Disorders, 331, 139–144. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2023.03.017