Journal of Psychiatry
Psychotherapy & Communication

Social Anxiety and Dating: From Avoidance to Connection

Christian Jonathan Haverkampf

Narrative Clinical Review

***Abstract*—**Social anxiety can make dating feel like a high-stakes performance when information is limited and the meaning of an interaction is uncertain. Anticipatory processing, self-focused attention, threat-biased interpretation, safety behaviors, and post-event processing may reduce distress in the short term while limiting corrective learning and intimacy. In established relationships, protective silence, reassurance seeking, conflict avoidance, muted responses to positive events, and difficulty discussing affection or sexuality can affect both partners. This narrative clinical review integrates cognitive, behavioral, interpersonal, and communication-oriented accounts with relationship research available through 30 November 2024. A stage-sensitive formulation distinguishes approach, meeting, disclosure, negotiation, and maintenance. Treatment should not aim to secure a partner or remove ordinary uncertainty, but to increase the patient's freedom to communicate, choose, discover compatibility, and tolerate an answer. Assessment includes realistic risk, minority stress, comorbidity, attachment, substance use, and dating-specific safety behaviors. Individual cognitive behavioral therapy has the strongest comparative evidence; relational strategies, behavioral experiments, attention training, communication practice, and paced self-disclosure can make treatment more relevant to dating. Online contact may widen access but can also support avoidance. The evidence is limited by small samples, predominantly young heterosexual participants, and reliance on cross-sectional self-report.

***Index Terms*—social anxiety disorder, dating, romantic relationships, psychotherapy, cognitive behavioral therapy, communication, self-disclosure, intimacy, safety behaviors**

I. INTRODUCTION

Dating places unusually concentrated demands on communication. A person has to become visible to someone whose response is not yet known, interpret incomplete signals, reveal interest without controlling the answer, and decide whether the other person is also interesting, respectful, and safe. Some anxiety in this setting is ordinary. It can reflect the significance of the encounter and may sharpen attention. Social anxiety becomes clinically important when fear of scrutiny, embarrassment, rejection, or visible anxiety persistently narrows behavior, causes marked distress, or prevents the person from acting in accordance with important needs and values (American Psychiatric Association, 2022).

Social anxiety disorder is common, impairing, and frequently untreated. In the National Comorbidity Survey Replication, impairment was particularly evident in social life and close relationships, and greater numbers of social fears were associated with greater impairment (Ruscio et al., 2008). Earlier JPPC case discussions emphasized that anxiety can restrict communication, occupational choices, relationships, and the pursuit of personally meaningful goals (Haverkampf, 2012, 2013). Dating is therefore not a peripheral quality-of-life topic. For some patients, it is the setting in which the disorder most directly obstructs companionship, affection, sexuality, family plans, or the wish simply to know another person.

Dating includes recognizing interest, creating a profile, messaging, meeting, expressing attraction, negotiating physical contact, discussing exclusivity, and sustaining a partnership. A patient may manage some stages but find others highly anxiety-provoking. Assessment should map the specific moment, prediction, behavior, and consequence rather than treat "dating anxiety" as a single problem.

Research does not support the assumption that social anxiety precludes satisfying relationships. Social anxiety is associated with difficulty initiating relationships and with some communication processes, but findings on relationship satisfaction are mixed (Beck et al., 2006; Gordon et al., 2012; Wenzel et al., 2005). People with social anxiety may desire closeness, form partnerships, and care deeply for partners. Clinical work should identify the specific processes that limit freedom and reciprocity, then support more accurate learning and meaningful communication.

This review uses the available evidence to organize dating-related difficulties by stage. The framework is author-developed and has not been validated. Clinically, dating is treated as mutual discovery rather than performance: improvement means greater freedom to approach or decline,

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

Haverkampf, C. J. (2024). Social Anxiety and Dating: From Avoidance to Connection. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2024 Dec 31;13(4):91-100

express interest and boundaries, assess compatibility, and tolerate uncertainty.

II. DATING AS A DISTINCT SOCIAL CONTEXT

A. Visibility, uncertainty, and significance

The early stages of dating commonly involve three conditions that readily activate social anxiety. First, the person is visible. Appearance, voice, timing, interests, and signs of emotion may all feel open to evaluation. Second, information is scarce. A delayed reply, a short answer, or an altered expression can have many explanations, but uncertainty invites threat-biased interpretation. Third, the interaction can feel unusually significant. If the patient has had few opportunities for intimacy, one meeting may be experienced as a global test of attractiveness, lovability, adulthood, gender or sexual identity, or the possibility of ever finding a partner.

These conditions help explain why a person who can speak competently at work may become highly inhibited when messaging someone they find attractive. Professional roles usually supply a purpose, boundaries, and a script. Dating brings personal preference and reciprocal choice to the foreground. The anxious person may try to replace uncertainty with rules: the perfect opening sentence, the correct interval before replying, the precise amount of eye contact, or a method for ensuring that rejection cannot occur. Such rules provide temporary structure but often convert connection into self-surveillance.

Social anxiety can also alter the apparent objective of communication. Instead of learning whether two people enjoy one another, the objective becomes preventing a bad impression. Instead of expressing interest, it becomes concealing anxiety. Instead of listening, it becomes monitoring posture, blushing, silence, or the next sentence. The person may then leave an interaction with detailed awareness of internal alarm but surprisingly little information about the other person.

B. Initiation and maintenance are not the same problem

Approaching a possible partner and maintaining an existing relationship require overlapping but distinct capacities. Initiation involves tolerating ambiguity, expressing interest or extending an invitation, receiving an answer, and recovering from nonreciprocity. Maintenance involves disclosure, responsiveness, conflict, affection, interdependence, and the communication of sexual and nonsexual needs. A patient who avoids initiation may never discover that closeness within an established relationship is less difficult. Another may initiate successfully but become anxious when the relationship acquires emotional importance.

Available evidence suggests that social anxiety can affect both stages. In one clinical study, marital status was associated with social phobia severity, although cross-sectional data cannot determine whether anxiety is a cause, a consequence, or a correlate of relationship status (Hart et al., 1999). Analogue work on dating initiation also links social anxiety with negative interpretations, anticipatory processing, and avoidant response choices, although the evidence is limited to a young heterosexual student sample (Daniels, 2007). In close relationships, social anxiety has been associated with lower assertion, conflict avoidance, limited emotional expression, self-protective communication, and dependency (Cuming & Rapee, 2010; Davila & Beck, 2002; Sparrevohn & Rapee, 2009). These patterns should be assessed separately rather than summarized as a single deficit in "dating skills."

C. Dating is reciprocal

Most social anxiety formulations focus on the anxious individual's beliefs and behavior. Dating is inherently dyadic: each person's behavior changes the information available to the other. A guarded answer may be interpreted as disinterest. The other person may then become less expressive, which appears to confirm the first person's expectation of rejection. Reassurance seeking may initially elicit comfort but later create pressure. Conversely, a warm, curious, and responsive partner can make disclosure safer and help disconfirm an expectation that imperfection leads to contempt.

The other person's actual behavior must not be explained away. Some prospective partners are dismissive, incompatible, prejudiced, manipulative, or unsafe. Some communications are genuinely ambiguous, and ending a relationship may be appropriate. A cognitive formulation is not an instruction to assume that every feared judgment is imaginary. It asks which interpretation is supported, what information is missing, and what response protects both dignity and choice.

III. WHAT THE RELATIONSHIP LITERATURE SHOWS

A. Self-disclosure, expression, and intimacy

Intimacy often develops through a process in which one person reveals something personally meaningful and the other responds with understanding, validation, or care (Reis & Shaver, 1988). The depth and pace of disclosure usually increase as trust is earned. A meta-analysis outside the social anxiety literature found a reliable association between self-disclosure and liking, while also showing that disclosure and liking influence one another (Collins & Miller, 1994). Disclosure is therefore neither a confession nor a technique for producing affection; it is part of a reciprocal process.

Social anxiety can interrupt this process. In a clinical comparison, participants with social phobia reported less self-disclosure, emotional expression, and intimacy in their romantic relationships than community controls, even after accounting for mood disorder (Sparrevohn & Rapee, 2009). In a larger community study, social anxiety was associated with reduced disclosure in close relationships, particularly among

Haverkampf, C. J. (2024). Social Anxiety and Dating: From Avoidance to Connection. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2024 Dec 31;13(4):91-100

women, and disclosure statistically accounted for part of the association with perceived romantic relationship quality (Cuming & Rapee, 2010). Davila and Beck (2002) similarly found associations with lower assertiveness, greater conflict avoidance, avoidance of strong emotional expression, and overreliance on others.

These findings are consistent with self-protection. Saying little, agreeing quickly, hiding desire, or avoiding disagreement can reduce the immediate likelihood of visible disapproval. Yet the other person receives less information with which to know the patient and respond meaningfully. The result may be a relationship that appears peaceful but permits little mutual discovery. Treatment should not simply demand more disclosure. It should help the patient choose disclosures that are authentic, proportionate to trust, and informative, while observing how the other person responds.

B. Support and perceived responsiveness

Social support is not only the amount of help offered. It also depends on whether a person can ask for, receive, recognize, and reciprocate support. Wenzel et al. (2005) observed socially anxious and nonanxious participants interacting with romantic partners and found differences in several communication and relationship-maintenance behaviors, although broader relationship outcomes were not uniformly impaired. Beck et al. (2006) found no overall group difference in supportive behavior during a social-evaluative stress task in a small sample. Porter and Chambless (2014) reported that among women, higher social anxiety was related to self-reports of providing and receiving less support and to lower relationship satisfaction, although findings varied by gender and reporter.

Daily-life data add another layer. In a 35-day study of 80 committed couples, Bar-Kalifa et al. (2015) found that social anxiety was associated with poorer daily relationship satisfaction for socially anxious individuals and their partners. For the socially anxious individual, the association was statistically mediated by perceiving the partner as less responsive. The same pathway did not explain the effect on the partner. This does not prove that perception causes dissatisfaction or that partners are always responsive. It does suggest that treatment should examine both the partner's observable behavior and how the patient perceives and receives it.

A useful clinical question is therefore not only, "Does your partner support you?" but also, "What did your partner do? What did you notice? What meaning did you give it? What did you do next?" This sequence separates observable information from prediction and allows for both perceptual bias and genuine relational problems.

C. Positive events and the capacity to celebrate

Relationship therapy often concentrates on conflict and negative emotion, but positive events are equally informative. Sharing good news gives a partner an opportunity to show interest and enthusiasm, a process sometimes called capitalization. Active and constructive responding to a partner's positive event is associated with relational well-being (Gable et al., 2004).

Kashdan et al. (2013) studied 174 heterosexual couples using self-report, partner report, behavioral observation, and follow-up. Greater social anxiety was associated with providing and receiving less supportive responses to shared positive events. Observers also noted less enthusiastic and expressive responding. When partners of socially anxious individuals experienced inadequate support for good news, relationship quality was more likely to decline and relationships were more likely to end over the six-month follow-up. These results broaden formulation beyond fear. A patient may monitor for danger so intensely that an opportunity for shared pleasure passes unnoticed.

In therapy, these findings can be translated into small, observable actions: turning toward the partner, asking a follow-up question, expressing pleasure, or allowing praise to register before discounting it. These actions do not require exaggerated positivity. They are experiments in noticing and responding to positive information that anxiety often filters out.

D. Negative emotion expression is context-dependent

A general instruction to "open up" is too imprecise. Kashdan et al. (2007) found that the relationship between negative emotion expression and changes in closeness depended on the person's level of social anxiety. Open expression was associated with greater closeness for less anxious participants, whereas the pattern differed for more socially anxious participants. One possible explanation is that expression varies in content, timing, reciprocity, and function. A concise disclosure that helps a partner understand may differ substantially from repeated self-denigration, reassurance seeking, or anxious analysis that leaves little room for the partner.

The clinical aim is flexible expression. The patient learns to identify what is felt, why it may matter to the relationship, what is being requested, and whether the timing is appropriate. A statement such as "I am enjoying this, and I also notice that I become quiet when I am nervous" conveys information without requiring the partner to guarantee an outcome. By contrast, "Tell me that I did not ruin everything" places the partner in the role of providing short-lived anxiety relief.

E. Affection, sexuality, and consent

Social anxiety can affect sexual communication because the person is both physically and emotionally visible. Montesi et al. (2013) studied 115 young, committed heterosexual couples. Higher social anxiety was associated with greater fear of

Haverkampf, C. J. (2024). Social Anxiety and Dating: From Avoidance to Connection. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2024 Dec 31;13(4):91-100

intimacy, which in the path model was associated with lower satisfaction with open sexual communication and, in turn, lower sexual satisfaction. The cross-sectional model cannot establish the direction of effects, but it highlights a clinically important sequence: fear may limit communication, and limited communication may make mutual understanding more difficult.

Sexual communication includes desire, uncertainty, contraception, sexual health, pace, boundaries, pleasure, pain, orientation, and the right to change one's mind. Exposure principles never override consent. A patient should not remain in unwanted contact to prove courage, use sexual behavior as a test of normality, or interpret another person's pressure as a therapeutic opportunity. Treatment should increase the capacity to give or withhold consent, ask about it, hear the answer, and respect it. It should also distinguish anxiety from lack of desire, incompatibility, trauma responses, medication effects, pain, and coercion within the relationship.

IV. A PROCESS MODEL OF SOCIAL ANXIETY IN DATING

A. Anticipatory processing

Before an interaction, the patient may simulate possible failures in detail. Preparation becomes repetitive rather than practical. Images are commonly viewed from an observer perspective: a flushed face, awkward posture, faltering speech, or a disappointed expression on the other person's face. The person rehearses sentences, checks photographs, seeks reassurance, delays sending a message, or cancels. Cognitive models describe how assumptions about scrutiny and social cost activate self-focused attention and threat monitoring (Clark & Wells, 1995; Hofmann, 2007; Rapee & Heimberg, 1997).

Anticipatory processing is not defined by the amount of thought alone. Useful preparation produces a decision or a simple plan; anxious preparation repeatedly seeks certainty that the situation cannot provide. Therapy can help the patient set a brief planning period, identify the feared prediction, choose one experiment, and then return attention to current activity.

B. Self-focused attention and the imagined audience

During a date, attention may move inward. The patient monitors voice, breathing, eye contact, hands, and the apparent quality of every sentence. Internal sensations are used as evidence of external appearance: "I feel hot, therefore I must look visibly panicked." A mental image is treated as though it represented the other person's view. This is consistent with cognitive models in which self-focused attention and distorted observer-perspective imagery maintain social anxiety (Clark & Wells, 1995; Rapee & Heimberg, 1997).

The cost is twofold. Self-monitoring intensifies symptoms and reduces access to the external conversation. The person may miss warmth, humor, discomfort, a boundary, or evidence of incompatibility. Attention training asks the patient to notice the actual person and environment without converting the conversation into a checklist of questions. The task can be as simple as learning three things about the other person's experience while also noticing one's own preferences.

C. Safety behaviors

Safety behaviors are actions intended to prevent a feared social outcome. Dating examples include scripting every response, speaking very little, asking questions without revealing anything, agreeing with every preference, hiding the face, repeatedly checking a phone to escape the interaction, drinking alcohol before the date, bringing a friend without prior agreement, restricting contact to text, ending the interaction before new information can emerge, or repeatedly checking whether the other person is still interested.

Some superficially similar behaviors are sensible precautions. Meeting in a public place, telling a trusted person where one is going, arranging transport, protecting private information, using safer-sex practices, and leaving when a boundary is violated are not pathological safety behaviors. Function and context matter. The question is whether the behavior protects against a realistic hazard or prevents learning about a feared prediction.

Safety behaviors can maintain anxiety in several ways. They focus attention on threat, lead the person to attribute an acceptable outcome to the safety behavior, and sometimes alter how the other person responds. Minimal disclosure may be read as indifference. Excessive agreement may prevent genuine compatibility from being tested. Alcohol may reduce anxiety temporarily while impairing attention, memory, judgment, the capacity for informed consent, and corrective learning.

D. Interpretation of ambiguity

Dating produces ambiguous information. A person may not reply because of disinterest, work, illness, indecision, another relationship, a lost phone, or no particular reason. Social anxiety often selects the most self-condemning explanation and treats it as fact. The goal of cognitive work is not to replace that interpretation with guaranteed reassurance. It is to preserve uncertainty, generate plausible alternatives, and identify a respectful action regardless of which explanation is true.

For example, one clear follow-up message may provide information. Repeated checking messages seek certainty and risk crossing a boundary. Sending no message may protect against a feared answer while prolonging ambiguity. A balanced response combines clarity with a willingness to tolerate nonresponse.

Haverkampf, C. J. (2024). Social Anxiety and Dating: From Avoidance to Connection. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2024 Dec 31;13(4):91-100

E. Post-event processing

After a date, the patient may conduct a detailed review of mistakes while discounting neutral or positive information. Memory may be reconstructed through an imagined observer perspective. The review feels like learning but often repeats global judgments: "I was boring," "They noticed everything," or "No one could want me." This process can increase shame and make the next approach less likely.

A structured review is different. It records the original prediction, observable events, the patient's actions, what cannot be known, what was learned about the other person, and one limited adjustment. Review ends at a defined time. The patient is asked to include evidence of coping and value-consistent behavior, not only signs of approval.

F. The interpersonal feedback loop

The processes above can form a loop. Fear prompts self-protective communication. Self-protective communication gives the other person less access to the patient's warmth, preferences, and personality. The other person's uncertainty or withdrawal is then experienced as rejection. The anxious prediction appears confirmed, and the next encounter is approached with greater efforts to control the interaction.

The loop is not a statement of blame. Both people shape the interaction, and either may be incompatible or unavailable. Its clinical value is that it identifies modifiable links: attention, disclosure, requests, interpretation, and response. Relationally enhanced CBT has shown that social approach behavior and relationship satisfaction can be targeted alongside symptom reduction (Alden & Taylor, 2011).

V. ASSESSMENT AND INDIVIDUAL FORMULATION

A. Define the problem behaviorally

Assessment begins with specific recent episodes. "I cannot date" should be translated into observable sequences. Does the patient avoid creating opportunities, fail to signal interest, cancel meetings, remain silent, overdisclose, repeatedly pursue unavailable partners, use alcohol, seek reassurance, or withdraw after signs of mutual interest? What happens before, during, and after each episode? What short-term benefit does the behavior provide, and what longer-term cost follows?

A dating map can cover the following domains:

- noticing attraction and allowing oneself to want contact;
- creating opportunities through friends, activities, online services, or directly approaching someone;
- initiating and responding to messages;
- proposing and planning a meeting;
- attending and remaining present during an encounter;
- expressing interest, preference, disagreement, and boundaries;
- receiving interest, ambiguity, incompatibility, or rejection;
- disclosing personal information at an appropriate pace;
- discussing affection, touch, sexuality, and consent;
- integrating a relationship with friends, family, work, culture, and identity;
- tolerating increasing attachment and the possibility of loss.

For each domain, the clinician records anxiety, avoidance, safety behaviors, predictions, attentional focus, imagery, post-event processing, and valued purpose. Standard measures such as the Liebowitz Social Anxiety Scale and the Social Interaction Anxiety Scale can monitor the broader disorder, but they should be supplemented by individualized behavioral targets (Heimberg et al., 1999; Mattick & Clarke, 1998).

B. Distinguish diagnosis from normal anxiety and other conditions

Not all dating difficulty is social anxiety disorder. The clinician should assess depression, panic disorder, generalized anxiety disorder, obsessive-compulsive symptoms, trauma-related symptoms, body dysmorphic concerns, eating disorders, autism spectrum features, attention-deficit/hyperactivity symptoms, substance use, sexual dysfunction, and relevant personality patterns. Limited opportunity, grief, discrimination, disability, caregiving demands, cultural constraints, poverty, and geographic isolation may be more important than fear of evaluation.

Depression deserves particular attention because it can reduce motivation, positive affect, and hope, and it commonly co-occurs with social anxiety. Alcohol and sedatives require direct inquiry because patients may use them before dates. Short-term relief can obscure escalating use or dependence and can interfere with judgment, informed consent, and corrective learning. Suicidality and self-harm should be assessed whenever hopelessness, severe isolation, humiliation, or comorbid depression is present.

Attachment concepts may help describe expectations of closeness, but they should not become a total explanation. Avoidance and dependency can coexist in social anxiety (Davila & Beck, 2002). A person may avoid new contacts yet become highly reliant on one established partner. Formulation should remain tied to current behavior and testable predictions.

C. Assess realistic context and minority stress

Dating occurs within culture and power. Sexual and gender minority patients, people with disabilities, patients from racialized groups, migrants, older adults, people with visible health conditions, and those dating across religious or cultural boundaries may face real stigma or danger. The clinician must not relabel realistic vigilance as distorted thinking. A useful formulation distinguishes realistic external risk, uncertainty, and anxiety-amplified prediction, then develops strategies for each.

The evidence base itself is limited. Many romantic-relationship studies have used young, white, heterosexual,

Haverkampf, C. J. (2024). Social Anxiety and Dating: From Avoidance to Connection. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2024 Dec 31;13(4):91-100

monogamous couples. Gender effects have not been consistent across measures and studies. Treatment should therefore be inclusive and individualized rather than built on assumptions about who initiates, who pays, which partner is more expressive, or what a relationship should become.

D. Clarify purpose, values, and consent

Earlier communication-focused case reports proposed that a clearer sense of needs, values, aspirations, and the purpose of communication can reduce the burden of trying to say the perfect thing (Haverkampf, 2013, 2015). In dating, useful questions include: What kind of contact matters to you? What qualities do you want to express? What boundaries protect you? What do you want to learn about another person? What forms of partnership, sexuality, or single life fit your values?

Values do not prescribe a relationship. A patient may decide not to date, to date casually, to seek commitment, to remain celibate, or to prioritize other relationships. Therapy supports an informed choice. It should not impose cultural milestones or treat being partnered as evidence of health.

VI. TREATMENT PRINCIPLES

A. Begin with a collaborative communication setting

Social anxiety affects the medium through which psychotherapy occurs. The patient may try to be an "ideal patient," conceal disagreement, or overstate homework completion to avoid disappointing the therapist. A clear, nonjudgmental setting and explicit permission to correct the therapist are therefore active parts of treatment, not merely preparation. Earlier JPPC cases described the therapeutic conversation as a place to observe and change communication while reconnecting with meaning and purpose (Haverkampf, 2012, 2013).

The therapist should also avoid becoming a dating authority. Advice about the perfect message or the meaning of a delayed reply can reinforce dependence and certainty seeking. The therapist's role is to help formulate processes, design experiments, examine information, and support the patient's values and boundaries.

B. Provide a transparent model

The patient should understand the proposed cycle in plain language. A typical formulation is:

1. A dating cue activates a prediction of scrutiny or rejection.
2. Attention moves inward and an observer-perspective image develops.
3. Anxiety-related sensations are interpreted as visible failure.
4. Safety behaviors reduce authentic participation.
5. Ambiguous responses are interpreted negatively.
6. Post-event review strengthens the prediction.
7. Avoidance reduces opportunity and corrective learning.

The model is a hypothesis, not a verdict. The patient and therapist revise it when behavior shows something different. The formulation should not absorb ordinary attraction, incompatibility, or realistic external risk into the anxiety cycle without supporting evidence.

C. Build an approach hierarchy around learning

Exposure is most useful when organized around predictions and learning rather than endurance. A hierarchy may begin with allowing interest to be visible, continue through brief conversations and invitations, and later include disclosure, disagreement, affection, or relationship integration. Difficulty is determined by the patient's formulation, not by a universal ranking.

Possible experiments include:

- making brief eye contact and offering a greeting without rehearsing;
- expressing one genuine preference in a conversation;
- sending a concise message after one review rather than repeated editing;
- asking a person to meet while allowing for a yes, a no, or no reply;
- attending a short meeting without alcohol or covert checking;
- permitting a natural pause instead of filling every silence;
- sharing one moderately personal fact and observing the response;
- stating a small disagreement respectfully;
- accepting a compliment with thanks before discounting it;
- asking a partner what kind of support would be useful;
- discussing a boundary, contraception, or pace directly.

The outcome measure is not whether the other person approves. It is whether the patient acted in line with the experiment, gathered information, and tolerated the result. Rejection can be painful and still make the experiment therapeutically successful: the patient communicated, tolerated uncertainty, respected the answer, and retained a coherent sense of self.

D. Drop safety behaviors selectively

Behavioral experiments should identify one or two safety behaviors at a time. If the patient normally scripts every line, the experiment may permit only a simple opening and one reminder of the intended purpose. If the patient asks questions continuously, the experiment can include one reciprocal disclosure. If the patient checks a phone to escape pauses, the phone can remain out of sight for a defined period.

Dropping all protection at once is unnecessary and may be unsafe. Real-world precautions remain. The distinction should be written explicitly. A public location and transport plan are realistic safety measures. Avoiding alcohol used to suppress anxiety protects learning, judgment, and informed consent. One agreed check-in may support safety, whereas repeated reassurance messages are more likely to function as anxiety-maintaining behavior.

Haverkampf, C. J. (2024). Social Anxiety and Dating: From Avoidance to Connection. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2024 Dec 31;13(4):91-100

E. Train external and flexible attention

Attention exercises can begin outside dating. The patient practices shifting between sound, color, physical sensation, and another person's words without evaluating performance. During a date, a simple external task may be to notice the substance of the other person's answer, aspects of their expression, and one's own genuine response. The aim is not distraction from anxiety. Anxiety is allowed to be present while attention becomes more flexible.

Video or audio feedback may be used carefully when feared appearance is central. The feared prediction is recorded first, the recording is viewed from a factual perspective, and the patient compares the prediction with observable evidence. Repeated checking for reassurance should be avoided. Individual cognitive therapy, which directly targets self-focused attention, imagery, safety behaviors, and beliefs, has strong comparative evidence (Clark et al., 2006; Mayo-Wilson et al., 2014).

F. Work with predictions rather than positive thinking

A useful prediction is specific and observable: "If there is a five-second pause, the other person will end the meeting," or "If I say I prefer a different film, they will criticize me." A global belief such as "I am unlovable" must be linked to situations and evidence before it can be tested.

The patient estimates the expected outcome, conducts the experiment, and records what occurred. Alternative explanations are considered without forcing optimism. If the feared outcome occurs, therapy examines its meaning and the patient's coping. A date's lack of interest provides information about one interaction; it does not establish a global conclusion about the patient's identity or worth.

G. Limit anticipatory and post-event rumination

The patient can distinguish preparation from rumination by asking whether the thinking is producing a next action. Before a date, practical planning may cover time, place, transport, safety, and one learning goal. Further rehearsal is postponed. Attention then returns to ordinary activity.

Afterward, a structured record can use six questions: What did I predict? What did I observe? What did I do that was value-consistent? What did I learn about the other person? What remains unknown? What single adjustment might be useful? The review is time-limited. Repeated mental replay is labeled as post-event processing and met with a deliberate shift to current activity rather than another attempt at certainty.

H. Practice graded, reciprocal disclosure

Disclosure practice should address breadth, depth, timing, and reciprocity. Early disclosure may involve interests and everyday preferences. More vulnerable disclosure follows as evidence of respect accumulates. The patient learns to notice whether the other person also shares, responds with care, respects privacy, and accepts boundaries.

Two errors are common. Protective underdisclosure prevents being known. Anxiety-driven overdisclosure attempts to secure immediate acceptance or eliminate uncertainty. The middle path is chosen disclosure: enough information to be genuine, without disclosing more than the current level of trust can safely support. The therapist can role-play a disclosure and several possible responses, including warm interest, awkwardness, a boundary, and nonreciprocity.

I. Teach responsiveness, not performance

Engaging conversation does not require a continuous stream of polished remarks; it depends more on attention and responsiveness. Patients can practice acknowledging what was heard, asking a genuine follow-up question, connecting it with their own experience, and allowing pauses. With an established partner, the same principles apply to support and positive events.

When a partner shares good news, the patient can turn toward it, ask for detail, and express pleasure or interest. When a partner is distressed, the patient can ask whether listening, practical help, affection, or space would be useful. This reduces mind reading and makes support collaborative. Research on capitalization suggests that responsiveness to positive events is a clinically relevant relationship behavior rather than a peripheral skill (Gable et al., 2004; Kashdan et al., 2013).

J. Address negative emotion without making the partner regulate it

The patient may need language that acknowledges the emotion and makes a bounded request: "I notice I am anxious and quiet. I would like to stay, and a slower pace would help." This differs from repeated demands that a partner disprove every fear. The clinician can help distinguish disclosure, reassurance seeking, problem solving, and coercion.

Because the effects of negative emotion expression are context-dependent, the question is not whether to express but how, when, and for what purpose (Kashdan et al., 2007). If disclosure is met with contempt, manipulation, or pressure, the therapeutic task may be to set boundaries or leave the interaction or relationship, not to increase vulnerability.

K. Include conflict and repair

Conflict avoidance can resemble compatibility until unexpressed differences accumulate. Treatment may therefore include small disagreements: choosing a restaurant, declining a plan, correcting a misunderstanding, or asking for a change. The patient practices direct language, curiosity about the partner's view, and repair after misunderstanding or misattunement.

The therapist should normalize that a healthy interaction can include awkwardness and repair. The capacity to say, "I expressed that badly; what I meant was..." is more realistic

Haverkampf, C. J. (2024). Social Anxiety and Dating: From Avoidance to Connection. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2024 Dec 31;13(4):91-100

than a standard of error-free communication. Repair also provides evidence that a relationship can survive imperfection.

L. Use online dating as access and bridge

A major review concluded in 2012 that the available evidence did not justify commercial claims that matching algorithms reliably produce superior relationships (Finkel et al., 2012). For a socially anxious patient, text-based contact can widen opportunity and provide a graduated step toward meeting. It also offers more time to formulate a response.

The same advantages can become avoidance. A patient may edit a profile indefinitely, communicate only with unavailable people, maintain long message exchanges without meeting, compare hundreds of profiles, monitor matches compulsively, or treat low response rates as a global evaluation. A clinical plan can limit platform time, define privacy and safety rules, encourage an appropriate transition from messaging to voice or in-person contact, and measure approach behavior rather than the number of matches.

Profiles and messages are useful places to practice accurate self-presentation. The goal is neither exhaustive confession nor an idealized persona. A concise, truthful profile gives another person enough information to decide whether contact might be worthwhile. Online platforms also make nonresponse more visible, although most nonresponse provides little interpretable information about the individual.

M. Consider partner involvement carefully

When a stable partner is willing, one or more joint sessions may clarify the anxiety cycle and reduce accommodation of avoidance. The partner can learn to support approach behavior without providing endless reassurance, answering on the patient's behalf, or organizing life around avoidance. The couple can identify a shared behavioral experiment and a way to discuss its outcome.

Partner involvement requires consent from both partners and an assessment of relationship safety. Joint work is not appropriate when there is coercive control, violence, intimidation, or a substantial risk that disclosure will be used against the patient. The partner is not made responsible for treatment.

N. Medication and treatment selection

Medication is not a treatment for dating as such. When the patient meets criteria for social anxiety disorder, pharmacological options can be considered within established guidance. Earlier meta-analytic and controlled-trial evidence supports psychological treatment and documents medication efficacy, including direct comparison of cognitive behavioral group therapy and phenelzine (Acarturk et al., 2009; Heimberg et al., 1998). The 2014 network meta-analysis found evidence for several medication classes as well as psychological treatments, while individual CBT showed a favorable balance of benefit and acceptability among psychological interventions (Mayo-Wilson et al., 2014). NICE recommends disorder-specific individual CBT as an initial treatment and provides guidance on selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors when medication is preferred (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, 2013).

Medication decisions require discussion of adverse effects, discontinuation symptoms, comorbidity, patient preference, and the possibility of sexual side effects. Benzodiazepines and alcohol are particularly problematic as coping strategies before dates because they can impair learning, judgment, memory, and the capacity for informed consent. Treatment-resistant presentations require renewed diagnostic and treatment review rather than automatic escalation. Reassess comorbidity, adherence, adverse effects, avoidance and safety behaviors, whether an adequate disorder-specific intervention was delivered, and the patient's preference before sequencing or augmenting treatment (Blanco et al., 2013; National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, 2013).

VII. COMPOSITE CLINICAL ILLUSTRATION

A fictional composite illustrates the pattern. A patient who managed work presentations spent hours editing messages, canceled meetings, drank before dates, and monitored every response. Treatment preserved realistic safety measures while reducing alcohol use, scripting, and reassurance seeking. Graded, truthful communication helped the patient tolerate rejection, discover reciprocity, negotiate intimacy and boundaries, and end an incompatible relationship without treating grief as relapse.

VIII. COMMON CLINICAL ERRORS

Several common errors turn dating into another performance test. Behavioral experiments should preserve honest communication, consent, boundaries, and the other person’s right to refuse; success is measured by the patient’s clarity, learning, and respect for the outcome rather than by securing another date. Scripts can become safety behaviors, disclosure should follow trust, and real incompatibility or external constraint should not be relabeled as anxiety. Treatment should also attend to curiosity, pleasure, repair, and the response to a partner’s good news (Kashdan et al., 2013).

IX. EVIDENCE LIMITATIONS AND RESEARCH NEEDS

Dating-specific recommendations remain more detailed than the direct trial evidence. Individual CBT is well supported for social anxiety disorder, and relationally enhanced CBT is promising, but more active-comparator studies are needed (Alden & Taylor, 2011). Much relationship research is cross-sectional, so mediation cannot establish causation, and perceived low support may reflect interpretation, partner behavior, or both. Samples are often small, young, educated, heterosexual, and monogamous,

Haverkampf, C. J. (2024). Social Anxiety and Dating: From Avoidance to Connection. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2024 Dec 31;13(4):91-100

limiting generalization. Future research should broaden representation and prospectively examine dating initiation, online-to-offline transitions, consent, and relationship endings. Outcomes should extend beyond symptoms to approach, values-consistent choice, relationship quality, disclosure, responsiveness, sexual communication, alcohol use, and respect for rejection and boundaries. Interpersonal-process research and a CBT-IPT trial inform formulation but did not test dating outcomes (Alden & Taylor, 2004; Stangier et al., 2011). A scoping review of 50 studies organized the relational evidence around satisfaction and commitment, communication and self-disclosure, conflict and support, and intimacy, while finding heterogeneous methods and particularly little evidence on relationship initiation (Casey et al., 2023).

X. CONCLUSION

Social anxiety can turn dating from mutual discovery into an effort to prevent or control negative evaluation. Anticipatory processing, self-focused attention, safety behaviors, threat-biased interpretation, and post-event review limit both learning and communication. In established relationships, protective silence, reassurance seeking, conflict avoidance, difficulty receiving support, and muted responses to positive events may affect intimacy.

Treatment should be precise, relational, and ethically grounded. It begins by distinguishing normal anxiety, realistic risk, and disorder-maintaining processes. Individual cognitive behavioral therapy provides the strongest general evidence, while communication-oriented formulation, relational strategies, graded behavioral experiments, flexible attention, reciprocal disclosure, positive responsiveness, and direct discussion of boundaries can make treatment fit the dating context. Online contact may broaden access and serve as a bridge when it leads toward chosen interaction rather than prolonged avoidance.

The aim is not fearlessness or guaranteed partnership, but greater freedom to communicate interest and limits, judge whether a relationship is wanted, respect another person's autonomy, and retain self-respect when the outcome is uncertain.

XI. DISCLOSURES

***Conflicts of interest*—**The author declares no conflicts of interest.
***Funding*—**This work received no specific funding.
***Author contributions*—**Christian Jonathan Haverkampf is the sole author and is responsible for the conception, literature review, manuscript preparation, and approval of the final version.
***Clinical illustration*—**The clinical illustration is a fictional, de-identified composite created for educational purposes and does not describe an identifiable patient.

REFERENCES

Acarturk, C., Cuijpers, P., van Straten, A., & de Graaf, R. (2009). Psychological treatment of social anxiety disorder: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Medicine*, *39*(2), 241–254. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291708003590

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

American Psychiatric Association. (2022). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed., text rev.). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.books.9780890425787

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

Beck, J. G., Davila, J., Farrow, S., & Grant, D. (2006). When the heat is on: Romantic partner responses influence distress in socially anxious women. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *44*(5), 737–748. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2005.05.004

Blanco, C., Bragdon, L. B., Schneier, F. R., & Liebowitz, M. R. (2013). The evidence-based pharmacotherapy of social anxiety disorder. International Journal of Neuropsychopharmacology, 16(1), 235–249. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1461145712000119

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

Clark, D. M., & Wells, A. (1995). A cognitive model of social phobia. In R. G. Heimberg, M. R. Liebowitz, D. A. Hope, & F. R. Schneier (Eds.), *Social phobia: Diagnosis, assessment, and treatment* (pp. 69–93). New York: Guilford Press.

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

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

Daniels, S. M., Jr. (2007). *Social anxiety and heterosexual dating initiation* (Master's thesis). University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Haverkampf, C. J. (2024). Social Anxiety and Dating: From Avoidance to Connection. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2024 Dec 31;13(4):91-100

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

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

Gordon, E. A., Heimberg, R. G., Montesi, J. L., & Fauber, R. L. (2012). Romantic relationships: Do socially anxious individuals benefit? Cognitive Behaviour Therapy, 41(2), 140–151. https://doi.org/10.1080/16506073.2012.656275

Hart, T. A., Turk, C. L., Heimberg, R. G., & Liebowitz, M. R. (1999). Relation of marital status to social phobia severity. *Depression and Anxiety*, *10*(1), 28–32. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1520-6394(1999)10:1%3C28::AID-DA5%3E3.0.CO;2-I

Haverkampf, C. J. (2012). A case of severe anxiety. *J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication*, *1*(2), 35–40.

Haverkampf, C. J. (2013). A case of social anxiety. *J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication*, *2*(1), 14–20.

Haverkampf, C. J. (2015). Treatment-resistant social anxiety. *J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication*, *4*(4), 117–127.

Heimberg, R. G., Liebowitz, M. R., Hope, D. A., Schneier, F. R., Holt, C. S., Welkowitz, L. A., Juster, H. R., Campeas, R., Bruch, M. A., Cloitre, M., Fallon, B., & Klein, D. F. (1998). Cognitive behavioral group therapy vs phenelzine therapy for social phobia: 12-week outcome. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *55*(12), 1133–1141. https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.55.12.1133

Heimberg, R. G., Horner, K. J., Juster, H. R., Safren, S. A., Brown, E. J., Schneier, F. R., & Liebowitz, M. R. (1999). Psychometric properties of the Liebowitz Social Anxiety Scale. *Psychological Medicine*, *29*(1), 199–212. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291798007879

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

Mattick, R. P., & Clarke, J. C. (1998). Development and validation of measures of social phobia scrutiny fear and social interaction anxiety. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *36*(4), 455–470. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0005-7967(97)10031-6

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

Montesi, J. L., Conner, B. T., Gordon, E. A., Fauber, R. L., Kim, K. H., & Heimberg, R. G. (2013). On the relationship among social anxiety, intimacy, sexual communication, and sexual satisfaction in young couples. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *42*(1), 81–91. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-012-9929-3

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. (2013). *Social anxiety disorder: Recognition, assessment and treatment* (Clinical guideline CG159). London: NICE. 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

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

Reis, H. T., & Shaver, P. (1988). Intimacy as an interpersonal process. In S. Duck (Ed.), *Handbook of personal relationships: Theory, research and interventions* (pp. 367–389). Chichester: Wiley.

Ruscio, A. M., Brown, T. A., Chiu, W. T., Sareen, J., Stein, M. B., & Kessler, R. C. (2008). Social fears and social phobia in the USA: Results from the National Comorbidity Survey Replication. *Psychological Medicine*, *38*(1), 15–28. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291707001699

Sparrevohn, R. M., & Rapee, R. M. (2009). Self-disclosure, emotional expression and intimacy within romantic relationships of people with social phobia. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *47*(12), 1074–1078. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2009.07.016

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

Wenzel, A., Graff-Dolezal, J., Macho, M., & Brendle, J. R. (2005). Communication and social skills in socially anxious and nonanxious individuals in the context of romantic relationships. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *43*(4), 505–519. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2004.03.010