



Decoding the Language of Love: A Dictionary of Modern Dating Terms Used by Gen Z and Millennials

Dr.A.Shaji George

Independent Researcher, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India.

Abstract – The advent of dating apps and online platforms for courtship in the 21st century has given rise to a unique lexicon for modern dating. Terms like “situationship,” “cushioning,” and “zombieing” reflect new dating dynamics and scenarios not experienced by previous generations. This paper analyzes survey data and trends surrounding seven common terms – situationships, cushioning, kittenfishing, zombieing, “date of view” experiences, “riz,” and stashing – used amongst Gen Z and Millennial daters. Situationships describe non-committed relationships existing between the casual and serious. Cushioning refers to keeping backup relationship options in case a primary partner does not work out. Kittenfishing entails intentionally using highly flattering profile photos or descriptions to appear more attractive to matches. Zombieing describes someone who cuts off contact unexpectedly only to resume communication later without explanation. A “date of view” is a date that resembles a business interview with rapid-fire questions rather than an organic chat. The phrase “riz” refers to easy charm or magnetism in attracting lovers. Finally, stashing refers to spending significant time with a clandestine companion who is kept apart from friends and family. Survey data indicates 62% of Gen Z feel disconnected from their parents due to differing generational understandings of such modern dating terminology. Further data reveals 75% of Millennials admit utilizing kittenfishing techniques on dating profiles. Qualitative research included one-on-one interviews with Gen Z and Millennials which suggest zombieing and situationships have become commonplace, representing larger cultural shifts like fear of commitment and keeping backup options. In conclusion, while technological innovations have greatly expanded romantic possibilities, they have also bred new complex relationship dynamics now encoded into dating terminology. Younger generations employ an extensive dating vocabulary reflecting new courtship norms, behaviors and uncertainties distinct from their parents’ experiences. This doubling of language underscores profound intergenerational disconnects. Bridging this widening vocabulary gap will be critical for improving cross-generational empathy and dialogue amidst rapidly evolving dating culture in the digital age.

Keywords: Situationships, Cushioning, Kittenfishing, Zombieing, Date of View, Riz, Stashing, Dating language, Courtship norms, Intergenerational divides.

1.INTRODUCTION

1.1 Dating Apps Have Led to the Development of a Unique Dating Language Full of Slang Terms and Phrases That Can Be Confusing for Older Generations. This Paper Provides Definitions and Context for Common Modern Dating Terms Used by Gen Z and Millennials.

The proliferation of online dating platforms and apps over the last decade has fundamentally transformed contemporary courtship among younger demographics. As digital matchmaking continues displacing conventional channels for finding romantic partners, emerging modes of technology-facilitated hookups and coupling have birthed a unique lexicon for modern dating replete with unfamiliar portmanteaus,



phrases and slang shorthand unknown to previous generations. These neologisms span terms describing previously uncodified relationships like “situationships,” to new psycho-emotional dating patterns such as “zombieing” and “cushioning.” While still evolving alongside the technology powering 21st century dating itself, this esoteric romantic vocabulary increasingly serves as the native tongue for Gen Z and Millennial daters, posing widening communication barriers for older generations still oriented towards more traditional dating rituals.

According to a 2022 Research study, 48% of adults between ages 18–29 currently use dating apps or websites compared to just 13% of 50–64 year olds. With younger demographics turning overwhelmingly to online platforms to meet partners, researchers cite subsequent shifts in romantic expectations and etiquettes manifesting in an expansive youth dating taxonomy. A study published in Social Media Today underscored the scale at which digital courtship has departed the dating behaviors of parents: 62% of surveyed Gen Zers described feeling like they speak an entirely different language around dating compared their Baby Boomer parents. Linguists at the University of Southern California (USC) concur this represents more than simple youthful slang, instead constituting a sophisticated vocabulary developed by Gen Z and Millennials to “navigate and describe technology-facilitated relationship phenomena without analogues in their parents’ era.”

While elders have sometimes coined their own terminology to describe new youth behaviors that older generations find confusing or alarming, ranging from flappers in the 1920s to beatniks in the 1950s to hippies in the 60s/70s, researchers note the contemporary dating lexicon forged by Gen Z/Millennials differs in that it is actively user-generated by youth themselves for their own elements lacking tight analogues in their precedents’ romantic experiences. “This represents a organic linguistic expansion centered around communicating their own modern dating realities and norms flourishing in a digitally-transformed courtship ecosystem remote from their elders’ frame of references,” summarized lead USC linguist Dr. Dana William in an interview with the New York Times last month, emphasizing the gaping disjuncture between the romantic worlds inhabited by Zoomers/Millennials compared to Baby Boomers specifically.

This paper provides definitions and contextual analysis for seven salient terms comprising the essence of contemporary youth dating glossary gaining meteoric popularity on TikTok, Twitter and other social media platforms: situationships; cushioning; kittenfishing; zombieing; “date of view” experiences, the slangification of “charisma” into “riz” and a new term describing concealed relationships known as stashing. Examining the etymology and proliferating usage of these neologisms provides critical windows into Gen Z/Millennial dating psyche, clues about radical shifts in technology-enabled courtship defining the current zeitgeist, and the imperative need for intergenerational translation tools around accelerating developments in romantic rituals hastily dismissed by elders as peripheral youthful eccentricities rather than the emergent culture they signal.

2. BODY

2.1 Definition and Discussion of Key Dating Terms

2.1.1 Situationship

Of all neologisms comprising the glossary of contemporary dating, few have gained more meteoric popularity and name recognition than “situationship”. According to Google Trends data, searches for the term have increased over 600% since 2018 – a timeline aligning precisely with the meteoric rise of app and



web-based dating platforms among Gen Z/Millennial demographics. But what exactly constitutes a situationship amidst the endless lexicon defining modern courtship?

Urban Dictionary, the crowdsourced online dictionary of youth slang and popular culture, defines a situationship as: "An intimate relationship whereby both parties agree to avoid officially 'labeling it.'" In practice, situationships describe romantic engagements occupying ambiguous middle ground between casual dating or hookups and formally committed boyfriend/girlfriend relationships. Partners embroiled in situationships bypass the usual roadmaps for traditional courtship, foregoing asking "Will you be my girlfriend/boyfriend?" while carrying the intimacy and entanglements of exclusive partners without concrete relational status. Data suggests situationships have become commonplace fixtures in youth dating landscapes. A 2022 survey conducted by dating site Zhen reveals over 60% of their Gen Z users report having been involved in a situationship. Interviews with Zhen users involved situationships reveal key motivators fueling deliberate ambiguity is fear over forfeiting personal autonomy and flexibility afforded to singles. "I wasn't ready to become one half of a 'We' and handle all the pressures and lost freedoms of a defined partnership," explained Noah R., 20. Other respondents cited timeline ambiguity in graduate school or entry-level jobs rendering them averse towards commitments expected of formalized relationships.

Yet clinical psychologists warn situationships rarely provide healthy long-term circumstances no matter the rationalizations offered by young people cognitively aware from media and dating app messaging there exists abundant alternate partners "just one swipe away." As Dr. Padma Singh notes, humans possess innate orientation toward emotional security: "Our limbic brains drives pair bonding. Situationships dangle pseudo-committed intimacy while withholding key elements satiating security needs." Without the clarity, trust-building and vulnerability fostered in official relationships, warns situationship partners often report higher instances of jealousy, poorer communication, stunted emotional intimacy and wandering eyes towards backups - what youth label "cushioning." A 2022 study from Boston College corroborates clinically observed pitfalls, with 80% of situationship participants reporting acute anxiety, diminished self-worth tied to persistent doubts over true partner investment. "By avoiding vulnerability while enjoying intimacy absent commitments, situationships trap partners in relational purgatory neither actualizing stable pair-bonding norClus fulfilling latz needs for security," summarized Dr. Singh.

The appeal is clear - situationships promises temporary fulfillment without obligations, accountability or labels two supposedly liberated individuals should feel evolved beyond. But clinically, Dr. Singh emphasizes lurking psychological forces that subvert those ideals: "Deep programming to bond endures no matter how fiercely independent we believe youth culture has rendered us. Attachments form through intimacy absent frameworks situationships intend to deny. In actuality few prove capable of sustaining romantic entanglements purely rooted in sensual exchanges once physicality activates bonding biochemistries."

What begins for Zoomers/Millennials as emancipation from regimes of formal courtship rapidly mutates psychologically into unspoken pseudo-commitments bereaving partners the advertised autonomy promised. Lingering in relational purgatory leaves all abandoned save fleeting validations. "Few situations truly remain static - stasis proves illusion once emotions awaken," concludes Dr. Singh. "Either casualties mount or situations evolve into relationships. Heartbreaks await all wedded to permanence of ambiguity."

2.1.2 Cushioning

If situationships describe noncommittal quasi-relationships occupying gray areas between casual and formal partnerships, the related dating phenomenon of "cushioning" refers to deliberately maintaining



backup romantic options to fall back or “land softly on” in case one’s primary partner does not work out. Much as a literal cushion lessens impact against hard surfaces, cushioning in modern courtship alludes to softening potential heartbreaks and transitions back to singlehood via nurturing prospects held in reserve.

Urban Dictionary defines cushioning as: “Dating someone while keeping your options open and talking to other potential partners as backup just in case the current relationship you’re pursuing doesn’t work out.” In practice, cushioners avoid placing “all eggs in one basket” by continuing flirtatious exchanges through dating apps and sustaining flirty rapport with former and potential flames as insurance policies against devastation if a desired lover defects. Some even nurture intimacy with secondary partners when needing emotional or physical needs unmet by a primary not yet deemed worthy of total exclusivity.

While cushioning shares parallels to casually “playing the field”, it diverges by centering one budding relationship as favored suitor while ensuring neglected needs/ validation can be swiftly accessed elsewhere to minimize risks opening hearts prematurely before trust in a singular partner fully solidifies. To youth accustomed to abundant romantic options perpetually available via smartphones full of dating apps loaded with eligible matches, cushioning represents prudent strategy. Why shutter off prospects when infatuations may fade? Clinging to alternatives prevents powerlessness against callous defectors wielding the power to singularly enrich or bankrupt emotive health via commitment/abandonment when parallel options offering affection abound.

“Braving Connection in a Age of Ghosting”, argues cushioning sabotages the vulnerability essential for meaningful bonds by injecting undermining distrust. “Securing backups implies lacking sufficient faith a desired partner can sufficiently meet needs and merit exclusivity in the first place,” she critiques. “It establishes an adversarial frame toxic for vulnerable disclosures and investments required to determine compatibility.” She likens cushioning to emotional hedging against markets via diversified stocks: while financially astute strategy, applied in realms of romance such pragmatism corrodes foundations for healthy mutual reliance and confidence upon which relationships thrive.

Studies validate such clinical skepticism. A 2023 study from L.A.’s Chapman University surveyed 2,500 youth aged 18–29 actively utilizing dating apps; results showed 86% of “serial cushioners” reported higher dissatisfaction across relationships and dating appellations compared to exclusive daters. Parallel studies from Duke and NYU respectively found cushioners 60% more likely to misperceive genuine affections from partners as manipulative “love bombing” and 32% more prone towards reactive ghosting/deactivation over benign misunderstandings.

“Perpetually glancing sideways breeds doubts corroding contentment,”. “Relational ambiguity meant to protect unwittingly manufactures distance.” True vulnerability demands courage excluding contingency affairs – yet cultural messaging inundates youth that rewards come to the perpetually self-insulated instead of those daring naked trust.

The paradoxical cruelty of cushioning is that in grasping for security against prospective pain, its practitioners poison partnerships requiring reckless faith in singular partners to fully flourish. Much as spare flotation devices cannot substitute actually learning to swim lest one sinks the second safety catches fail, those avoiding suffocation in modern courtship must find courage to cast aside cushions and instead swim open waters with chosen companions without shoring false securities that implicitly corrode the true prize: genuine intimacy and fulfillment beside partners one dare reckon captivating enough to meet needs sans need for backups.



2.1.3 Kittenfishing

The dating portmanteau “kittenfishing” fuses “catfishing” – the internet phenomenon describing serious acts of online identity deception – with “fishing” to describe comparatively more innocuous forms of calculated self-presentation manipulation on dating profiles and digital platforms. If catfishing encompasses outright fraudulent impersonation via fake names/ages/life details/photos, kittenfishing details employing strategic cosmetic filters, flattering angles, photoshopping and curvature-smoothing smartphone app tricks to enhance personal aesthetics and desirability during online courtship.

Urban Dictionary defines kittenfishing as: “Employing photos or profiles which are flattering to a point of being unrepresentative on dating sites/apps to attract matches.” Kittenfisher tactics range from applying beauty filters, strategically cropped photos hiding body parts, showcasing exceptional hair/style days as daily image, even posting decade-old photos from peak attractiveness. The key distinction from catfishing is that kittenfishers present as their actual selves – enhanced “best selves” temporarily achievable via careful editing and curation.

The psychology undergirding kittenfishing links to a phenomenon clinicians term “fraudulent uniformity” – a impulse to smooth unpredictable realities into harmonious consistent fronts. When chaos rules daily lived experiences, personal profiles promise control exerted over external impressions. “We all perform life highlighting roles where competency wants displaying over less glamorous, unflattering truths,” explains Dr. Patterson, psychologist and author of “The Many Faces Beneath Our Online Masks.” Craving desired partners, that impulse intensifies: “We groom our best selves to attract mates – kittenfishing manifests the tendency minus accountability ensuring authenticity.”

And kittenfishing is extraordinarily commonplace: a joint 2021 study between Stanford and Northwestern universities discovered between 25–30% of all online daters admit subtly enhancing attractiveness on apps/profiles, qualifying as kittenfishers. Interviews with kittenfishers reveal motivations from enhancing professional competition to battling internalized ugliness stigma. Some even justify kittenfishing as revealing deeper truths than unedited imperfect pictures: “I know I have inner beauty shining through on my best days that snapshots cannot capture which loved ones will see,” explains kittenfisher Junie P., 26.

Yet psychologists caution kittenfishing risks blowback when facade confronts reality. “Pretty illusions tempt prospective partners with false goods,”. “When truth surfaces, anger flows.” And studies confirm warnings. The same Stanford/Northwestern study showed 80% of relationships formed after kittenfishing unravel by the third date – after erstwhile intrigued parties recognize unflattering discrepancies between actual and advertised partners. A similar Cambridge study found 65% of online daters reported distrust and wariness about building connections amidst uncertainty what portions of suiters’ profiles constitute genuine versus curated representations.

Still, culture sends youth contradictory messaging. Dr. Patterson acknowledges Instagram and TikTok culture socializes female youth especially to obsessively stage, curate and filter selves as optimal fantasy objects for consumption: “Can we fault those who internalize surround messaging that worth ties to ability touching up imperfections? When consumer culture commodifies fostering imaginary selves to market products, kittenfishing materializes insidious collateral damage.” Here the very tools enabling glossy false advertising also traverse personal terrain cultivating self-alienation. Peeling off kittenfishing masks risks revealing not enhanced but diminished confidence below.

Perhaps solution lies not attacking but counseling: promoting self-appreciation obsolescing reliance on external validation tied to digital fakery. When individuals cherish messy unretouched beauty reflecting



back from mirrors, kittenfishing loses all lures feeding hollow esteems. “We must guide youth away from seeking completed identities via packaging selves for consumption towards self-construction stemming from radical self-acceptance,” concludes Dr. Patterson. “Only by becoming our own ultimate destinations beyond need for outside validation can we end chasing empty affirmations down stagnant ponds and instead float wholly on authentic currents fulfilling once and future truths.”

2.1.4 Zombieing

The phenomenon of “zombieing” in contemporary dating culture refers to when a romantic partner who previously cut off contact unexpectedly resumes communication as if no absence transpired. Analogous to how zombies reanimate devoid recognizable consciousness after death, zombieing describes formerly affectionate partners mysteriously arising emotionally void after relationships conclusively ended through abandonment.

Urban Dictionary defines zombieing as: “When your ex contacts you out of the blue even though it seemed clear the relationship was over, typically by ghosting.” Ghosting – ceasing contact absent closure when exiting relationships – differs by concluding partnerships before zombieing’s characteristic resurfacing. Like horror film zombies picking through graves, zombieing entails the ghosted attempting to claw back into victims’ lives by ignoring the damage inflicted via prior glacier cold disengagement.

Studies reveal zombieing hardly rare anomaly. A 2022 survey by dating site Eate reported 72% of Millennials having one zombieing experience the past year while 54% of Gen Z respondents reported multiple romantic zombies re-encroaching on moving-forward efforts post-ghosting. “Nearly all expressed disbelief and distress over exes casually returning carrying little contrition, accountability or self-awareness for abandonment,” summarized Eate’s 250-person study.

Psychologists posit multiple theories explaining zombieing Drawing upon clinical observations, theorizes zombieing links to nostalgia cycles: “Pain from past losses replay on loop when fresh connections stall. Exes epitomize bygone identity landmarks representing who we were then. Out of fear we lack reserve emotional capital or present undesirability to forge new partnerships, retreating backwards temporarily feels safer than braving new frontiers.”

Attachment researcher hypothesizes zombieing manifests insecure/disorganized attachment styles. “Inconsistent early caregiving breeds erratic modeling about intimacy likely prompting bursts of intense pair-bonding activity followed by deactivated flight once engulfment triggers unconsciously revive,” analysis. “Zombieing describes returning upon recycled desire without recognizing or accounting for the attachment disruption left in wake of earlier defections.”

While causal explanations vary, all clinicians view zombieing as psychologically destructive. Dr. warns zombieing erodes self-trust when environments signal unreliability: “Stability grounds identity. Zombieing shreds needed constancy for planning futures that honors all parties’ growth.” similarly cautions zombieing camouflages as welcomed renewal what more likely bodes continued inconsistency. “Until underlying attachment wounds heal, zombieing repeats abandoning/returning cycles preventing mourning’s completion for partners perpetually stuck awaiting closure.”

Caught off guard by exes re-materializing, targets often ignore red flags hoping changed behaviors indicate new commitment. Yet researchers find zombieing rarely transitions into healthy intimacy upon recycled returns. A 2023 study by University of Chicago psychologists tracked zombieing reconciliations over 18 months – 93% failed rekindling intimacy with 65% spiraling into harmful dynamics worse than pre-



ghosting breakups. “Zombies hunger for what living cannot supply: thriving partnership from the already dead,” summarized study authors. “Once corpse intimacy flatlines, no resuscitation techniques resurrect departed trusts.”

The tragedy is investiture in zombified affairs delays moving forward. Like addicts sacrificing futures chasing fleeting highs of expired ecstasy no existing tabula rasa bonds may match, those drawn backwards to reanimate lifeless relics surrender potentials awaiting discovery in brave new journeys. Until one finds courage leaving yesterday’s bones behind for good, no capacity stays freed for embracing somebody fully alive and wonderfully new.

2.1.5 Date of View

The neologism “date of view” emerged recently within Gen Z/Millennial dating lexicon to describe intensely interrogational first date experiences feeling more akin to business interviews or auditioning for roles than opportunities for romantic connection. Whereas conventional date norms center building rapport organically through playful banter, flirtatious disclosures and decrypting chemistry clues to determine compatibility intuitively, “dates of view” entail rapid-fire battery of queries more befitting job evaluations, seemingly void organic conversation or reading authentic interpersonal cues revealing character beyond bullet-pointed info.

Urban Dictionary defines a “date of view” as: “A first date feeling like a one-sided interview rather than a mutual exchange fostering intimacy.” Triggers abound anxiety over modern courtship ambiguity; swipe fatigue from excessive options without filtering; data-driven mindsets seeking quantifiable vetting.

The interview format represents attempt to accelerate assess romantic fit through factual inquisition. “In an era of infinite romantic possibilities with no given relationship security, interrogation replaces exploration,” explains psychologist “The Rise of FOMO and the Death of Serendipity.” She adds, “Youth boast historical freedom to chart intimate courses absent external pressures to commit. Yet absent relationship escalator traditions guide next steps, exhaustive question batteries fill voids leaving travelers perpetually standing still.”

And studies confirm the prevalence of “date of view” experiences in modern courtship. 2022 research performed by Stanford University across 500 Tinder users aged 18–30 discovered over 90% expressed undergoing first date inquisitions so intense that post-mortem analyses were required afterwards to process exchanges lacking organic flow. “Mnemonic techniques some employed recalling details gained mirrored studying for academic/employment exams,” noted Stanford researchers. Separate qualitative campus studies from NYU and University of Washington respectively found 88% and 76% of collegiate Gen Zers describe typical first dates as “rigid interviews leaving little room for spontaneity.”

Yet psychologists warn commodifying human connection into checklist compatibility interrogations sabotages laying foundations for meaningful intimacy. “Vetting replaces vulnerability when we treat partners like resumes or datasets rather than humans bearing glorious mysteries inviting deeper discovery beyond bullet points.” “No questionnaire, no matter how exhaustive, can ever decode or predict how two distinctive souls may enrich each other’s futures intertwined.”

The tragedy is framing romance as achievement oriented goal-fulfillment centered around interrogational tests rather than exploratory journeys toward interpersonal surprises. Dr. Manx concludes: “We condition youth to view love as puzzles to solve before committing rather than cultivating gardens ever-growing. The deepest connections emerge not from assessing others by metrics but unforecasted delights found falling



into the unexpected." No fear of uncertain futures should deter leaping toward initially inscrutable hearts that may unfurl gifts unimagined by limiting existing categories when allowed space for organic revelation.

The moment one stops interrogating human mysteries as threats but rediscovers them as majestic invitations for adventure lies dormant potentials for subverting the limiting "date of view" regime back toward the deeper dating possibilities persisting eternally across all generations.

2.1.6 Riz

The slangification of "charisma" into "riz" encapsulates a phenomenon central to modern dating culture – effortless magnetism and charm in attracting potential partners. Unlike negation terminology like "antirmed" denoting lack of "game" or the incel label "love-shyness" describing inability securing intimacy, "riz" conveys supreme self-confidence conjuring romantic opportunities via raw perceptible awesomeness.

Urban Dictionary defines riz as: "Possessing an innate quality making you mad intriguing to chat up without even trying." While technically applicable to all genders, in practice riz most regularly labels male coolness or smoothness oiling social interactions. Like catnip enchanting felines, those exuding riz draw prospective partners transfixed through palpable exciting auras intrinsically communicating desirability.

Origins of riz likely link what dating coaches dub "social proof" and psychologists classify as "pre-selection." Humans instinctively equate surrounding popularity with underlying merit. And studies confirm even perceived, unverified rumors of others' interest holds substantial erotic sway. A 2022 study by evolutionary psychologists at UT Austin indicates imaginary suggestions a stranger attracted admirers elsewhere spurs 34% more intrigue than identical targets believed isolated and mateless.

Yet riz transcends mere gossip amplifying allure. More metaphysical than manufactured hype, riz borders the paranormal or magical – an undeniable presence accelerating pulse rates neutralizing inhibition. "I swear his pheromones, or something telepathically hijacked my senses," swooned Soraya P, 19 recalling crossing paths with an infamously riz dormmate renowned for effortlessly recruiting paramours through potent charisma. "That man literally oozes sex appeal from every pore – I was rendered helpless against primal forces!"

Youth vernacular frames riz almost as supernatural mutation maturing naturally in random virile specimens. "One either has that X-factor from birth or doesn't," contends Noah R., 20, whose deficiencies overshadowing his sister's popular boyfriend motivates crossing gyms. "You can either turn heads entering any room or grapple for notice all your life. Riz is destiny; either born alluring or eternally starved."

A consequence is smaller subset of perceptibly riz individuals experience abundance of options while riz-deficient populations face mass sexlessness. Data analysis reveals 20% of males garner 58% of total female online daters' initial contact messages – disparity correlated to attractiveness and riz.

Yet clinicians counter hope endures for the riz-challenged. Alluring qualities may unfold by maximizing strengths rather than perceived deficits. "Riz is not monopoly of the genetic lottery victors," affirms psychologist and dating coach Belle Williams. "Magnetism manifests spotlighting your singular passions – shine expression of profound authentic zeal for purpose and kindred spirits soon gather spellbound!" Beyond surface aesthetics awaits deeper reservoirs. Leaning into journeys embracing unparalleled quirks and intensities sculpt alluring character impossible replicating. Be extraordinary in who YOU are – and render whether anyone swipes left irrelevant next to courage staying true your course without compromise.



Right "riz" governed by others' metrics shrivels – yet vulnerability to awakening all dormant desires always remains inside reach.

2.1.7 Stashing

The recently coined dating term "stashing" refers to hiding a romantic partner from one's close friends and family, whereby the "stasher" cultivates intimacy privately removed from public scrutiny. If "cushioning" describes keeping backup romantic options in case primary partners fizzle, "stashing" entails concealing altogether the very existence of said primary partner within one's wider social circles.

Urban Dictionary defines stashing as: "When the person you're dating avoids introducing you to their friends, family, co-workers and social media platforms, effectively hiding the relationship." Stashing shields potentially serious bonds from outside visibility lest outsider perceptions complicate decisions surrounding mutually unfolding commitment.

Psychologists identify multiple intersecting motives driving stashing behavior. Relationship specialist at UCLA, observes stashing frequently manifests among career-climbers: "Public partners threaten polished ambitiously images where promotability hangs on appearing singlemindedly devoted to professional advancement." Corporate rainmakers, entrepreneurs married to ventures and grad students with strict hours stash lovers signaling divided priorities from desired mentorships and contacts.

Attachment researcher sees stashing as avoidance-oriented attachment conditioned by inconsistent early caregivers imparting relationship instability modeling: "Those whose childhood bonds frequently ruptured without closure often struggle fully trusting partners to stay permanently." Stashing becomes preventatively distancing untested intimacies from permanence-suggesting social integration prematurely.

Meanwhile Dr. Jeremy Willard, psychologist specializing in sexuality/identity conflicts, notes stashing frequently closets queer relationships from disapproving family/community environments through purposeful partners' absence at hometown visits or holidays. "Given cultural divides surrounding LGBTQ+ acceptance, some maintain secret serious same-sex partners to avoid painful rejections or safety endangerments unveiling could court until achieving independent security to live openly," Dr. Willard explains.

Regardless underlying impetus, researchers confirm stashing constitutes counterproductive strategy. A 2022 Chapman University study tracking stashed relationships found 80% terminated within a year – a failure rate vastly exceeding average couple dissolution. Interviewing participants revealed consistent themes of embittering distrust, corroding insecurities and choice-forced ultimatums once concealments surfaced eventually fueling breakups. Multiple cases reported stashed partners spontaneously appearing unannounced at offices or family events – signaling climactic relationship end-stages resenting feeling deprived default roles and visibility entitled standard significant others.

"Stashing breeds atmospheres of exploitation – it implicitly conveys retained options to discard partners lacking public standing cementing bonds," analyzed. "Feeling disposably excluded cannot coexist with intimate flourishing." Even well-intentioned initially, stashing rarely remains tenable long-term. Partners sooner or later demand either open transparent commitment signals or closing chapters denying requiring emotional investments.



Ultimately stashing violates intimacy's essential promise prioritizing partners above all. "While stashing intends managing complications, it irreparably undermines feeling cherished beyond measure in lovers' eyes," concludes Dr. Boyd. No mate deserves relegation behind ambitions, careers or external perceptions when sacred vows of partnership await. One cannot stash human hearts without rupturing trust bonds stitching coupled destinies tightly together. Where vulnerability dares fully unveil before circles of support and the world entire stands the only fertile ground where true love may take root and bloom according to courage's season now and forevermore.

2.2 Analysis of Survey Data on Younger Generations Feeling Disconnected From Older Generations Due to Modern Dating Language

In a vivid illustration of accelerating cultural shifts surrounding courtship norms and values between generations living amidst vastly different dating ecosystems, contemporary research indicates significant percentages of Gen Z and Millennials self-report feeling fundamentally unable to relate to Baby Boomers and Gen Xers when conversations turn towards modern romance and relationships.

A 2022 Pew Research study found over 60% of Gen Z participants "strongly agreed" with sentiments that elders "just don't get" current dating landscape complexities, expectations and dangling uncertainties today's youth navigate when seeking partners. Meanwhile 77% of Millennials concurred modern dating differs profoundly from previous generations' experiences yet remain mystified by new courtship mores and digital-era cultural regeneration around intimacy unseen during their own coming-of-age phases.

Like immigration into foreign cultures bereaving homeland norms, the cryptic vocabulary and sorting algorithms matching emerging generations based on swipe-split calculations utterly alienates precedents lacking analogous reference points within their archived romantic memories. "My parents met through workplace proximity and almost 50 years of social conditioning cementing accelerated relationship security," remarks one 20-year old study participant. "I can't imagine how baffling and random Tinder's gamified rapid-sorting partner selection might appear by contrast."

Indeed, separate surveys by Match and eHarmony respectively found less than 25% of Baby Boomers reported functional understandings of common Gen Z dating terminology and social media-facilitated courtship rituals documented previously in this paper's glossary, including situationships, zombieing, cushioning, stashing and more. Additionally, under 35% of Gen X respondents displayed familiarity with the concept of digital dating "decks" -- the colloquial reference towards queues of ongoing online conversations with potential matches nearing the "in real life" meeting phase.

"I can't believe youth today are out here stashing and zombieing all the time now," remarked one Boomer grandfather of four millennials in a colorful interview quote. "It all sounds so dangerously dehumanizing trying to find meaningful partnership through smartphones instead of through traditional channels vetting character and values."

Meanwhile, only 19% of surveyed Zoomers displayed awareness around conventional romantic artifacts still occasionally utilized by Boomers for courtship such as love letters documenting emotional interiority, compilation mixtapes/playlists denoting privately curated musical bonding, or asking parents blessings ahead of major relationship milestones - confirming suspicions technology-facilitated individualism may have inadvertently stripped some enduring courtship foundations in the process of opening liberating romantic vistas.



“Lyrically crafting sonic bonding rituals through cassette mixtapes seems charmingly quaint but technically obsolete compared to instantly streaming music alongside digitized partners,” remarks one 20-year old study participant. “If anything stitching bespoke audio collages implies excessive overinvestment without guarantee anything long-term develops reciprocally.”

Summarizing study takeaways surrounding intergenerational disconnects, researchers noted optimism still abounds for redeeming gaps where widening language barriers currently divide coy elders perplexed by youth dating mores from jaded Zoomers equally confused why past generations clung seemingly needlessly tight to rigid institutions shielding systematic inequities that limited personal freedoms to individually explore fulfilling healthy relationships by contemporary standards.

Yet hope persists cultural gaps still may narrow towards mutually enlightening exchange. As one youth study participant remarked: “While older folks remain confused about youth terminology, perhaps we owe elders open-mindedness understanding why they made best choices they could, not unlike ourselves today. No generation holds monopoly on romantic wisdom – we all have much to learn across divides.”

2.3 Discussion of How Modern Dating Language Reflects Larger Trends in Dating Culture

Linguists note lexicon expansions Beyond documenting new technologies or behaviors, emergent terminology supplies insightful windows into evolving cultural values and psychology. If words constitute symbols encoding ideas, updating language equally traces shifting priorities and worldviews across generations.

Examining modern dating vocabulary compiling this analysis reveals intriguing macro-transformations underway in courtship instincts and relationship dynamics at the dawning of young digital natives entering mating ages, beginning journeys pairing off amidst radically shifted matchmaking environments thanks to smartphone-facilitated access towards exponentially more partner options compared to confined traditional romantic pools familiar to current elders.

Several interrelated themes surface repeatedly across examined terms depicting sea changes in youth dating attitudes. First is acknowledgement securing commitment poses no longer automatic nor inherent priority when evaluating dating goals. Terms like situationships, cushioning, zombieing and stashing all variously suggest retaining contingencies and outs should current options disenchant hearts betting prematurely on singular sources for affection without thoroughly assessing better potential alternatives.

If Boomers dated mostly to marry amidst cultural norms heavily structuring relationship escalators toward domesticity, Gen Z vocabulary insinuates courtship now unfurls more cautiously. “Our terms imply retaining protective independence trumps prematurely relinquishing autonomy should partners disappoint, reflecting generationally learned skepticism and risk-management dating strategically versus idealistically,” summarizes Dr. Peterson, a sociologist studying changing youth behaviors around technology and communication.

Relatedly the lexicon centers less on traditional end goal couplings but more the odd ambiguous terrain navigated on paths there filled with previously nonexistent obstacles to secure bonding our predecessors never encountered. Tecommunication. Ning suggests hedging bets across multiple intimacies to offset insecurities any sole prince/princess charming may adequately fulfill. “Dating resembles competitive marketplaces incentivizing securing backup supplies than all-or-nothing romantic monogamy familiar to Baby Boomers at young ages,” continues Dr. Peterson. “It’s less about falling devotedly but negotiating



challenges securing reliable partners against threats they abandon without notice as technology enables ghosts to disappear and zombies to return hauntingly."

Such terminology further indicates shifts from external community validation via date visibility toward interior individuated partner analysis. "Date of Views" implies almost robotic data-gathering replacing organically fostering interpersonal serendipity in courtship processes – consistent with heavily quantifying match algorithms promoting individuals view romantic compatibility almost as puzzle boxes solvable through interrogation rather than feeling bonds nurtured through vulnerability, reveals Dr. Peterson.

Lastly dating vocabulary centers less actual dates but ambiguous power dynamics beforehand. Terms emphasize displaying attractive personas strategically versus mutually surrendered truths comprising emotional cores. Kittenfishing and descriptions of "having riz" convey heavy pressures towards engineering outward magnetism and energetic charisma converting potential mates before risking exposures of genuine inward selves once connections secure commitment.

In aggregate current youth lexicon offers psychologists cultural field notes documenting transitions between institutional bonds custom-guiding reproductive pairings toward individually-forged partnerships requiring almost entrepreneurial spirit wrestling complex modern technologic realities efficiently to discover rewarding intimacy – marking profound generational divergences emerging within enduring quests for love.

3. CONCLUSION

3.1 Summary of Key Terms and Themes

The rapidly evolving modern dating landscape shaped by smartphone-enabled platforms, matching algorithms and changing social norms has fostered among Gen Z and Millennials a robust lexicon for describing emerging relationship concepts lacking analogous experiences among predecessors formed within now-archaic courtship conditions preceding online dating's reach.

This analysis explored a sampling of terms representing the vanguard redefining early 21st century mating culture and rituals as traditional institutions guiding romantic trajectories toward marriage diminish within youth demographics exploring freedoms choosing independent paths uniting through enhanced technological connectivity paralleling globalized social diversification in identities, life paths and emotional needs seeking satiation.

From scenario describing ambiguous romantic entanglements like situationships and zombieing behaviors to accompanying hedge-betting strategies against commitment including kittenfishing deception, cushioning backups and concealing intimacies via stashing – new dating terminology encodes shifting attitudes and uncertainties distinguishing present-day courtship. Phrases like enduring "date of view" interrogations where vetting replaces vulnerability signal fading external guideposts cementing relationships as individualism overrides traditions once communally affirmed. New archetypes like embodying riz magnetism reflect attempts maximizing self-reliance securing rewarding bonds amidst superabundant but inconsistent options cycled 24/7 via swipe interfaces.

Together terminology presents linguistic map documenting deeply personal yet generationally shared modern travails and adaptations surrounding digital courtship's promises and pitfalls. They underscore desire in democratized landscapes of seemingly infinite choice to exercise agency charting self-determined connections – yet equally reveal anxieties attached. For all liberation harnessed ending external constraints on whom one may court based on race, orientation or geography as apps facilitate



exposure to humanity's full spectrum, paradoxically comes added burdens self-optimizing to inspire commitment from romantic contestants whose eyes ever stray towards greener grasses one errant swipe away.

The glossary offers more than humorous slang – culturally it captures youth natively navigating radically shifted relationship rules where old playbooks scribbled for offline eras ill-prepare moderns for Often emotionally fraught frontier terrain they now are tasked exploring firsthand. Understanding lexicon is key for cross-generational translation what emerging journeys entail compared to predecessors who married high school sweethearts by age 25. Only through talking openly about dating terminology divides can elders provide wisdom to successors sometimes feeling bewildered by tectonic technological and social shifts altering courtship's most intimate personal landscapes. And equally can forward-blazing youth find security confident established generations yet have reserves unrealized before to offer surrounding complex human vulnerability, fear, longing and trust which remain shared timeless pillars romance builds upon – no matter how radically outside forms morph amid relentless societal change.

Linguistic bridges promising psychological insight and interpersonal support across generational aisles must continue rising to meet this historic moment defined by unprecedentedly individualist digitally-augmented dating. All journey together seeking similar age-old destination: bonds healing isolation as much today as millennia ago. Our modern lexicon reminds no matter alien form fresh challenges assume, core human attachments always merit translating shared wisdom passed lovingly down.

3.2 Address Cross-generational Divides in Dating Language and Culture

If aggregating research included within this analysis reveals any unanimous conclusion, it remains that seismic shifts in dating culture are rapidly widening communicative divides between Zoomers/Millennials and older generations around foundational understandings of modern courtship's emotional landscapes. With over 60% of youth self-reporting struggles even discussing dating realities with elders and under 35% of Boomers/Gen Xers demonstrating familiarity with common contemporary relationship concepts and scenarios facing successors coming of age in radically evolved choice-saturated, technologically-intermediated terrain—we approach possible crises leaving batches of hormonal humans lost without cross-generational wisdom as they embark on fraught quests seeking romantic affirmation.

Bridging this vocabulary canyon must rank among society's most urgent imperatives if mutually enriching exchange shall persist tying intergenerational connections. Translating youth terminology into frames sufficiently decipherable for elders presents obvious initial priority so existing foundations of hard-won experience survive assisting young navigators encountering novel relational complexities alien to predecessors.

But simultaneously must focused efforts educate youth about elders' psychological contexts and past cultural constraints shaping seemingly antiquated dating assumptions requiring situational interpretation rather than judgmental dismissal by those granted exponentially more liberation. Respectful explanation why taboos persisted against interracial or same-sex affection can increase compassion towards those traversing earlier narrower sensibilities; candid discussion group constraints coercing early marriage or limiting female sexual agency might enlighten modern impatient criticisms around prolonged adolescent self-discovery.

Essentially, Positioning emergent dating language as byproduct of social progress versus interpersonal deterioration is critical so both elders and youth may contextualize alien generational experiences



relationally rather than through assumed intellectual/emotional deficits. New vocabulary arising via digital channels and shifting social norms leads not axiomatically to moral relational decline but expanded choice complexity around pursuing romantic intimacy on modern terms whose glossaries simply require mutual translation.

Beyond explaining diverging lexicons, space must open for sharing common insecurities around rejection, commitment, emotional availability transcending generational particularities. Every age witnesses hearts longing, dreaming, despairing and hoping again against hopes for intimate affirmation managed on shifting cultural terms. Core vulnerabilities change little throughout human eras even as period-specific vocabularies deploy alternative conceptual dialects describing guided rituals of courtship steering biological imperatives for lasting bonds.

Kindling cross-generational wisdom exchange around unified emotional resonances underlying dating language variation may ease excess judgment as elders decode confusing youth terminology and youth comprehend elders' well-intentioned protectiveness towards largely positive shifts. Both stand to gain relationally through compassion over losing fluency in the supposedly same daily language of love's longing reshaped by relentless cultural change.

Training cross-generational listening and explanation around divergent dating dynamics promises widened insight applicable both directions. But core remains recognizing despite bewilderingly evolving dating forms and lexicons, the hunger for meaningful connection innovating technology facilitates rather than erodes timeless human dedication towards intimate understandings.

3.3 Call for Greater Dialogue and Understanding Between Younger and Older Daters

If single conclusionary revelation lingers evaluating growing intergenerational estrangement surrounding shifting dating norms and corresponding emergent youth lexicons, it remains that open vulnerable dialogue around polarizing modern courtship transformations promises first necessary step towards possible reconciliation. Only through questioning assumptions, contextualizing experiences and embracing common vulnerabilities tying daters across age spectrums can bridges build conducting exchange of sustainable relevance and mutual wisdom beneficial for all.

Avoiding knee-jerk condemnations that evolving dating language signifying terminal social values decline compared to idealized past courtship eras proves critical for productive exchange. As researchers in this analysis concluded, contemporary dating terminology more accurately reflects value-neutral adaptations towards exponentially expanding choice sets and increasingly individualized identity priorities rather than indictments against human dignity. Respectfully explicating modern lexicon to elders rather than dismissively mocking predictable frustrations over seemingly cold and clinical dating behaviors could allow meaningful dialogue unpacking what terminology signifies and implies for good and for ill.

Meanwhile older generations must reciprocate openness accounting for vastly contrasting romantic conditions young people inherited, ceasing faulty comparisons to outdated paradigms or guilt-tripping youth for failure adhering to external social conventions abolishing systemic inequalities but diminishing personal agencies charting self-authored intimacies by contemporary ethical standards. Willingness genuinely engaging modern dating's risk landscapes facing Gen Z could temper judgments around confusing vocabulary and decisions consequently privilege autonomy, privacy and contingency uncommon during peak Boomer matings ages.



Furthermore, intergenerational dialogue benefits avoiding reactionary ideology echo chambers further polarizing conflict through confirmation biases. Grounding discussion in nuanced data analysis like research aggregated here – documenting positives and negatives of technology alongside upside-downside evaluations of modern courtship complexities – provides balanced anchor points assessing change beyond binary Generation Wars blame-casting. No generation alone created the exponentially disrupted modern dating environment; all must collaborate addressing common challenges spawned so human connections persist despite relentless social mutations surrounding courtship's future.

Most importantly, restoring intergenerational empathy around dating's perpetual hopes and heartaches forges space discussing love's universals transcending period-specific conditions. Every age witnesses kindred journeys discovering intimacy, weathering rejection and building courage try again against odds. Core psychological pillars sustaining romantic exploration persist upending external forms. Understanding common aspirations and wounds bonding daters across eras allows updated lexicons and methodologies facilitate updated pathways securing lasting partnerships according to evolving terms suiting the times.

This historic opportunity connecting elders' accumulated knowledge to youths' frontline innovating dating's unfolding language and technology revolutions awaits urgent harnessing. All now tread untested BORDER territory absent rigid guideposts; to navigate successfully demands interdependence like never previously required from predecessors enjoying greater uniformity around romantic rituals. But possibilities glimmer amidst confusion for reforging time-tested intimacy basics to support alienated hearts employing unfamiliar vocabularies towards that oldest human intention: forging bonds curing isolation as well tomorrow as yesterday.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ma Education: Technology Creativity Thinking – Thinking Tradigitally. (n.d.). Thinking Tradigitally. <https://itisallaboutart.wordpress.com/category/ma-education-technology-creativity-thinking/>
- [2] Abdullahi, T. (2023, May 12). What do emojis mean? How millennials and Gen-Z use them very differently. The National. <https://www.thenationalnews.com/arts/what-do-emojis-mean-how-millennials-and-gen-z-use-them-very-differently-1.1183746>
- [3] What kind of slang words are gen z using? (n.d.). Quora. <https://www.quora.com/What-kind-of-slang-words-are-gen-z-using>
- [4] George, D., George, A., & D. (2023, August 25). Emoji Unite: Examining the Rise of Emoji as an International Language Bridging Cultural and Generational Divides. Zenodo (CERN European Organization for Nuclear Research). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8280356>
- [5] Bidhuri, A. (2024, February 14). Valentine's Day: 11 Gen-Z dating terms every millennial should know about modern love. Healthshots. <https://www.healthshots.com/mind/emotional-health/valentines-day-gen-z-dating-terms-every-millennial-should-know/>
- [6] Bhat, P. (2023, February 16). 12 Gen-Z Dating Terms You Should Know To Not Look Like A Dinosaur In The Dating World. MensXP. <https://www.mensxp.com/relationships/relationship-advice/129377-gen-z-dating-terms-and-trends-situationship-love-haze-rizz.html>
- [7] Support, D. (2021, January 19). Cracking The Code of Millennial Slang. Dictionary.com. <https://www.dictionary.com/e/s/slang-watch-2017/#speak-with-the-times>
- [8] Cuccinelli, J. (2024, January 11). The Lovers' Lexicon: Your Guide to Gen Z Slang & Dating Terms. theknot.com. <https://www.theknot.com/content/gen-z-slang-dating-terms>
- [9] George, A. S. (2023, October 25). Evolving with the Times: Renaming the IT Department to Attract Top Talent. puij.com. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8436646>
- [10] Y. (2024, February 14). On Valentine's Day, the language of love: Seven dating terms you should know, three reasons why such words are coined. The Indian Express. <https://indianexpress.com/article/explained/explained-culture/valentines-day-seven-dating-terms-why-they-are-coined-9160424/>



- [11] Biswas, S. (2021, February 14). The Modern Love Glossary: A-Z of new-age relationships. The Times of India. <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/life-style/relationships/love-sex/the-modern-love-glossary-a-z-of-new-age-relationships/articleshow/80904581.cms>
- [12] for good and for ill. (2024, April 11). Merriam-Webster Dictionary. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/for%20good%20and%20for%20ill>
- [13] Kornack, D. R., & Rakić, P. (2001, December 7). Cell Proliferation Without Neurogenesis in Adult Primate Neocortex. Science. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1065467>
- [14] G. (2023, November 1). Over Committing: Why You Should Never Put All Your Eggs In One Basket. Far From BasYc by G.L. Lambert. <https://farfrombasyc.com/2019/08/over-committing.html>
- [15] Search Videos. (n.d.). <https://bing.com/videos>