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Abstract: The current research is aimed at exploring the "Development of SNS as a New Platform of Interaction Among Teenagers and its Consequences on Family Bonding." Data was collected from the teenage students of colleges and Schools. The present research is a survey-based study using Media Dependency and Uses & Gratification as its theoretical foundation keeping in view the major concepts. A sample of 400 respondents is selected using the purposive sampling technique. The main social interaction patterns are Audio Chat, Gif, Messages, and Video Chat. The analysis of findings reveals that WhatsApp more affects teenagers' social interaction patterns (68%). It is observed from the findings that Facebook more frequently affects teenagers' bonding with Friends (61%). A correlation test is applied in this study. The study's findings supported a positive relationship between the frequency of use of social media and the effects on social interaction patterns of teenagers in terms of communication, interaction, gathering and socialization. Social media has significantly affected youngsters in building bondings with friends as more sharing of feelings takes place with friends over distance instead of families.
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Introduction

The explosion of digital technologies has changed the way individuals interact with each other, but conventional ways of communication are still important and useful in targeting a target audience amid the emergence of websites, blogs, and social media. The traditional methods of communication are face-to-face communication, telephone communication, and broadcast media channels which include television and radio. People also interact with each other through letters. They sent letters to each other. But now, the communication and the methods of interaction are different. People now use SNS to interact with each other (Coleman et al., 2018). Social networking sites have gained a significant role in our daily lives. These sites are contributing not only contributing in our social life but also to religious and political spheres as well. Linking and contacting people has become very easy and simple (Sawyer & Chen, 2012).

The link between SNS and family relationships is the most important field which has been explored in the whole world. In this aspect, a flourishing concern associated with SNS has been noted to the growing reformation in the behavior and concern of people towards their families. Once a time when people in the world were more aware of relations, family issues, and their companions but the scheme
was altered in the late time. Persons who spend more time with their parents and their relatives now spend a lot of time using SNS like TikTok, Facebook, WhatsApp, Instagram and YouTube. It has been a dispute that because of the excessive use of these applications, a lot of families are now missing the close emotional promises that are productive when they have more social contact (Dovidio et al., 2011).

This shows that SNS have an impact lot on family relationships. Significant usage of SNS has been found to take part in the loneliness of teenagers as they are confined to their rooms only and they all skip the family parties. Teenagers who are used to the usage of SNS do not understand the blackness of time. In Pakistan and in the whole globe, a lot of use of SNS is a hazard for teenagers (abid).

The growing vague of SNS are dramatic characteristics of modern human society, especially among teenagers. They are the hugest users of SNS like TikTok, Facebook, WhatsApp, Instagram and YouTube. The most important facts that were in social media statistics observed that in 2014 Instagram was the most important cherished social media application of 23% of teenagers and also the social media statistics of YouTube that were observed in 2014 shows that 40% of teenagers use YouTube on mobile phones. According to McAfee’s report (2014), 66% of teenagers use more interest in SNS than in other persons. When they transfer their pictures, 72% of teenagers have a wish that they receive likes from their friends and family circles. 72% of them feel more excited and they feel that they become famous when they receive more likes and comments and when no one likes their pictures, they become sad (Kumari & Verma, 2015).

**Literature Review**

With regards to B. Bi. (2013) in this blog post, researcher plan to examine YouTube's design patterns and function to explain impacts among its users on social behavior. Crumlish and Malone (2012) pointed out, to continue with interface patterns, that interaction patterns allow users to communicate with the material and with each other. Therefore, the interface framework of YouTube collaborates with patterns of engagement such as; sign in, subscribe networks, stream operation, messages, tags, chat, suggestions, etc.

Amanda (2020), in his research, explores and addresses how teenagers who use social media who conducted motivations of social interaction directly and indirectly, and the effect on their psychological aspects, have social interactions. Using a qualitative approach to this study, Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) is the theoretical analysis used. This research examined three instances of teens utilizing social media with an average 7-10 hours of social media use per day. All three examples illustrate how teens utilize social media to communicate. The results show that adolescents participate with constructive motivations such as bonding, group discussion, company, and also language skills development in social interactions. Additionally, two detrimental motivations have been shown, namely vengeance and the urge to go down. High levels of social media use cause a poor standard of direct interaction. Adolescents get more distracted by their mobile phones and don't pay attention to the environment. According to Westenberg (2016), Teenagers now exist in a world of smartphones, so they cannot recall a period before social media. By the age 10, several teenagers are involved in social media.

According to Westenberg (2016), the goal of this analysis is to provide a summary of the modern YouTube culture, including the influence Dutch You Tubers have on their adolescent viewers and the degree to which that effect is positive or bad for their lives. Using a semi-structured interview method, this research takes a methodological approach to the review. The research notes and incorporates the findings on both teens and YouTubers. The study involves 16 in-depth interviews, especially with 20 teens and 4 in-depth interviews with 4 YouTubers in general.

**Theoretical Framework**

Quantitative studies always take insights from existing theoretical perspectives. These theoretical perspectives guide the selection of major concepts and execution of the research study overall. The present study has taken Uses and Gratification mainly because users select different mediums according to their own will and every medium has its unique characteristics which satisfy certain needs of the users. Secondly, media dependency explains about consequences in terms of our perception of the
world as a result of our exposure to a different medium. Dependency over certain mediums will bring about a change in our existing value system as social media has emerged as new media where users have a different experience of interaction, sharing, exchange and bondings. The present study, by utilizing these theories, will look for the effects of social networking sites on the lives of teenagers.

**Research Design**

The present study has used survey research design to study the development of SNS as a new platform of interaction among teenagers and its consequences on family bonding. Data has been gathered from the students of colleges and schools. A sample of 400 respondents was selected using the purposive sampling technique.

**Findings**

Social media usage has been a rising phenomenon, especially after the outbreak of COVID-19. Social networking sites have led youth towards a new form of interaction and communication patterns. The present study is based on the study development of SNS as a new platform of interaction among teenagers and its consequences on family bonding. Major findings of the study are given below:

| Variable | Scale | Overall | 13-16 y | 17-19 y | Male | Female |
|----------|-------|---------|---------|---------|------|--------|
| Facebook affects our social interaction patterns | Very Much | 40 | 42 | 39 | 38 | 42.4 |
| | Much | 25 | 20 | 26 | 26 | 22.1 |
| | Somewhat | 14 | 20 | 12 | 15 | 11.6 |
| | Little | 11 | 7 | 12 | 10 | 12.2 |
| | Not at all | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11.0 |
| | Very Much | 26 | 22 | 27 | 29 | 21.5 |
| | Much | 28 | 26 | 28 | 27 | 28.5 |
| | Somewhat | 16 | 17 | 15 | 13 | 19.2 |
| | Little | 16 | 17 | 15 | 14 | 17.4 |
| | Not at all | 16 | 19 | 15 | 18 | 13.4 |
| | Very Much | 39 | 44 | 38 | 39 | 39.0 |
| | Much | 17 | 11 | 18 | 14 | 19.2 |
| | Somewhat | 11 | 10 | 12 | 13 | 8.7 |
| | Little | 11 | 14 | 10 | 11 | 10.5 |
| | Not at all | 23 | 21 | 23 | 23 | 22.7 |
| | Very Much | 43 | 44 | 42 | 42 | 43.6 |
| | Much | 25 | 29 | 23 | 25 | 23.8 |
| | Somewhat | 13 | 9 | 14 | 11 | 15.7 |
| | Little | 11 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 12.8 |
| | Not at all | 9 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 4.1 |
| | Very Much | 26 | 22 | 27 | 29 | 20.3 |
| | Much | 25 | 20 | 26 | 24 | 25.0 |
| | Somewhat | 23 | 23 | 23 | 20 | 26.2 |
| | Little | 16 | 23 | 13 | 11 | 22.1 |
| | Not at all | 12 | 13 | 11 | 15 | 6.4 |

*Figure shows the percentage*

Table 1 shows that SNS affect teenagers' social interaction patterns. Empirical findings reveal that WhatsApp more affects teenagers' social interaction patterns (68%), Facebook (65%), TikTok (56%), Instagram (54%), and YouTube (51%).
Table 2. SNS (Facebook) Effects on Bonding with Family, Relatives, Peers, and Friends

| Variable                                      | Scale       | Overall | 13-16 y | 17-19 y | Male | Female |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|------|--------|
| Facebook affects bonding with our Family      | Very Much   | 32      | 39      | 30      | 32   | 32.6   |
|                                               | Much        | 20      | 21      | 20      | 21   | 18.0   |
|                                               | Somewhat    | 12      | 8       | 13      | 8    | 16.3   |
|                                               | Little      | 17      | 21      | 15      | 17   | 16.3   |
|                                               | Not at all  | 20      | 11      | 22      | 21   | 16.9   |
|                                               | Very Much   | 31      | 31      | 31      | 30   | 32.0   |
|                                               | Much        | 30      | 32      | 29      | 30   | 29.1   |
| Facebook affects bonding with our friends     | Somewhat    | 14      | 13      | 14      | 14   | 13.4   |
|                                               | Little      | 13      | 11      | 13      | 12   | 13.4   |
|                                               | Not at all  | 14      | 13      | 14      | 15   | 12.2   |
|                                               | Very Much   | 14      | 16      | 13      | 14   | 14.0   |
|                                               | Much        | 24      | 23      | 24      | 26   | 20.9   |
| Facebook affects bonding with our peers       | Somewhat    | 25      | 25      | 25      | 23   | 27.9   |
|                                               | Little      | 18      | 22      | 17      | 19   | 16.9   |
|                                               | Not at all  | 19      | 15      | 20      | 18   | 20.3   |
|                                               | Very Much   | 19      | 19      | 19      | 17   | 20.9   |
|                                               | Much        | 24      | 23      | 24      | 26   | 20.9   |
| Facebook affects bonding with our relatives   | Somewhat    | 18      | 22      | 16      | 17   | 18.6   |
|                                               | Little      | 24      | 31      | 21      | 24   | 23.3   |
|                                               | Not at all  | 23      | 16      | 25      | 23   | 22.1   |

*Figure shows the percentage*

Table 2 shows SNS affects teenagers’ bonding with Family, relatives, peers, and friends. Empirical findings reveal that Facebook more frequently affects teenagers bonding with Friends (61%) as compared to Facebook affecting teenagers bonding with Family (52%), Facebook affects teenagers bonding with Peers (38%), and Facebook affects teenagers bonding with Relatives (36%).

Table 3. SNS (Insta) Effects on Bonding with Family, Relatives, Peers, and Friends

| Variable                                      | Scale       | Overall | 13-16 y | 17-19 y | Male | Female |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|------|--------|
| Instagram affects bonding with our Family    | Very Much   | 17      | 14      | 17      | 18   | 14.5   |
|                                               | Much        | 14      | 17      | 13      | 16   | 11.6   |
|                                               | Somewhat    | 12      | 10      | 12      | 9    | 15.7   |
|                                               | Little      | 18      | 24      | 16      | 16   | 20.3   |
|                                               | Not at all  | 40      | 35      | 41      | 41   | 37.8   |
|                                               | Very Much   | 14      | 15      | 13      | 14   | 12.8   |
|                                               | Much        | 24      | 23      | 24      | 26   | 21.5   |
| Instagram affects bonding with our Friends   | Somewhat    | 11      | 10      | 11      | 8    | 14.5   |
|                                               | Little      | 17      | 22      | 15      | 17   | 17.4   |
|                                               | Not at all  | 35      | 30      | 36      | 35   | 33.7   |
|                                               | Very Much   | 9       | 8       | 9       | 9    | 8.1    |
|                                               | Much        | 14      | 16      | 13      | 15   | 12.2   |
| Instagram affects bonding with our Peers      | Somewhat    | 17      | 16      | 17      | 18   | 16.3   |
|                                               | Little      | 19      | 26      | 16      | 17   | 20.9   |
|                                               | Not at all  | 42      | 34      | 44      | 42   | 42.4   |
|                                               | Very Much   | 10      | 10      | 10      | 11   | 8.7    |
|                                               | Much        | 13      | 14      | 13      | 15   | 9.3    |
Table 3 shows SNS affect teenagers' bonding with Family, relatives, peers, and friends. Empirical findings reveal that Instagram more frequently affects teenagers bonding with Friends (38%) as compared to Facebook equally affects teenagers bonding with Peers and Relatives (23%).

Table 4 shows SNS (TikTok) affects teenagers' bonding with Family, Relatives, Peers, and Friends. Empirical findings reveal that TikTok more frequently affects teenagers bonding with Friends (40%) as compared to TikTok affecting teenagers bonding with Family (32%), TikTok affects teenagers bonding with Relatives (31%), and TikTok affects teenagers bonding with Peers (30%).

Table 5 shows SNS affects teenagers' bonding with Family, relatives, peers, and friends. Empirical findings reveal that TikTok more frequently affects teenagers bonding with Friends (40%) as compared to TikTok affecting teenagers bonding with Family (32%), TikTok affects teenagers bonding with Relatives (31%), and TikTok affects teenagers bonding with Peers (30%).
Table 5 shows SNS affects teenagers' bonding with Family, relatives, peers, and friends. Empirical findings reveal that WhatsApp more frequently affects teenagers bonding with Family (68%) as compared to WhatsApp affects teenagers bonding with Friends (66%), WhatsApp affects teenagers bonding with Relatives (54%), and WhatsApp affects teenagers bonding with Peers (47%).

Table 6. SNS (YouTube) Effects on Bonding with Family, Relatives, Peers, and Friends

| Variable                     | Scale       | Overall | 13-16 y | 17-19 y | Male  | Female |
|------------------------------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|-------|--------|
| WhatsApp affects bonding with our Friends | Very Much   | 50      | 56      | 48      | 50    | 50.6   |
|                              | Much        | 16      | 18      | 15      | 17    | 15.1   |
|                              | Somewhat    | 13      | 11      | 13      | 11    | 15.7   |
|                              | Little      | 9       | 9       | 9       | 11    | 5.8    |
|                              | Not at all  | 12      | 5       | 14      | 11    | 12.8   |
|                              | Very Much   | 27      | 26      | 28      | 30    | 23.8   |
|                              | Much        | 20      | 19      | 20      | 19    | 20.3   |
| WhatsApp affects bonding with our Peers | Somewhat    | 23      | 28      | 21      | 21    | 25.0   |
|                              | Little      | 15      | 17      | 14      | 14    | 15.1   |
|                              | Not at all  | 16      | 10      | 18      | 17    | 15.7   |
|                              | Very Much   | 32      | 34      | 31      | 33    | 29.1   |
|                              | Much        | 22      | 20      | 18      | 15    | 23.8   |
| WhatsApp affects bonding with our Relatives | Somewhat    | 19      | 20      | 18      | 15    | 23.8   |
|                              | Little      | 12      | 11      | 12      | 14    | 8.7    |
|                              | Not at all  | 16      | 8       | 18      | 16    | 15.7   |

*Figure shows the percentage
Table 6 shows SNS affects teenagers bonding with Family, relatives, peers, and friends. Empirical findings reveal that YouTube more frequently affects teenagers bonding with Friends (35%) as compared to YouTube affects teenagers bonding with Family (32%), YouTube affects teenagers bonding with Relatives (23%), and YouTube affects teenagers bonding with Peers (22%).

Table 7. SNS and Relationship Problems

| Variable                  | Scale       | Overall | 13-16 y | 17-19 y | Male | Female |
|---------------------------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|------|--------|
|                           |             |         |         |         |      |        |
| Aggression                | Very Much   | 26      | 24      | 27      | 26   | 26.2   |
|                           | Much        | 24      | 24      | 24      | 24   | 23.8   |
| Somewhat                  |             |         |         |         |      |        |
| Little                    |             | 13      | 9       | 13      | 12   | 12.8   |
| Not at all                |             | 13      | 15      | 12      | 15   | 9.3    |
| Very Much                 |             | 21      | 16      | 22      | 24   | 16.3   |
| Much                      |             | 37      | 41      | 36      | 36   | 37.2   |
| Communication Gap         | Somewhat    | 18      | 16      | 18      | 17   | 19.2   |
|                           | Little      | 13      | 17      | 12      | 10   | 16.3   |
|                           | Not at all  | 12      | 11      | 13      | 13   | 11.0   |
|                           | Very Much   | 19      | 23      | 18      | 18   | 19.8   |
|                           | Much        | 25      | 22      | 25      | 27   | 20.9   |
| Isolation Problem         | Somewhat    | 22      | 18      | 23      | 21   | 22.7   |
|                           | Little      | 18      | 20      | 17      | 16   | 20.3   |
|                           | Not at all  | 17      | 18      | 17      | 18   | 16.3   |
|                           | Very Much   | 21      | 19      | 21      | 23   | 17.4   |
|                           | Much        | 30      | 29      | 31      | 29   | 31.4   |
| Understanding your Family | Somewhat    | 21      | 19      | 21      | 21   | 20.9   |
|                           | Little      | 17      | 18      | 16      | 14   | 20.3   |
|                           | Not at all  | 12      | 16      | 11      | 13   | 9.9    |
|                           | Very Much   | 13      | 9       | 14      | 16   | 8.1    |
|                           | Much        | 25      | 22      | 25      | 24   | 25.0   |
| Understanding your Peers  | Somewhat    | 22      | 22      | 21      | 21   | 22.7   |
|                           | Little      | 22      | 26      | 20      | 20   | 24.4   |
|                           | Not at all  | 20      | 21      | 19      | 19   | 19.8   |

*Figure shows the percentage*

Table 7 depicts the relationship problems faced by teenagers as a result of frequent interaction on SNS. Empirical findings reveal that teenagers face the Communication Gap problem by spending more time using SNS (58%) as compared to Understanding with Family (51%), Aggressiveness (50%), Isolation (44%), and Understanding with Peers (38%).

Table 8. Ways of Social Interaction on SNS

| Variable                           | Scale       | Overall | 13-16 y | 17-19 y | Male | Female |
|------------------------------------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|------|--------|
| The extent of interacting socially |             |         |         |         |      |        |
| through Audio Chat                 | Very Much   | 27      | 24      | 28      | 25   | 29.7   |
|                                    | Much        | 26      | 23      | 27      | 25   | 27.3   |
|                                    | Somewhat    | 19      | 23      | 18      | 17   | 21.5   |
|                                    | Little      | 12      | 15      | 12      | 11   | 14.0   |
|                                    | Not at all  | 16      | 16      | 15      | 21   | 7.6    |
|                                    | Very Much   | 12      | 13      | 12      | 12   | 11.0   |
|                                    | Much        | 12      | 14      | 12      | 12   | 12.2   |
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Table 8 shows the methods that teenagers use to interact socially on SNS. Empirical findings reveal that teenagers more use the method of Messages to interact socially on SNS (83%) as compared to Audio Chat (53%), Video Chat (39%), and Gif (24%).

Table 9. Preference of social media over traditional media

| Variable | Scale     | Overall | 13-16 y | 17-19 y | Male | Female |
|----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|------|--------|
|          |           |         |         |         |      |        |
|          | Somewhat  | 20      | 22      | 19      | 17   | 23.8   |
|          | Little    | 24      | 24      | 24      | 21   | 27.9   |
|          | Not at all| 32      | 28      | 34      | 38   | 25.0   |
|          | Very Much | 57      | 59      | 57      | 54   | 61.0   |
|          | Much      | 26      | 23      | 26      | 29   | 20.9   |
|          |           |         |         |         |      |        |
|          | Somewhat  | 8       | 11      | 6       | 7    | 8.7    |
|          | Little    | 6       | 4       | 7       | 5    | 7.0    |
|          | Not at all| 4       | 2       | 4       | 5    | 2.3    |
|          | Very Much | 19      | 24      | 17      | 19   | 18.0   |
|          | Much      | 20      | 25      | 19      | 21   | 19.8   |
|          |           |         |         |         |      |        |
|          | Somewhat  | 18      | 14      | 19      | 11   | 26.7   |
|          | Little    | 20      | 20      | 20      | 21   | 17.4   |
|          | Not at all| 23      | 18      | 25      | 27   | 18.0   |

*Figure shows the percentage*
Because of User Friendly prefer social media over traditional media

| Variable | Scale | Overall | 13-16 y | 17-19 y | Male | Female |
|----------|-------|---------|---------|---------|------|--------|
|          |       |         |         |         |      |        |
| Much     | 38    | 47      | 35      | 37      | 38.4 |
| Somewhat | 11    | 8       | 12      | 11      | 9.9  |
| Little   | 9     | 9       | 9       | 8       | 9.9  |
| Not at all | 10   | 6       | 11      | 12      | 7.0  |

*Figure shows the percentage*

Table 9 shows the preference for social media over traditional media. The empirical finding reveals that teenagers prefer social media over traditional media because social media has the feature of Speedy Information Transfer (81%) as compared to Ease to communicate (79%), Freedom of Expression (73%), Time Saving (71%), User Friendly (71%) and Anonymity (40%).

**Table 10. Correlation Test**

| Frequency USM App | SIP Bonding | Relationship liking | Interaction | Reduced Activities |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------|--------------------|
|                   | Pearson     | Sig. (2-tailed)     |             |                    |
| USM = using of SNS, SIP = social interaction patterns, SM = social media, TM = traditional media |
| Correlation       | .157 **     | .002                 | .033        |                    |
| N                 | 399         | 400                  | 400         | 400                |
| **.** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). |
| *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). |

Results suggest that there is a positive relationship between the frequency of usage of social networking sites and its effect on social interaction, family bondings, relationship issues and interaction with Family and peers. Similarly, social media contribute to the reduction of physical or out door activities.

**Summary and Discussion**

The present study has used survey research design to study the development of SNS as a new platform of interaction among teenagers and its consequences on family bonding." Data was collected from the students at colleges and Schools. A sample of 400 respondents was selected using the purposive sampling technique. The present study has taken Uses and Gratification mainly because users select different mediums according to their own will and every medium has its unique characteristics which satisfy certain needs of the users. Secondly, media dependency explains about consequences in terms of our perception of the world as a result of our exposure to a different medium. Dependency over certain mediums will bring about a change in our existing value system as social media has emerged as new media where users have a different experience of interaction, sharing, exchange and bondings. The present study, by utilizing these theories, will look for the effects of social networking sites on the lives of teenagers.

The traditional methods of communication are face-to-face communication, telephone communication, and broadcast media channels which include television and radio. People also interact with each other through letters. They sent letters to each other. But now, the communication and the methods of interaction are totally different. People now use SNS to interact with each other.

Findings regarding the research question about the SNS affect our social interaction patterns revealed that WhatsApp more affects our social interaction patterns (see Table 1). Among the age group, WhatsApp has more affects social interaction patterns on 13–16-year teenagers. It is also observed that WhatsApp has more effects on females’ social interaction patterns than on male teenagers’ social interaction patterns.

Findings regarding the research question to which extent the use of SNS affects your bonding with your Family, relatives, peers and friends revealed that Facebook more frequently affects
teenagers bonding with friends (see Table 2). Among the age group, Facebook more frequently affects 13-16 year teenagers bonding with Friends as compared to 17-19 year teenagers bonding with Friends. It is also observed that Facebook more frequently affects females bonding with Friends than male teenagers bonding with Friends.

Findings regarding the research question to which extent the use of SNS affects your bonding with your Family, relatives, peers and friends revealed that Instagram more frequently affects teenagers bonding with friends (see Table 3). Among the age group, Instagram more frequently affects on 13-16 year teenagers bonding with Friends as compared to 17-19 year teenagers bonding with Friends. It is also observed that Instagram more frequently affects on males bonding with Friends than female teenagers bonding with Friends.

Findings regarding the research question to which extent the use of SNS affects your bonding with your Family, relatives, peers and friends revealed that TikTok more frequently affects teenagers bonding with friends (see Table 4). Among the age group, TikTok more frequently affects 13-16 year teenagers bonding with Friends as compared to 17-19 year teenagers bonding with Friends. It is also observed that TikTok more frequently affects males bonding with Friends than female teenagers bonding with Friends.

Findings regarding the research question to which extent the use of SNS affects your bonding with your Family, relatives, peers and friends revealed that WhatsApp more frequently affects teenagers bonding with Family (see Table 5). Among the age group, WhatsApp more frequently affects 13-16 year teenagers bonding with Family as compared to 17-19 year teenagers bonding with Family. It is also observed that WhatsApp more frequently affects females bonding with Family than male teenagers bonding with families.

Findings regarding the research question to which extent the following relationship problems you face by spending more time on using SNS revealed that teenagers more face Communication Gap problem by spending more time on using SNS (see Table 7). Among the age group, 17-19 year teenagers face more Communication Gap problems by spending more time using SNS as compared to 13-16 year teenagers. It is also observed that males face more Communication Gap problems by spending more time using SNS than female teenagers.

Findings regarding the research question to what extent do you prefer social media over traditional media revealed that teenagers prefer social media over traditional media because social media has the feature of Speedy Information Transfer (see Table 8). Among the age group, 13-16 year teenagers prefer social media over traditional media because of Speedy Information Transfer as compared to 17-19 year teenagers. It is also observed that males prefer social media over traditional media because social media has Speedy Information Transfer than female teenagers' preference.

It can be concluded from the findings of the present study that Social media has significantly affected youngsters in building bondings with friends as more sharing of feelings take place with friends over distance instead of Family.
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