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Abstract
This research paper aims to make a cross-national study about trust in Facebook ads (FB-ads) and Traditional Media ads (TM-ads), according to a sample of audiences from Egypt (EG) and Saudi Arabia (SA). The research based on an e-questionnaire, which was prepared after reviewing a number of literatures and semi-structured interviews. The validity of survey instrument and the reliability of the gathering data were tested. The questionnaire was prepared to explore the opinions of Facebook users from EG & SA. Data were collected through, “Facebook” & “Google Drive”. In total 812 respondents responded to the questionnaire, after canceling unsuitable cases. This total includes 428 Egyptians and 384 Saudis. It provides useful information for advertisers about impacts of Gender, Age and Education on the trust in FB-ads & TM-ads, according to Egyptians & Saudis. The paper offers new areas for future research.
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1. Introduction
The continued increase in the users’ number of internet members is clear. According to (IWS, 2013), the world total number of internet active users represented 3.29 billion in the end of March 2013. In the last years, the increase in marketing activities on social media has been phenomenal (Tsai and Men, 2012). No one can ignore the importance of virtual relationships on people lives (Baltar and Brunet, 2011). Marketers should take into consideration the changes required depending on Globalization, especially about the mass media with their targeted customers. In 2004, Mark Zuckerberg started the social network Facebook at Harvard University (Hansson et al., 2013 and Light & McGrath, 2010). Today; Facebook is the world’s most successful social networking corporation (Hansson et al., 2013). Facebook has gained the widest acceptance among internet users (Pillai & Mukherjee, 2011). Facebook is no longer a preserve of individuals, but for commercial corporations, governmental departments and non-profit organizations (Makori, 2011; Merilainen & Vos, 2011 and Srimamesh, 2012). 66% of the Fortune’ 500 companies surged in 2012 have official corporate accounts in Facebook (Okazaki & Taylor, 2013). So, no advertiser can ignore the outstanding position of Facebook network among the other Online Social Networks OSNs. Based on the Facebook report of Q3/2013, Facebook has approximately 1.15 billion active accounts. Facebook receives its income from the marketing & advertising activities of companies through users’ pages (Hansson et al., 2013). According to the Facebook report of Q2/2013, around 88% of Facebook revenues were formed through ad activities, with 61% increasing percentage (Facebook, 2013 and Computerworld, 2013). Although the first ad of Facebook on mobile devices just started 2012, but its revenue reached 41% of total Facebook ad-revenues in 2013. The internet is an inherently risky environment according to the absence of personal contact (Brengman & Karimov, 2012). The popularity of Facebook has grown commonly in recent years Word-Of-Mouth (WOM) or e-WOM effects need to be considered (Coulter & Roggeveen, 2012). Facebook pages could save money of attracting new clients (Royo-Vela & Casamassima, 2010), and they could help in building customers loyalty by effective communications with them (Abdelkadr, 2011-b). Trust is important in e-commerce, because it decreases uncertainty, perceived risk and positively affects purchase intentions (Brengman & Karimov, 2012 and Hansson et al., 2013). In general, perceived trust is very significant to achieve effective ad, especially for global business (Munoz-Leiva et al., 2012).

To date, there have been only a very limited number of cross-national studies about international advertising (Okazaki & Taylor, 2013). According to the statistics of UN (2013), number of Population in the 22 Arabian countries exceeds 370 million. EG is the biggest Arabian country with more than 83 million and SA has more than 29 million. According to Facebook (2013) and Socialbakers (2013), the rate of Facebook users/population of May 2013 in EG was 16.17% while in SA was 21.38%. The increase rate of Facebook users between March 2012 and May 2013 in EG was 22.24% with 13 million users, while in SA was 4.98% with 5.5 million users.

The total expenditures on ads represent one of the biggest industries in all over the world (Abdelkader, 2011-a).
According to Zenithmedia (2013), the total world expenditure on ads exceeded $503 billion by the end of 2012. The average of annual growth between 2012 & 2013 is 3.5% with an estimation to represent 5.9% by the end of 2015. Internet ads represented the fastest increase rate among all media with 16.4%, while mobile ads represented 9.5% of internet. The percentages of the most common media to the total are as follows: television 40%, internet 18.3%, newspaper 18.7%, magazine 8.5%, radio 7%, outdoor 6.9%, cinema 0.6%. According to PARC (2013), the total expenditures of ads in all Arabian countries exceeded $17 billion by the end of 2012 with 19% increase rate comparing with 2011 (without internet ads). Although the high rates of using internet and Facebook in Arabian countries, but the traditional media is still the common usage in Arabian markets. According to the statistics of 2012, the percentages of the most common media to the total are as follows: television 69%, newspaper 21%, magazine 5%, radio 2%, outdoor 1%, cinema 0.2%. In 2012 Egypt expended $1.13 billion, with 17% increasing rate comparing with 2011. Saudi Arabia expended $1.43 billion, with 8% increase rate comparing with 2011.

This research explores the variation among some variables from a cross-national prospective between EG & SA as follows:

- The effectiveness of users’ trust in FB-ads & TM-ads and their usefulness to advertisers.
- The Impacts of Gender, Age and Education on the degree of the trust in FB-ads & TM-ads.

2. Literature review

2.1 Advertising:

Advertisement is one of the main marketing activities. There are significant correlations between successful business & effective ad (Abdelkader, 2011-a). Advertising is no longer a preserve of profit organizations, but also serves other forms of activities like; governmental departments and non-profit organizations. Advertisers know very well the importance of AIDA approach. It describes a common list of events that may occur when a consumer engages with an advertisement which includes Attention, Interesting, Desire and Action. The first instance of AIDA acronym was in an article by C.P. Russell in 1921 (Coolsen, 1947). This approach helps in explaining the reasons of different reactions of audiences about the same ad.

2.2 Social Network Sites:

Social Network Site (SNS) is defined as a websites that make it possible for people to form online communities, and share user-created contents (Kim et al., 2010) or user-generated contents (Harris, 2012). Researches refer to social networks by many acronyms & expressions; Social Network (SN) (Pillai & Mukherjee, 2011), Electronic Social Network (e-SN) (Makori, 2011), Social Network Site (SNSs) (Brengman & Karimov, 2012 and Beer & Burrows, 2010), Online Social Network (OSN) (Pinho, 2013), Social Network Online Community (SNOC) and Social media (SM), but all of them mean the same meaning (Park & Cho, 2012). The prominent categories of SNSs are public (e.g. Facebook) or for business (e.g. Linkden). Some of SNSs may fit B2C, while others fit B2B (Pillai & Mukherjee, 2011). Facebook is one of the best examples of SNSs, which allows user content creation (Brengman & Karimov, 2012). Market orientation is positively related to social networking (Assis-Dorr & Palacios-Márquez, 2012). Strong social networks in general tend to develop pioneering (Parra-Requena et al., 2011). It may be used in brand management or even in online games (Chen et al., 2012 and Jin, 2012). This technology that has not yet reached its zenith and organizations have many avenues left still to explore using it (Bierman & Valentino, 2011).

2.3 FB-ads:

Facebook is a social networking site that was founded in the USA in 2004, by a Harvard University student, Mark Zuckerberg (Hansson et al., 2013 and Light & McGrath, 2010). In September 2006 it granted access rights to anyone, regardless of affiliation. In April 2010, Facebook has over 400 million active users; this number reached to 1.15 billion in the Jun 2013 (Facebook, 2013). Facebook is a very successful business and it is the leader of the in social media corporations. It has a current valuation of $85 billion, profit of $11 billion and it aims to have a market value of $234 billion in 2015 (Lilley et al., 2012 and Rosoff, 2011). Revenue is primarily obtained from companies willing to pay for access to members and their social networks for the purpose of advertising and marketing. Facebook is a consumer-oriented network (Hansson et al., 2013). Poynter was right when he called Facebook “the future of networking with customers”, in 2008. Also, it helps in self-learning
opinions & attitudes for the general public (Jin, 2012). Perceived ease of use leads to intention of joining Facebook (Pillai & Mukherje, 2011 and Baxter et al., 2011) Facebook plays real role in political campaigns or publicity (Panagiotopoulos et al., 2011 and Bronstein, 2013). It is a main tool used by some industries (i.e. Banking and non-governmental Organizations NGOs), they are used for reactive customer service and advertising (Merrilainen & Vos, 2011). Advertisers are attracted to Facebook based on the increasing number of the user population and the (IAB, 2013 and Tsai & Men, 2012). Facebook's audience is bigger than any TV network in existence (IAB, 2013 and Giles, 2010). Facebook data can also help advertisers to find potential customers through useful segmentation (Lilley et al., 2012). Facebook pages are very useful tools to measure the effectiveness of ad through quality of information (Baltar & Brunet, 2011); demographic data about users (Branthwaite & Patterson, 2011) and avoiding duplication of cases (Logan et al., 2012). Facebook is attractive to users because it builds on enjoyment, high contact relations and usefulness (Hansson et al., 2013). The study of (Logan et al., 2012) confirmed the significant relations between informative, irritation and entertainment with ad value & attitude to advertising. The advanced position of Facebook among the other SNSs may have negative or positive impacts on ads effectiveness according to the pages performance and the cleverness of their admins (Hansson et al., 2013). Most users prefer light participations, so photos represent 70% of the interests of Facebook members; it is the highest interest comparing with videos or text. Facebook pages are managed by admins from inside or outside (Facebook, 2013).

2.4 Trustworthiness:

Trust is confidence and willingness to be opened (Haigh et al., 2012). Initial trust is the first impression or interaction with unfamiliar trustees (Wu et al., 2010). Persons have general tendency to trust or distrust others, this tendency is referred to as trust propensity (also called trust disposition and Brengman & Karimov, 2012). According to literature review presented by Brengman & Karimov (2012), some studies confirmed the positive influence of trust propensity on consumers’ initial online trust in a website. Trust factor and recommendations of friends, impact on ad effectiveness (Barreto, 2013). Trust has three main sides, ability (i.e. expertise), benevolence (i.e. goodwill) and integrity (i.e. honesty), also there are three categories of trust, cognitive (also called cognition-based trust) (Komia & Benbasat, 2006), affective (also called affect-based trust or emotional trust) (Dabholkar et al., 2009) and behavior (also called behavior-based trust) (Brengman & Karimov, 2012). Trust dimensions: the organization treats the public fairly and justly; the organization can be relied on to keep its promises; the organization takes public opinion into account when making decisions (Haigh et al., 2012). Increased online trust leads to a favorable attitude towards joining & interactions (Benedickts et al., 2010; Dabholkar et al., 2009; Lee & Kozar, 2009; Brengman & Karimov, 2012 and Goldsmith et al., 2012). Compared with traditional virtual communities, people are more willing to share information on Facebook than many of other SNSs, according to trust in Facebook (Shu, & Chuang, 2011). People increase their level of confidence by the explanation of their personal information "Facebook’s profile" and their groups of interest "Facebook’s groups" (Baltar & Brunet, 2011). Satisfaction leads to loyal customer (Abdelkader, 2011-b), who spread positive WOM advertising about products or companies, and vice versa (Royo-Vela & Casamassima, 2010 and Kiiikka & Laukkanen, 2012). Users of SNSs avoided ads as much as possible and opposed data sharing/selling practices (Lilley et al., 2012). So, some researchers suggest that, Facebook ads are in need to be more secured (Gulenko, 2013). To increase the trustworthiness of SNS’ ads, advertisers have to design more ethical and aesthetic ad, and to be reliable sources of information (Logan et al., 2012). A sector of Facebook users have some doubts of the violation of privacy on Facebook by the corporation itself in order to sell these data to marketers & advertisement agencies or by hackers (Jones & Soltren, 2008).

2.5 FB-ads & TM-ads:

FB-ad looks like the double-edged weapon; members exhibit a similar set of motivations (Royo-Vela & Casamassima, 2010). Therefore, e-WOM may be positive or negative. It has multiplied effects comparing with WOM through traditional ways. Marketing through social media means that there are more reviews of products to take advantage of and, thus, the customers’ buying behavior has changed (Hansson et al., 2013). Both perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness impact on attitude towards SNS (Martins et al., 2011). The number of cases detected by Facebook and the virtual response rate is higher than traditional snowball technique (Baltar & Brunet, 2011). Interaction has an impact on users’ online experiences and their purchase intention (Huang, 2011). Social media communications have a significant impact on brand equity and brand images (Bruhn et al., 2012). While traditional media has a stronger impact on brand awareness, the significant differences between the industries under the investigation of researchers (Bruhn et al., 2012). Data on SNSs
takes two ways, firm-created (i.e., Traditional SNSs) and user-generated (i.e., Facebook pages) (Bruhn et al., 2012). The lack of social contact with store employees is still one of the main factors holding back consumers to purchase online (Lowry et al., 2010 and Brengman & Karimov, 2012). These kinds of new media tools enable individuals to have interpersonal interactions with each other as an online alternative to “face-to-face” social interactions (Papacharissi, 2009 and Brengman & Karimov, 2012). Consequently, the perception of a high degree of social presence during the virtual interaction contributes to the formation of trust. The e-commerce literature of Brengman & Karimov (2012) suggests that higher levels of social presence can be achieved by embedding social cues such as human images (Cyr et al., 2009), video streams (Aljukhadar et al., 2010) and chatting, that may provide the trustworthiness of an online user (Brengman & Karimov, 2012). Trust is one of the impact factors on customer online behavior (Gummerus et al., 2012). Trust among shareholders and consumers are the first components of generating success (Byrd, 2012). The study of (Logan et al., 2012) confirmed significant differences among ads of traditional & social media on the basis of entertainment, informative and irritation. Relationship between certain cognitive and behavioral variables may vary depending on the specific website (Munoz-Leiva et al., 2012). The network effect is seen as complementary to traditional social marketing tools (Barrutia & Echebarria, 2011).

\[ H_1. \] It will be significantly different between trust in FB-ads and trust in TM-ads, according to Egyptians.

\[ H_2. \] It will be significantly different between trust in FB-ads and trust in TM-ads, according to Saudis.

2.6 Gender Impact:
In-depth qualitative research on Facebook has many advantages and benefits (Branthwaite & Patterson, 2011). Facebook needs more qualitative research about effectiveness of ad according to Gender. This coupled with the ability to target ads based on detailed data about gender and other data (Lilley et al., 2012 and Logan et al., 2012). Females spend more time on Facebook; they tend to be more intense users of social sites than males (Hargittai & Hsieh, 2010). According to the Facebook report of Q3/2013, male’s online-presence on Facebook is more than the female in Arabian area; it is around 55% for male in general. Participants’ reasons and motivations for online presence varied as a function of gender (Koles & Nagy, 2012). According to Ruddell, & Jones (2013), there are no significant differences between genders in using Facebook.

\[ H_3. \] Gender has a significant impact on trust in FB-ads, according to Egyptians.

\[ H_4. \] Gender has a significant impact on trust in TM-ads, according to Egyptians.

\[ H_5. \] Gender has a significant impact on trust in FB-ads, according to Saudis.

\[ H_6. \] Gender has a significant impact on trust in TM-ads, according to Saudis.

2.8 Cross-national Impact:
Findings of some researches indicate that communication appeals on SNSs reflect the dominant cultural values in each country (Tsai & Men, 2012). We should advance our understanding of marketing communications on social media from a cross-national perspective (Tsai & Men, 2012). Some other researchers reported the differences between east & west in some values, that impact on attitude and behavior (Tsai & Men, 2012 and
Cho et al., 1999). Incorporating a two-way communication approach can yield positive results for the company’s brand reputation (Byrd, 2012). MNCs do not generally approach negative comments as public relations opportunities, but prefer to censor, or ignore, critical feedback (Dekay, 2012). This paucity of research on how social media is used by global advertisers is likely due to several reasons: premature, data collection, personalized targeting more than internationalization and it takes much time (it is the most one) (Okazaki & Taylor, 2013). Facebook is still the predominant choice for the majority of students, special for international students.

\[ H_{11} \] it will be significantly different between the trust in FB-ads of Egyptians and the trust in FB-ads of Saudis.

\[ H_{12} \] it will be significantly different between the trust in TM-ads of Egyptians and the trust in TM-ads of Saudis.

Figure1 shows the structure of the research hypotheses as the following:

Figure1: The structure of Research Hypotheses

![Figure1: The structure of Research Hypotheses](image)

*(*) Significant on Level (0.05), (**) Significant on Level (0.01) and (***) Significant on Level (0.001)

3. Methodology

3.1 Data Generating & Validity:

The questionnaire was built on “Google Drive”, and it was disseminated through "e-Mail" and the social networking site “Facebook”. These ways of distribution of questionnaire were driven by earlier studies (Libai et al., 2010; Verhoef et al., 2010 and Ojiako et al., 2012). There were three main resources to generate the items of the questionnaire. First resource was the literature review. Second one is the semi-structured interviews, that the research conducted 30 in-depth interviews with some of Facebook users from EG & SA. Finally, seven experts & academicians from related fields reviewed the primary contents of the questionnaire and suggested some changes to be more valid.

3.2 Questionnaire Structure:

The final structure of the questionnaire includes two dimensions, with 16 items. First dimension includes eight items for measuring the trust in FB-ads. Second dimension includes 8 items for measuring the trust in TM-ads. The questionnaire based on Likert scale on a five-point scale (1 representing "Strongly Disagree" to 5 representing "Strongly Agree") their level of agreement for each statement of the two dimensions. An overall evaluation item was added to each dimension in order to test the significance of items in measuring of "Trust". All the items of the questionnaire are about the trust in ads. The questionnaire contains two dimensions; FB-ads
& TM-ads. The following are the items and their extinctions:

1. Respecting of user privacy, FB1 & TM1 (adapted from Koles & Nagy, 2012);
2. Presenting real information, FB2 & TM2 (adapted from Logan et al., 2012 and Koles & Nagy, 2012);
3. Presenting complete information, FB3 & TM3 (adapted from Logan et al., 2012);
4. Not harmful to users, FB4 & TM4 (adapted from Martins et al., 2011 and Gummerus et al., 2012);
5. Keeping confidential of users' data, FB5 & TM5 (adapted from Brengman & Karimov, 2012);
6. Preparing by honest persons, FB6 & TM6 (adapted from Brengman & Karimov, 2012);
7. Preparing by skillful persons, FB7 & TM7 (adapted from Brengman & Karimov, 2012 and Gummerus et al., 2012);
8. Controlled by overt users' evaluation, FB8 & TM8 (adapted from Park & Cho, 2012);

3.3 Sample:
Participates of the sample received the URL of the Google-Drive' questionnaire by "e-mail" & "Facebook" according to the Nationality and Age which should be 18+. The URL of the e-questionnaire was available for 30 days started on four\textsuperscript{th} September 2013. Considering the time and resources constraints, only 812 respondents were finally selected from participates, (428 Egyptians and 384 Saudis). Selection conditions are 18+ years old, using of Facebook and just from EG or SA. The sample is sufficiently large, over the recommended size of 200 cases (Medsker, 1994 and Jalilvand & Others, 2012). Table1 shows the demographic description of the sample as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors/ Sub-factors</th>
<th>Egypt</th>
<th>Saudi Arabia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-45</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 more</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary or Less</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates/University'</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Analysis & Results

4.1 Reliability:
Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS, V. 20) was used in this research to test the reliability by measuring Cronbach's $\alpha$. The overall values of Cronbach's $\alpha$ for all items together were ($\alpha = 0.816$ for Egyptians), ($\alpha = 0.862$ for Saudis) and ($\alpha = 0.867$ for Egyptians & Saudis together). All of them are more than 0.60, so the reliability of the scale are acceptable (Sekaran, 1992). Also, all sub-scales display acceptable reliabilities, these being of the order above the generally accepted value of 0.70 (Hair, 1998). The sub-scales values of Cronbach's $\alpha$ for each dimension of questionnaire were ($\alpha = 0.764$ for Trust in FB-ads of Egyptians), ($\alpha = 0.921$ for Trust in FB-ads of Saudis), ($\alpha = 0.864$ for Trust in FB-ads of Egyptians & Saudis together), ($\alpha = 0.933$ for Trust in TM-ads of Egyptians), ($\alpha = 0.892$ for Trust in TM-ads of Saudis) and ($\alpha = 0.867$ for Trust in TM-ads of Egyptians & Saudis together).

4.2 Means of Items:
According to the collected data, there are three levels of the means for each item of the questionnaire dimensions, as follows: less than 3.00 (Low level "L"), between 3.00 and 3.50 (Moderate level "M") and above 3.5 (High
level "H"), as follows in Table 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>EG</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FB_1</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB_2</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB_3</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB_4</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB_5</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB_6</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB_7</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB_8</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB-Overall</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM_1</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM_2</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM_3</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM_4</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM_5</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM_6</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM_7</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM_8</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM-Overall</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.3 Hypothesis Analysis:**

Table 3 shows the results of hypothesis analysis, from H_3 to H_{10}. The following are the results of the sample analysis through (SPSS, V.20):

- **Accept H_1**, because there are significant differences between the Trust in FB-ads and Trust in TM-ads; according to Egyptians; (Sig. =0.000), (Trust in FB-ads: Mean=2.867 & SD=0.599) and (Trust in TM-ads: Mean=3.714, SD=0.783).

- **Accept H_2**, because there are significant differences between the Trust in FB-ads and Trust in TM-ads; according to Saudis; (Sig. =0.000), (Trust in FB-ads: Mean=3.174 & SD=0.826) and (Trust in TM-ads: Mean=3.104 & SD=1.009).

- **Refuse H_3**, because there are no significant differences between Males & Females about trust in FB-ads according to Egyptians; (Sig. =0.221), (Male: Mean=2.748 & SD=0.845) and (Female: Mean=2.944 & SD=0.838).

- **Accept H_4**, there are significant differences between Males & Females about the trust in TM-ads in EG. Males are more confident than Females; (Sig. =0.040), (Male: Mean=3.242 & SD=0.865) and (Female: Mean=2.896 & SD=0.838).

- **Refuse H_5**, because there are no significant differences between Males & Females about trust in FB-ads according to Saudis; (Sig. =0.792), (Male: Mean=3.104 & SD=1.009) and (Female: Mean=3.152 & SD=0.111).

- **Refuse H_6**, there are no significant differences between Males & Females about the trust in TM-ads according to Saudis; (Sig. =0.098), (Male: Mean=3.833 & SD=1.031) and (Female: Mean=3.561 & SD=0.712).

- **Accept H_7**, because there are significant differences between the different stages of age about the trust in FB-ads among Egyptians. Egyptians in the stage of (18:<30) are more confident than others; (Sig. =0.000), (18:<30): Mean=3.167 & SD=0.772), ((30:<45): Mean=2.611 & SD=0.791) and ((45:more):
Mean=2.533 & SD=0.775).

- Accept H8, because there are significant differences between the different stages of age about the trust in TB-ads; in EG, the stage of (18:<30) are more confident than others; (Sig. =0.030), ((18:<30): Mean=3.406 & SD=0.970), ((30:<45): Mean=3.031 & SD=0.784) and ((45:more): Mean=2.900 & SD=0.761).

- Accept H9, because there are significant differences between the different stages of age about the trust in FB-ads among Saudis. Saudis in the stage of (30:<45) are more confident than others; (Sig. =0.004), ((18:<30): Mean=2.964 & SD=0.902), ((30:<45): Mean=3.833 & SD=0.924) and ((45:more): Mean=3.222 & SD=0.924).

- Refuse H10, because there are no significant differences between the different stages of age about the trust in FB-ads; in SA; (Sig. =0.489), ((18:<30): Mean=3.373 & SD=0.869), ((30:<45): Mean=3.556 & SD=0.313) and ((45:more): Mean=3.333 & SD=0.193).

From another side, the results of the analysis of H11 & H12 were as follows:

- Accept H11, because there are significant differences between Egyptians & Saudis according to their Trust in FB-ads; (Sig. =0.000), (EG: Mean =2.867 & SD=0.826) and (SA: Mean=3,174 & SD=0.826).

- Accept H12, because there are significant differences between Egyptians & Saudis according to their Trust in TM-ads, (Sig. =0.000), (EG: Mean =3.078 & SD=0.810) and (SA: Mean=3,714 & SD=0.783).

Those indicate to two general results, first: the Saudis trust in ads generally more than the Egyptians trust. Second: the Trust in TM-ads more than Trust in FB-ads for the two countries. So, there are significant differences between EG & SA in general, (Sig. = 0.000), (EG: Mean=2.972 & SD=0.478) and (SA: Mean=3,444 & SD=0.584). But the statistics without taking the nationality in consideration were as follows: (Sig. = 0.000, Mean=3,188 and SD=0.578). Also, Multi-regression was used to determine the significant items of each dimension, with the overall item about the trust in FB-ads & TM-ads. The results of the analysis about were as follows:

- The significant items of Trust in FB-ads were (FB2, FB3 and FB4); (R=0.638, R^2=0.407 and Adjusted R^2=0.393). So, These 3 items could explain 39.3% of the total overall of the Trust in FB-ads in EG.

- The significant items of Trust in FB-ads were (FB2, FB3, FB4 and FB7); (R=0.827, R^2=0.684 and Adjusted R^2=0.673). So, These 3 items could explain 67.3% of the total overall of the Trust in FB-ads in SA.

- The significant items of Trust in FB-ads were (FB1, FB2, FB6 and FB7); (R=0.793, R^2=0.629 and Adjusted R^2=0.618). So, These 3 items could explain 61.8% of the total overall of the trust in FB-ads in EG.

- The significant items of Trust in FB-ads were (FB2, FB3 and FB7); (R=0.708, R^2=0.502 and Adjusted R^2=0.488). So, These 3 items could explain 48.8% of the total overall of the trust in FB-ads in SA.
Table 3: Demographic Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions/Factors</th>
<th>Egypt</th>
<th>Saudi Arabia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.748</td>
<td>0.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.944</td>
<td>0.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:&lt;30</td>
<td>3.167</td>
<td>0.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:&lt;45</td>
<td>2.611</td>
<td>0.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45:more</td>
<td>2.533</td>
<td>0.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary or less</td>
<td>2.437</td>
<td>0.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>2.807</td>
<td>0.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Graduate</td>
<td>2.795</td>
<td>0.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.242</td>
<td>0.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.896</td>
<td>0.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:&lt;30</td>
<td>3.406</td>
<td>0.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:&lt;45</td>
<td>3.031</td>
<td>0.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45:more</td>
<td>2.900</td>
<td>0.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary or less</td>
<td>3.143</td>
<td>0.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>3.132</td>
<td>0.980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Graduate</td>
<td>3.164</td>
<td>0.783</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions

According to the analysis of the collected data, some of the conclusions and suggestions that can be drawn from the research are as follows:

- Generally, the trust in TM-ads is more than the trust in FB-ads; according to the data of EG or SA.
- Gender has no significant impact on the trust in FB-ads of Egyptians or Saudis. Also, Gender has no significant impact on Saudis’ trust in TM-ads, but it has a significant impact on Egyptians’ trust in TM-ads.
- Age has a significant impact on the trust in FB-ads of Egyptians or Saudis. Also, Age has a significant impact on Egyptians’ trust in TM-ads, but it has a significant impact on Saudis’ trust in TM-ads.
- There are significant differences between Egyptians and Saudis according to the analysis of the data about the trust in FB-ads or TM-ads.

Future research should consider bigger sample size. Ideally a larger sample size would provide a clearer understanding of the relationships between the variables. Also, future research should include sample from more than two countries.
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