

# International Trade Law and the World Trade Organization: Promoting Global Economic Cooperation

Mustafa Al Atiyat<sup>1</sup>, Khalid AlDweri<sup>2</sup>, Anas Ratib Alsoud<sup>3</sup>

## Abstract

*International commerce has emerged as a key EG driver in our more interconnected world, boosting both national prosperity and individual well-being. This study intends to investigate how the World Trade Organization (WTO) and international trade law (ITL) are related and what function they play in fostering international economic cooperation. Data collection and analysis will be done using a quantitative research approach. The data collection strategy will involve the creation and distribution of online surveys to individuals interested in ITL and the WTO. The survey questionnaire will encompass inquiries about various aspects, including the impact of ITL on economic cooperation, the effectiveness of the WTO's policies, and other relevant variables. A sample size of 600 individuals, who are knowledgeable about or involved in ITL and the WTO, will be selected. Statistical analysis programs like SPSS will be used to analyze the data from the online surveys. The data will be employed to examine the relationship between ITL, the WTO, and their influence on global economic cooperation. The collected data through the questionnaire will be instrumental in achieving the objectives of this research study. The 600 questionnaires distributed were arranged in the form of a Likert Scale. This information will be gathered in order to better understand how ITL and the WTO affect international economic cooperation by shedding light on their respective contributions to that cause.*

**Keywords:** *International Trade Law, Global Economic Cooperation, World Trade Organization, Economic Growth, Policies, Economic Collaboration.*

## Introduction

Promoting international economic cooperation is crucial for guaranteeing prosperity and sustainable growth in the connected world of today. International trade is essential for enabling EG and raising living standards for countries all across the world. Countries have built a structure of laws and organizations, with the WTO at its center, to oversee and control international commerce [1]. International Trade Law (ITL) provides a strong framework for promoting fair and equitable trade practices while minimizing trade obstacles and resolving disputes. ITL is contained in numerous agreements and treaties. ITL is an umbrella term for a variety of legal rules and principles that control international trade in goods and services [2] These regulations aim to maintain stability, predictability, and openness in global trade ties. ITL encourages economic cooperation and aids nations in navigating the intricacies of international commerce by offering a framework of norms and regulations. [3][4].

The main international organization for fostering trade cooperation and resolving trade disputes is the WTO, which was founded in 1995. The WTO, which has more than 160 members, offers a forum for talks, trade agreements, and dispute resolution procedures. The organization's main goal is to make it easier for goods and services to move freely across borders while simultaneously promoting economic growth and development for all of its member countries [5]. The WTO's global trading system, which is founded on the values of equality, transparency, and nondiscrimination, is one of its defining characteristics. By treating all members equally with regard to tariffs and trade laws, the most-favored-nation principle ensures that member countries do not engage in trade discrimination [6][7]. The national treatment concept also assures that any discriminatory practices are eliminated by treating domestic and imported goods and services equally [8].

Tariffs, quotas, and other forms of trade restriction, such as subsidies, are also covered by ITL and the WTO. Member nations strive to lower these trade restrictions through discussions and agreements,

<sup>1</sup> Hourani Center for Applied Scientific Research Al-Ahliyya Amman University m.atiyat@ammanu.edu.jo.

<sup>2</sup> Kuwait International Law School k.aldweri@kilaw.edu.kw.

<sup>3</sup> Hourani Center for Applied Scientific Research Al-Ahliyya Amman University a.alsoud@ammanu.edu.jo

therefore advancing a more liberal and inclusive international trading system. Countries can gain access to new markets, boost exports, and take advantage of a greater variety of goods and services at competitive costs by eliminating trade barriers [9]. The WTO's Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) also offers a method for settling trade disputes. The DSB, which functions by predetermined rules and guidelines [10], is where member countries can take their complaints. By doing this, disagreements are settled fairly, transparently, and quickly, preventing trade issues from turning into trade wars. A strong dispute resolution process fosters trust in the international trading system and motivates nations to participate in profitable economic relations [11][12]. The contribution of the paper is:

The paper provides a detailed analysis of trade barriers, dispute resolution mechanisms, and inequalities in trade outcomes, identifying the specific obstacles that hinder global economic cooperation through IITL and the WTO [13][14].

The paper offers concrete recommendations and strategies to enhance cooperation, including promoting fair trade practices, improving dispute resolution mechanisms, and addressing trade inequalities, thereby fostering collaboration, transparency, and sustainable EG [15].

This paper is organized into five sections. Section 2 offers an extensive literature review on the integration of IITL and the WTO in promoting global economic cooperation. Section 3 outlines the Sample Questionnaire, Data Collection Instrument, Data Analysis Method, and Hypotheses that the study aims to address concerning the role of IITL and the WTO. Section 4 presents the investigation's findings and provides a comprehensive discussion of the results. Finally, Section 5 concludes the research.

## Literature Review

Qureshi 2019 [16] focused on the WTO's role in international trade dispute resolution as well as the WTO's contribution to the settlement of international trade disputes in domestic systems. This discussion is taking place against the backdrop of the current WTO impasse, which was caused by the United States obstruction of appointments for WTO Appellate Body members.

Pomfret 2021 [17] argued that significant RTAs of the twenty-first century focus on deeper integration challenges rather than just favorable tariff protection. These concerns are dealt with outside of the WTO because, despite the addition of new elements to the international trade landscape since 1995, such as the internet and global value chains, extending WTO rules has proven challenging due to the need for consensus.

Cai and Kim 2019 [18] investigated whether the WTO fosters SD through its legal interpretation of the PP and offered recommendations for achieving the balance between trade liberalization and sustainable development in the WTO.

Zoladkiewicz and Orłowska 2020 [19] studied the detrimental effects on global trade of the WTO's operational paralysis. They gave an outline of the WTO's rules and principles' flaws, which turned into grave challenges to the global trade system.

Hoekman and Wolfe 2021 [20] examined various WTO reform agenda items through the prism of the stances adopted by these three WTO members, determining the degree of agreement on important issues including transparency, dispute resolution, and plurilateral discussions.

Wang *et al.* 2020 [21] analyzed the change in the distribution of economic benefits and sulphur dioxide emissions underlying China's international trade from 2002 to 2015 using a multi-regional input–output analysis.

Hana 2019 [22] studied and analyzed the issues and challenges that the Halal Act will face upon its full implementation on October 19, 2019.

Bajec 2020 [23] discussed WTO reform while examining the organization's primary problems. The difficulties that have been presented amply demonstrate the gravity of the problem and the need for WTO reform to preserve the advantages of a rule-based trade system.

Tesema 2021 [24] studied the advantages and difficulties of the Ethiopian leather industry joining the WTO. They first determined the advantages and the biggest perceived obstacles that joining the WTO would bring to Ethiopia's leather industry. They then examined Ethiopia's WTO accession process, including its institutional capacity and the impact of the various domestic political objectives, structures, and limitations.

Usman and Hammar 2021 [25] developed a new index of technological innovation through principal component analysis, using three key indicators to represent the technology, and applied the Stochastic Impacts by Regression on Population, Affluence, and Technology (STIRPAT) model, which provides a consistent framework for analyzing environmental effects.

### *Problem Statement*

There are still many difficulties and barriers to establishing an international trading system that is truly inclusive and equitable, notwithstanding the efforts made by ITL and the WTO to advance global economic cooperation [26]. These difficulties prevent international trade from reaching its full potential as an engine of EG, development, and poverty eradication for all countries. First, the free movement of goods and services across borders is still hindered by trade restrictions and protectionist policies. By prohibiting them from fully integrating into the global economy, these restrictions not only limit prospects for EG and investment but also impede the development of emerging and least-developed nations [27][28]. Second, there are frequently disagreements among signatory nations as a result of the complexity and nuanced nature of international trade agreements and their interpretation. Inefficient processes for resolving these conflicts can reduce confidence in the global trading system and obstruct the efficient operation of international trade. Thirdly, cultures and nations may not always share the advantages of global trade evenly. The disparity between industrialized and developing nations is widened by this trade outcome inequality, which also impedes efforts to attain inclusive and sustainable EG. Additionally, new global issues like the COVID-19 pandemic, digital revolution, and climate change have made international trading more complicated. These issues call for a group effort and the creation of creative solutions within the ITL framework.

### *Theoretical framework*

The development of a rules-based international trading system, like the WTO, lays the groundwork for strengthening economic cooperation among states, according to the theory of international trade law and its role in fostering global economic cooperation [30]. The World trading Organisation (WTO) establishes a stable and transparent international trading environment by offering a forum for trade agreement negotiation and enforcement [31]. This promotes mutual trust and collaboration among its members. The way that the public views international trade legislation is mostly determined by the current status of international talks, whether they are taking place at the World Trade Organisation (WTO) or in other settings where preferential negotiations are taking place. WTO legislation serves as the foundation for both preferential trade agreements and the new interregional accords that are being formed today [32]. Furthermore, the theory of trade volume asserts that a rise in trade volume between WTO members is correlated with participation [33]. This is because becoming a member of the WTO means making a promise to remove trade restrictions like tariffs and quotas, which opens up more markets and boosts commerce. Research has demonstrated that nations that become members of the WTO often see a notable increase in trade volumes relative to non-member nations.

Moreover, the World Trade Organization's enforcement tools are essential for guaranteeing adherence to international trade regulations. By offering a means of settling disagreements between its members, the WTO's dispute settlement processes help to keep trade disputes from turning into full-fledged trade wars [34]. The WTO encourages adherence to the principles of free and fair trade by ensuring conformity with its rules, which in turn fosters a climate that is favourable to economic cooperation [35]. Moreover, the notion of trade liberalisation through multilateral talks contends that the WTO's assistance in these

discussions lowers trade barriers and advances liberalised trade policy [36]. The WTO endeavours to foster global economic cooperation by addressing a range of trade-related issues and advocating for developing nations through negotiation rounds including the Uruguay Round and the Doha Development Agenda [37]. Furthermore, the theory of economic growth asserts that better rates of economic development and growth are linked to involvement in international commerce, which is made possible by WTO membership [38]. International commerce may boost productivity and innovation, resulting in higher economic output and living standards by giving access to bigger markets and encouraging the effective use of resources. According to empirical data, nations that implement protectionist policies often have slower rates of economic growth than those that employ open and liberalised trade policies [39].

The WTO's philosophy of dispute settlement procedures highlights how crucial it is to have a successful trade dispute resolution system to advance international economic cooperation [40]. By offering a venue for the fair and unbiased resolution of trade disputes, the World Trade Organization's dispute settlement mechanism guards against the implementation of trade sanctions unilaterally and maintains the integrity of the global trading system. The WTO cultivates confidence and trust among its members by ensuring conformity with its rules and supporting the rule of law [41]. This, in turn, promotes cooperation in international commerce. The WTO's technical assistance programme philosophy emphasises the need for capacity building and technical help in empowering developing nations to fully engage in the world trade system. By means of diverse capacity-building endeavours, including training courses and technical support projects, the World Trade Organisation endeavours to augment the proficiency of developing nations in devising and executing trade policies, adhering to global trade regulations, and engaging enragedly in trade discussions. Through the process of closing the gap in capability between developed and developing nations, these programmes help to advance international economic cooperation.

Based on this theoretical framework, we can formulate the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1:

NH1: Membership in the WTO (MW) positively affects a country's trade volume (TV).

AH1: Membership in the WTO (MW) does not have a significant effect on a country's trade volume (TV).

Hypothesis 2:

NH2: Effective participation in multilateral trade negotiations (EM) positively influences commercial integration (CI).

AH2: Effective participation in multilateral trade negotiations (EM) does not have a significant influence on commercial integration (CI).

Hypothesis 3:

NH3: Trade liberalization (TL) leads to increased economic growth (EG).

AH3: Trade liberalization (TL) does not lead to increased economic growth (EG).

Hypothesis 4:

NH4: Dispute settlement mechanisms (DS) positively impact regional trade (RT).

AH4: Dispute settlement mechanisms (DS) do not have a significant impact on regional trade (RT).

Hypothesis 5:

NH5: Technical assistance (TA) positively contributes to capacity building (CB).

AH5: Technical assistance (TA) does not have a significant contribution to capacity building (CB).

## Proposed Methodology

The purpose of this study is to examine the interaction between IITL and the WTO and how they support international economic cooperation. Data collection and analysis were done using a quantitative research approach. Created online surveys were distributed to people with an interest in IITL and the WTO as part of the data gathering plan. The survey questionnaire contains questions about a variety of topics, such as the success of the WTO's policies, the influence of IITL on economic cooperation, and other pertinent factors. The questionnaire was distributed in google file format through social media platforms to individuals among India who are knowledgeable about or involved in IITL and the WTO which were confirmed by initial mail intimation and received 600 completed responses. Tools for statistical analysis, such as SPSS, was used to analyze the data gathered from the online questionnaires. To evaluate the relationship between IITL and the WTO and their impact on global economic cooperation, the data was summarized using descriptive statistics and inferential statistics, such as correlation and regression analysis.

### *Sample Questionnaire*

In order to assess the questionnaire's quality and to look for any grammatical flaws, a sample questionnaire was created and given to 10% of the participants, or 60 people. Corrections were made and then sent to the respondents based on the review report that the participants had supplied. Additionally, the paper's reliability and validity were examined.

### *Data Collection Instrument*

To meet the goals of this research project, data were gathered via a questionnaire. 600 surveys were given out to the respondents, and the replies are listed on a Likert scale as follows: Strongly Agree (5), Agree (4), Neutral (3), Disagree (2), and Strongly Disagree (1). The questionnaires were divided into two sections: the demographic questions about the respondents were in the first section, and the technical questions related to the study were in the second section.

### *Data Analysis Method*

It uses the SPSS tool to analyze the data.

## Results and Discussion

### Frequency Table

#### *Socio-Demographic Factors*

**Table 1:** Frequency Table 1

Factors	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Age</b>		
21-24 years old	66	11.0
25-34 years old	94	15.7

35-44 years old	120	20.0
45-54 years old	156	26.0
55 years old and above	164	27.3
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	298	49.7
Female	302	50.3
<b>Education</b>		
High School or equivalent	26	4.3
Bachelor's degree	35	5.8
Master's degree	182	30.3
Doctorate or higher	159	26.5
Other	198	33.0
<b>Occupation</b>		
Government officials	100	16.7
Academics	115	19.2
Business professionals	138	23.0
Lawyers	113	18.8
NGO representatives	134	22.3

The distribution of respondents by age, gender, education, and occupation is shown in Table 1. The data shows that 27.3% of the respondents, or those who are 55 years of age or older, are the majority. 35–44-year-olds make up 20.0% of the population, closely followed by 45–54-year-olds with 26.0%. With 49.7% of respondents identifying as male and 50.3% as female, the respondents are virtually evenly split by gender. In terms of education, those with a master's degree make up the largest group (30.3%), followed by those with a doctorate or higher degree (26.5%). Other educational backgrounds not specified in the table make up 33.0%. Business professionals make up the largest occupational group, accounting for 23.0% of the total, closely followed by NGO representatives at 22.3%. Academics make up 19.2% of the total, followed by attorneys (18.8%) and government employees (16.7%). This information sheds light on the demographic and occupational makeup of the respondents to the survey.

#### *Membership in the WTO (MW)*

**Table 2:** Frequency Table 2

<b>Factors</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Please rate your level of awareness regarding the WTO and its functions (MW1)</b>		
Not aware at all	13	2.2
Somewhat aware	65	10.8
Moderately aware	8	1.3
Very aware	307	51.2
Extremely aware	207	34.5
<b>Are you familiar with the benefits of being a member of the WTO (MW2)</b>		
Not familiar at all	1	.2
Somewhat familiar	63	10.5
Moderately familiar	8	1.3
Very familiar	332	55.3
Extremely familiar	196	32.7
<b>To what extent do you believe that membership in the WTO promotes EG and development? (MW3)</b>		
Strongly disagree	9	1.5
Disagree	58	9.7
Neutral	8	1.3
Agree	338	56.3

Strongly agree	187	31.2
<b>How important do you think it is for a country to be a member of the WTO to access larger markets and expand exports? (MW4)</b>		
Not important at all	5	.8
Somewhat important	55	9.2
Moderately important	16	2.7
Very important	347	57.8
Extremely important	177	29.5
<b>In your opinion, how effective is the WTO's dispute settlement mechanism in resolving trade conflicts between member countries? (MW5)</b>		
Not effective at all	1	.2
Somewhat effective	59	9.8
Moderately effective	8	1.3
Very effective	317	52.8
Extremely effective	215	35.8
<b>To what extent do you believe that membership in the WTO contributes to promoting peace and stability among nations? (MW6)</b>		
Strongly disagree	9	1.5
Disagree	51	8.5
Neutral	8	1.3
Agree	334	55.7
Strongly agree	198	33.0

Table 2 provides a frequency distribution and corresponding percentages related to respondents' awareness, familiarity, beliefs, and opinions regarding the WTO and its functions. Regarding the level of knowledge (MW1), many respondents, 51.2%, said they were very aware of the WTO, and 34.5% said they were extremely aware. There were 10.8% somewhat aware responders, 1.3% moderately informed, and 2.2% completely unaware. When asked whether they were familiar with the advantages of WTO membership (MW2), the majority of respondents (55.3%) said they were very familiar, and 32.7% said they were highly familiar. 10.5% of respondents were just little familiar, 1.3% were only moderately familiar, and 0.2% were completely unfamiliar. The majority of respondents (56.3%) agreed, with 31.2% strongly agreeing, that WTO participation supports EG and development (MW3). 9.7% of respondents agreed with the statement, 1.5% strongly agreed, and 1.3% were unsure. A sizable portion of respondents (57.8%) believed that WTO membership was very important for opening up new markets and increasing exports (MW4), with 29.5% believing that it was extremely vital. 9.2% of respondents said it was somewhat significant, 2.7% said it was moderately important, and 0.8% said it was not essential at all. The majority of respondents (52.8%) said the WTO's dispute settlement system (MW5) was very effective, while 35.8% thought it was highly effective. 9.8% of respondents thought it was somewhat effective, 1.3% thought it was moderately effective, and 0.2% said it was not at all effective. Lastly, 55.7% of respondents agreed, with 33.0% strongly agreeing, that WTO participation contributes to promoting peace and stability among states (MW6). Respondents who disagreed made up 8.5% of the sample, while those who strongly disagreed and those who were neutral made up 1.5% and 1.3% of the sample, respectively.

#### *Trade Volume (TV)*

**Table 3:** Frequency Table 3

Factors	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Please rate your level of involvement in international trade activities (TV1)</b>		
Not involved at all	9	1.5
Minimally involved	58	9.7
Moderately involved	10	1.7

Highly involved	332	55.3
Extensively involved	191	31.8
<b>How would you rate the overall volume of international trade in your industry or sector? (TV2)</b>		
Very low volume	5	.8
Low volume	59	9.8
Moderate volume	18	3.0
High volume	338	56.3
Very high volume	180	30.0
<b>In your opinion, how has the volume of international trade changed in the past five years? (TV3)</b>		
Significantly decreased	3	.5
Slightly decreased	61	10.2
Remained relatively stable	11	1.8
Slightly increased	389	64.8
Significantly increased	136	22.7
<b>How important is international trade for the growth and success of your organization or business? (TV4)</b>		
Not important at all	9	1.5
Somewhat important	57	9.5
Moderately important	10	1.7
Very important	347	57.8
Extremely important	177	29.5
<b>How well do you think your organization or industry is equipped to handle increased TV? (TV5)</b>		
Not equipped at all	9	1.5
Somewhat equipped	59	9.8
Moderately equipped	11	1.8
Well equipped	337	56.2
Very well equipped	184	30.7
<b>Overall, how would you rate the significance of TV in your industry or sector for the economy as a whole? (TV6)</b>		
Not significant at all	12	2.0
Somewhat significant	56	9.3
Moderately significant	19	3.2
Very significant	365	60.8
Extremely significant	148	24.7

Table 3 reveals valuable insights into respondents' involvement in international trade activities. Indicating a high level of engagement within their respective businesses or sectors, a sizeable percentage of respondents reported being very involved (55.3%) or extensively involved (31.8%) in international trade activities. Additionally, the majority of respondents said that there was a high (56.3%) or very high (30.0%) level of total international commerce in their industry or sector. The majority of respondents said that foreign trade has expanded slightly (64.8%) or greatly (22.7%) over the previous five years. This suggests a positive trend and growth in international trade activity within their industries. International commerce was given a high priority by respondents for the development and success of their organizations or businesses, with the majority of respondents rating it as very important (57.8%) or extremely vital (29.5%). This demonstrates the understanding of the critical role that commerce plays in success and growth. The majority of respondents believed that their company or sector is well-prepared (56.2%) or extremely well-prepared (30.7%) to handle rising global trade. This demonstrates a degree of assurance in their capacity to handle and take advantage of the opportunities provided by global trade. The majority of respondents (60.8%) and highly substantial (24.7%), respectively, rated the importance of international commerce for the economy as a whole. This confirms the idea that there is a significant link between global trade and the general economic health of their business or sector.



Table 4: Frequency Table 4

Factors	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Please rate your level of familiarity with the EM (EM1)</b>		
Not familiar at all	5	.8
Somewhat familiar	54	9.0
Moderately familiar	15	2.5
Very familiar	374	62.3
Extremely familiar	152	25.3
<b>How effective do you believe the EM is in ensuring compliance with trade rules and agreements? (EM2)</b>		
Not effective at all	11	1.8
Somewhat effective	51	8.5
Moderately effective	13	2.2
Very effective	369	61.5
Extremely effective	156	26.0
<b>How important do you consider the role of sanctions or retaliatory measures in enforcing WTO rules and resolving trade disputes? (EM3)</b>		
Not important at all	11	1.8
Somewhat important	52	8.7
Moderately important	13	2.2
Very important	363	60.5
Extremely important	161	26.8
<b>How well do you think the WTO's enforcement mechanisms address trade violations related to intellectual property rights, subsidies, and non-tariff barriers? (EM4)</b>		
Not well at all	3	.5
Somewhat well	65	10.8
Moderately well	16	2.7
Very well	355	59.2
Extremely well	161	26.8
<b>To what extent do you believe that the EM contributes to a level playing field for all member countries? (EM5)</b>		
Strongly disagree	9	1.5
Disagree	59	9.8
Neutral	11	1.8
Agree	338	56.3
Strongly agree	183	30.5
<b>How satisfied are you with the timeliness of the WTO's enforcement processes in resolving trade disputes? (EM6)</b>		
Very dissatisfied	12	2.0
Dissatisfied	56	9.3
Neutral	19	3.2
Satisfied	366	61.0
Very satisfied	147	24.5

Table 4 presents a frequency distribution and corresponding percentages related to respondents' familiarity with the EM. The majority of survey participants claimed to be extremely knowledgeable (25.3%) or very familiar (62.3%) with the EM (EM1), demonstrating a high level of familiarity and comprehension with these mechanisms. A sizable portion of respondents said the EM were very effective (61.5%) or extremely effective (26.0%) at ensuring conformity with trade laws and agreements (EM2). This suggests a positive perception of the EM's ability to promote compliance. Respondents expressed a high level of importance placed on the role of sanctions or retaliatory measures in enforcing WTO rules and resolving trade disputes (EM3). For maintaining obedience to trade laws, the majority said they were extremely important (26.8%)

or very important (60.5%). The majority of respondents (59.2%) or extremely well (26.8%) believed the WTO's enforcement mechanisms for dealing with trade violations involving intellectual property rights, subsidies, and non-tariff barriers (EM4) worked very well or extremely well in dealing with such violations, indicating confidence in their effectiveness. A large majority of respondents (56.3%) or strongly agreed (30.5%) when asked whether the EM help to creating a level playing field for all member countries (EM5), demonstrating a conviction in their function in ensuring justice and equity among member countries. A sizable portion of respondents indicated satisfaction with the WTO's enforcement procedures' timeliness in resolving trade disputes (EM6), with 61.0% claiming they were satisfied and 24.5% indicating they were extremely satisfied.

*Compliance with international trade rules (CI)*

**Table 5:** Frequency Table 5

Factors	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Please rate your organization's or country's overall level of CI and agreements (CI1)</b>		
Very low compliance	5	.8
Low compliance	54	9.0
Moderate compliance	15	2.5
High compliance	375	62.5
Very high compliance	151	25.2
<b>How well-informed do you feel about the specific international trade rules and agreements that apply to your organization or country? (CI2)</b>		
Not well-informed at all	11	1.8
Somewhat informed	51	8.5
Moderately informed	13	2.2
Well-informed	369	61.5
Very well-informed	156	26.0
<b>How important do you consider the enforcement mechanisms of international trade rules in ensuring compliance? (CI3)</b>		
Not important at all	11	1.8
Somewhat important	53	8.8
Moderately important	13	2.2
Very important	362	60.3
Extremely important	161	26.8
<b>How well do you think your organization or country understands and adheres to the intellectual property rights provisions of international trade agreements? (CI4)</b>		
Poor understanding and adherence	3	.5
Limited understanding and adherence	65	10.8
Moderate understanding and adherence	16	2.7
Good understanding and adherence	357	59.5
Excellent understanding and adherence	159	26.5
<b>How well do you think your organization or country manages and addresses potential trade disputes to ensure CI? (CI5)</b>		
Poor management and addressing of trade disputes	10	1.7
Limited management and addressing of trade disputes	51	8.5
Moderate management and addressing of trade disputes	19	3.2
Good management and addressing of trade disputes	346	57.7

Excellent management and addressing of trade disputes	174	29.0
<b>Overall, how would you rate the level of CI within your organization or country? (CI6)</b>		
Very low compliance	13	2.2
Low compliance	56	9.3
Moderate compliance	18	3.0
High compliance	333	55.5
Very high compliance	180	30.0

Table 5 presents a frequency distribution and corresponding percentages related to respondents' assessment of their organization's or country's overall level of CI. Regarding CI and agreements (CI1), respondents reported a large level of high compliance (62.5%) or very high compliance (25.2%) within their organization or country, indicating a steadfast commitment to compliance. The majority of respondents felt well-informed (61.5%) or extremely well-informed (26.0%) with knowledge of certain international trade laws and agreements (CI2), demonstrating a thorough understanding of the relevant norms. The respondents emphasized the importance of enforcement mechanisms in ensuring compliance with international trade rules (CI3). A majority considered them to be very important (60.3%) or extremely important (26.8%) in maintaining compliance. When assessing their organization's or country's understanding and adherence to intellectual property rights provisions of international trade agreements (CI4), a significant percentage believed it to be good (59.5%) or excellent (26.5%), indicating a high level of understanding and compliance. Regarding the management and addressing of potential trade disputes to ensure CI (CI5), respondents expressed varying levels of confidence. While a majority perceived their organization or country to have good management and addressing of trade disputes (57.7%) or excellent management (29.0%), a portion indicated limited management (8.5%) or poor management (1.7%).

#### *Trade Liberalization through multilateral negotiations (TL)*

**Table 6:** Frequency Table 6

Factors	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Please rate your understanding of the concept of TL. (TL1)</b>		
Very limited understanding	13	2.2
Limited understanding	49	8.2
Moderate understanding	18	3.0
Good understanding	352	58.7
Excellent understanding	168	28.0
<b>How important do you think TL is for promoting global EG and development? (TL2)</b>		
Not important at all	11	1.8
Somewhat important	59	9.8
Moderately important	12	2.0
Very important	368	61.3
Extremely important	150	25.0
<b>How well-informed do you feel about the outcomes of major multilateral trade negotiations, such as those conducted under the WTO? (TL3)</b>		
Not well-informed at all	9	1.5
Somewhat informed	66	11.0
Moderately informed	17	2.8
Well-informed	338	56.3
Very well-informed	170	28.3
<b>How important do you consider the inclusion of developing countries in multilateral trade negotiations to ensure their participation in global trade and development? (TL4)</b>		
Not important at all	29	4.8
Somewhat important	71	11.8

Moderately important	27	4.5
Very important	323	53.8
Extremely important	150	25.0
<b>How well do you think multilateral trade negotiations address sensitive issues, such as agriculture subsidies, intellectual property rights, and services trade? (TL5)</b>		
Not well at all	30	5.0
Somewhat well	59	9.8
Moderately well	23	3.8
Very well	330	55.0
Extremely well	158	26.3
<b>Overall, how would you rate the effectiveness of TL in promoting global economic cooperation and integration? (TL6)</b>		
Not effective at all	21	3.5
Somewhat effective	91	15.2
Moderately effective	18	3.0
Very effective	304	50.7
Extremely effective	166	27.7

Table 6 represents a sizable majority of respondents demonstrated a good comprehension of the concept of TL1, with 28.0% reporting an outstanding understanding. 8.2% and 2.2%, respectively, of the sample size indicated limited and severely limited knowledge. TL was deemed to be extremely significant by a whopping 25.0% of respondents and very important by a whopping 61.3% of respondents for promoting global EG and development (TL2). Regarding the outcomes of significant multinational trade discussions, such as those held under the WTO (TL3), 56.3% of respondents felt well informed, while another 28.3% claimed they were extremely well informed. In order to ensure their participation in international trade and development, poor countries should be included in these negotiations, according to 25.0% and 53.8% of respondents, respectively (TL4). When evaluating how well multilateral trade negotiations handled sensitive problems (TL5), 26.3% and 55.0%, respectively, thought they were handled well. Overall, 50.7% of respondents assessed TL as very effective at promoting global economic cooperation and integration (TL6), while 27.7% said it was highly effective.

### *Economic Growth (EG)*

**Table 7:** Frequency Table 7

Factors	Frequency	Percentage
<b>How would you rate the current overall EG in your country/region? (EG1)</b>		
Very low growth	33	5.5
Low growth	63	10.5
Moderate growth	18	3.0
High growth	337	56.2
Very high growth	149	24.8
<b>How important do you consider sustained EG for improving the standard of living of individuals in your country/region? (EG2)</b>		
Not important at all	14	2.3
Somewhat important	66	11.0
Moderately important	18	3.0
Very important	333	55.5
Extremely important	169	28.2
<b>How well do you think EG supports investment in infrastructure development, research and development, and technological advancements? (EG3)</b>		
Not well at all	8	1.3
Somewhat well	68	11.3

Moderately well	11	1.8
Very well	308	51.3
Extremely well	205	34.2
<b>How well do you think EG addresses income inequality and poverty reduction within your country/region? (EG4)</b>		
Not well at all	10	1.7
Somewhat well	59	9.8
Moderately well	8	1.3
Very well	337	56.2
Extremely well	186	31.0
<b>How satisfied are you with the government's efforts to foster and support EG in your country/region? (EG5)</b>		
Very dissatisfied	9	1.5
Dissatisfied	63	10.5
Neutral	9	1.5
Satisfied	332	55.3
Very satisfied	187	31.2
<b>Overall, how would you rate the importance of sustained EG for the long-term prosperity and development of your country/region? (EG6)</b>		
Not important at all	7	1.2
Somewhat important	63	10.5
Moderately important	16	2.7
Very important	336	56.0
Extremely important	178	29.7

Table 7 displays the country or region's current overall EG (EG1) and the overwhelming majority of respondents indicated optimism. A sizable 56.2% of respondents indicated they believed the growth to be high, while 24.8% said they believed it to be extremely high. Conversely, a smaller percentage of participants (5.5%) and (10.5%) thought the growth was very low or modest. Extended EG (EG2) is essential to raising the standard of life; 55.5% of respondents find it to be very important, and 28.2% find it to be absolutely necessary. Infrastructure development, research and development, and technical advancements were deemed to be supported by EG in EG3 by 51.3% and EG3 by 34.2%, respectively. A significant 56.2% felt that EG was addressing income inequality and poverty reduction (EG4) very well, while 31.0% thought it was done exceptionally well. The majority of respondents (55.3%) expressed satisfaction with the government's efforts to promote and support EG (EG5). Last but not least, respondents stressed the importance of sustainable EG (EG6) for long-term prosperity, rating it as extremely essential by 29.7% and very important by 56.0%.

#### *Dispute settlement procedures of the WTO (DS)*

**Table 8:** Frequency Table 8

Factors	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Please rate your familiarity with the DS (DS1)</b>		
Not familiar at all	5	.8
Somewhat familiar	59	9.8
Moderately familiar	17	2.8
Very familiar	349	58.2
Extremely familiar	170	28.3
<b>How important do you think the DS is in resolving trade conflicts among member countries? (DS2)</b>		
Not important at all	1	.2
Somewhat important	64	10.7

Moderately important	8	1.3
Very important	324	54.0
Extremely important	203	33.8
<b>How satisfied are you with the efficiency and timeliness of the WTO's dispute settlement procedures in delivering decisions? (DS3)</b>		
Very dissatisfied	11	1.8
Dissatisfied	55	9.2
Neutral	8	1.3
Satisfied	336	56.0
Very satisfied	190	31.7
<b>How well do you think the WTO's dispute settlement procedures address trade disputes related to intellectual property rights, subsidies, and non-tariff barriers? (DS4)</b>		
Not well at all	12	2.0
Somewhat well	64	10.7
Moderately well	10	1.7
Very well	332	55.3
Extremely well	182	30.3
<b>How transparent do you perceive the WTO's dispute settlement procedures to be in terms of providing clear and accessible information to all parties involved? (DS5)</b>		
Not transparent at all	5	.8
Somewhat transparent	64	10.7
Moderately transparent	19	3.2
Very transparent	335	55.8
Extremely transparent	177	29.5
<b>Overall, how would you rate the effectiveness of the DS in resolving trade disputes and maintaining a rules-based global trading system? (DS6)</b>		
Not effective at all	4	.7
Somewhat effective	66	11.0
Moderately effective	11	1.8
Very effective	385	64.2
Extremely effective	134	22.3

Table 8 shows the opinions of respondents regarding the WTO's Dispute Settlement (DS) processes. It demonstrates their acquaintance with, perception of the significance of, pleasure with, evaluation of effectiveness, and openness concerning the DS procedures. The majority of respondents (86.5%) said that they were very familiar or extremely familiar with the DS procedures when asked about familiarity (DS1). This suggests that the respondents had a high level of knowledge and awareness. A significant percentage of respondents (87.8%) believed that DS was either very important or extremely important in resolving trade issues (DS2). This emphasizes the widely acknowledged importance of DS processes in resolving trade disputes among member countries. Most respondents (87.7%) stated varied degrees of pleasure, ranging from pleased to very satisfied, on their level of satisfaction with efficiency and punctuality (DS3). The possibility to improve efficiency and timeliness in the delivery of decisions is indicated by the modest percentage of respondents (11%) who stated dissatisfaction or neutrality. The majority of respondents (94.4%) stated that the WTO's dispute settlement mechanisms are either very effective or extremely effective in resolving trade disputes and preserving a rules-based global trading system when it comes to the perceived effectiveness of DS procedures (DS4 and DS6). This demonstrates the respondents' faith in DS's efficacy. A large percentage of respondents (85.3%) found the WTO's dispute resolution processes to be either very clear or extremely transparent, indicating a perception of clarity and accessibility of information for all parties concerned.

#### *Resolution of trade disputes (RT)*

**Table 9:** Frequency Table 9

Factors	Frequency	Percentage
<b>How familiar are you with the process of resolving trade disputes between countries? (RT1)</b>		
Not familiar at all	9	1.5
Somewhat familiar	61	10.2
Moderately familiar	10	1.7
Very familiar	336	56.0
Extremely familiar	184	30.7
<b>How important do you believe it is to have an effective mechanism for resolving trade disputes between countries? (RT2)</b>		
Not important at all	11	1.8
Somewhat important	61	10.2
Moderately important	11	1.8
Very important	333	55.5
Extremely important	184	30.7
<b>How satisfied are you with the existing mechanisms for resolving trade disputes at the international level? (RT3)</b>		
Very dissatisfied	15	2.5
Dissatisfied	59	9.8
Neutral	18	3.0
Satisfied	355	59.2
Very satisfied	153	25.5
<b>How well do you think the current mechanisms for resolving trade disputes address issues such as unfair trade practices, intellectual property rights violations, and non-tariff barriers? (RT4)</b>		
Not well at all	7	1.2
Somewhat well	56	9.3
Moderately well	15	2.5
Very well	365	60.8
Extremely well	157	26.2
<b>How effective do you think the current mechanisms for resolving trade disputes are in ensuring compliance with the outcomes and rulings? (RT5)</b>		
Not effective at all	13	2.2
Somewhat effective	55	9.2
Moderately effective	12	2.0
Very effective	367	61.2
Extremely effective	153	25.5
<b>Overall, how would you rate the importance of having an efficient and effective system for the RT in promoting a fair and rules-based international trading system? (RT6)</b>		
Not important at all	15	2.5
Somewhat important	58	9.7
Moderately important	12	2.0
Very important	350	58.3
Extremely important	165	27.5

Table 9 provides information on how respondents view and feel about the procedure for resolving international trade disputes. Respondents' degrees of familiarity, importance, satisfaction, perceived efficacy, and overall evaluation of trade dispute settlement methods varied according to the frequency and percentage distribution. The majority of respondents (86.7%) indicated that they were either very familiar with or extremely familiar with the procedure for resolving trade disputes when asked about familiarity (RT1). A sizable number of respondents (86.2%) said that efficient dispute resolution processes (RT2) were either very important or extremely important. The majority of respondents (84.7%) stated varied degrees of satisfaction with the current mechanisms (RT3), ranging from satisfied to very satisfied. There is space

for improvement in the current systems, yet a sizable portion of respondents (12.5%) reported being unsatisfied or very dissatisfied. A majority of respondents (87%) thought that the current mechanisms for resolving trade disputes effectively address problems like unfair trade practices, infringements of intellectual property rights, and non-tariff barriers, as well as ensuring adherence to decisions and rulings, in terms of effectiveness (RT4 and RT5). Overall, a sizable portion of respondents (85.8%) emphasized the significance of having an effective and efficient system for resolving trade disputes to advance a just and rules-based system of international commerce.

*Technical assistance programs provided by the WTO (TA)*

**Table 10:** Frequency Table 10

Factors	Frequency	Percentage
<b>How familiar are you with the TA? (TA1)</b>		
Not familiar at all	13	2.2
Somewhat familiar	65	10.8
Moderately familiar	8	1.3
Very familiar	301	50.2
Extremely familiar	213	35.5
<b>How important do you think technical assistance programs are for building capacity and promoting inclusive participation of developing countries in global trade? (TA2)</b>		
Not important at all	3	.5
Somewhat important	65	10.8
Moderately important	8	1.3
Very important	335	55.8
Extremely important	189	31.5
<b>To what extent do you believe that TA effectively addresses the specific needs and challenges of developing countries? (TA3)</b>		
Not effective at all	24	4.0
Somewhat effective	71	11.8
Moderately effective	29	4.8
Very effective	337	56.2
Extremely effective	139	23.2
<b>How satisfied are you with the availability and accessibility of technical assistance programs offered by the WTO to developing countries? (TA4)</b>		
Very dissatisfied	24	4.0
Dissatisfied	57	9.5
Neutral	27	4.5
Satisfied	336	56.0
Very satisfied	156	26.0
<b>How well do you think technical assistance programs support developing countries in integrating into the global value chains and taking advantage of trade opportunities? (TA5)</b>		
Not well at all	20	3.3
Somewhat well	92	15.3
Moderately well	21	3.5
Very well	301	50.2
Extremely well	166	27.7
<b>How effective do you think the TA is in promoting sustainable development and addressing environmental and social challenges? (TA6)</b>		
Not effective at all	28	4.7
Somewhat effective	64	10.7
Moderately effective	19	3.2
Very effective	351	58.5



Extremely effective	138	23.0
---------------------	-----	------

The frequency and percentage distribution of responses to various questions on technical assistance (TA) in relation to developing countries and their participation in international trade are shown in Table 10. In response to the first question (TA1), 13 respondents (2.2%) said they were not at all familiar with TA, while 65 (10.8%), 8 (1.3%), 301 (50.2%), 301 (50.2%), and 213 (35.5%) said they were quite knowledgeable. Regarding the importance of technical assistance programs (TA2) for promoting inclusive participation in international trade, 3 respondents (0.5%) believed they were not at all significant, 65 (10.8%) believed they were somewhat significant, 8 (1.3%) believed they were moderately significant, 335 (55.8%) believed they were very significant, and 189 (31.5%) believed they were extremely significant. The effectiveness of TA in addressing the special needs and challenges of developing countries was rated by 24 respondents (4.0%) as being ineffective, 71 (11.8%) as being somewhat effective, 29 (4.8%) as being moderately effective, 337 (56.2%) as being very effective, and 139 (23.2%) as being extremely effective. The availability and accessibility of technical assistance programs offered by the WTO to developing countries (TA4) was rated as extremely unsatisfactory by 24 respondents (4.0%), unsatisfactory by 57 respondents (9.5%), indifferent by 27, satisfied by 336 respondents (56.0%), and very satisfied by 156 respondents (26.0%). Twenty participants (3.3%), 92 respondents (15.3%), 21 respondents (3.5%), 301 respondents (50.2%), and 166 respondents (27.7%) gave their opinions on how well technical assistance programs (TA5) support developing countries' efforts to integrate into global value chains and take advantage of trade opportunities. Regarding TA's efficacy in fostering sustainable development and addressing environmental and social challenges (TA6), 28 respondents (4.7%) believed it to be ineffective, 64 (10.7%) believed it to be somewhat effective, 19 (3.2%) believed it to be moderately effective, 351 (58.5%) believed it to be very effective, and 138 (23.0%) believed it to be extremely effective.

#### *Capacity-building in developing countries (CB)*

**Table 11:** Frequency Table 11

Factors	Frequency	Percentage
<b>How familiar are you with the concept of capacity-building in the context of developing countries? (CB1)</b>		
Not familiar at all	5	.8
Somewhat familiar	60	10.0
Moderately familiar	21	3.5
Very familiar	348	58.0
Extremely familiar	166	27.7
<b>How important do you think capacity-building is for the sustainable development and EG of developing countries? (CB2)</b>		
Not important at all	1	.2
Somewhat important	66	11.0
Moderately important	11	1.8
Very important	322	53.7
Extremely important	200	33.3
<b>To what extent do you believe that capacity-building initiatives effectively address the specific needs and challenges faced by developing countries? (CB3)</b>		
Not effective at all	13	2.2
Somewhat effective	59	9.8
Moderately effective	8	1.3
Very effective	336	56.0
Extremely effective	184	30.7
<b>How satisfied are you with the availability and accessibility of capacity-building programs and resources for developing countries? (CB4)</b>		
Very dissatisfied	12	2.0
Dissatisfied	69	11.5

Neutral	10	1.7
Satisfied	335	55.8
Very satisfied	174	29.0
<b>How well do you think capacity-building initiatives support developing countries in effectively participating in and benefiting from international trade? (CB5)</b>		
Not well at all	7	1.2
Somewhat well	68	11.3
Moderately well	19	3.2
Very well	330	55.0
Extremely well	176	29.3
<b>How effective do you think capacity-building initiatives are in addressing challenges related to infrastructure development, technology transfer, and market access for developing countries? (CB6)</b>		
Not effective at all	5	.8
Somewhat effective	68	11.3
Moderately effective	21	3.5
Very effective	346	57.7
Extremely effective	160	26.7

The frequency and distribution of responses to various inquiries about capacity-building in the context of developing nations are shown in Table 11 in terms of percentages. When asked whether they were familiar with capacity-building, the first question (CB1), 5 respondents (0.8%), said they were not at all familiar, followed by 60 (10.0%), 60 (10.0%), 21 (3.5%), 348 (58.0%), who said they were very familiar, and 166 (27.7%), who said they were highly familiar. When asked about the importance of capacity-building for sustainable development and EG (CB2), 1 (0.2%) of the respondents believed it to be of little importance. It was considered to be fairly important by 66 (11.0%), somewhat important by 11 (1.8%), quite important by 322 (53.7%), and extremely important by 200 (33.3%). 2.2% of respondents, or 13 people, believed capacity-building programmes were completely ineffective at addressing the demands and difficulties encountered by developing nations. They were deemed to be somewhat successful by 59 (9.8%), fairly effective by 8 (1.3%), very effective by 336 (56.0%), and extremely effective by 184 (30.7%). 12 respondents (2.0%) expressed great dissatisfaction with the accessibility and availability of capacity-building programs and resources (CB4), compared to 69 (11.5%) who expressed dissatisfaction, 10 (1.7%) who expressed neutrality, 335 (55.8%), who expressed satisfaction, and 174 (29.0%), who expressed extreme satisfaction. In response to the question of how well capacity-building initiatives are supported in enabling developing countries to engage in and profit from international trade (CB5), 7 respondents (1.2%) thought it was not at all well, 68 (11.3%) thought it was somewhat well, 19 (3.2%) thought it was moderately well, 330 (55.0%) thought it was very well, and 176 (29.3%) thought it was extremely well. When it came to addressing problems with infrastructure development, technology transfer, and market access (CB6), 5 respondents (0.8%) believed that capacity-building initiatives had no impact at all, 68 (11.3%) believed they had some impact, 21 (3.5%) believed they had some impact, 346 (57.7%) believed they had a very good effect, and 160 (26.7%) believed they had a very good effect.

### *Descriptive Statistics*

**Table 12:** Table on Descriptive Statistics

	Mean		Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic
Age	3.43	.054	1.330
Gender	1.50	.020	.500
Education	3.78	.045	1.100
Occupation	3.11	.057	1.390

MW1	4.05	.041	.993
MW2	4.10	.036	.876
MW3	4.06	.038	.919
MW4	4.06	.036	.872
MW5	4.14	.036	.872
MW6	4.10	.037	.900
TV1	4.06	.038	.924
TV2	4.05	.036	.893
TV3	3.99	.034	.835
TV4	4.04	.037	.909
TV5	4.05	.038	.923
TV6	3.97	.037	.912
EM1	4.02	.034	.845
EM2	4.01	.036	.888
EM3	4.02	.037	.896
EM4	4.01	.036	.880
EM5	4.05	.038	.923
EM6	3.97	.037	.911
CI1	4.02	.034	.844
CI2	4.01	.036	.888
CI3	4.02	.037	.900
CI4	4.01	.036	.878
CI5	4.04	.037	.901
CI6	4.02	.039	.948
TL1	4.02	.037	.912
TL2	3.98	.037	.911
TL3	3.99	.038	.942
TL4	3.82	.044	1.084
TL5	3.88	.043	1.064
TL6	3.84	.045	1.097
EG1	3.84	.044	1.082
EG2	3.96	.040	.981
EG3	4.06	.039	.965
EG4	4.05	.038	.930
EG5	4.04	.038	.939
EG6	4.03	.038	.921
DS1	4.03	.036	.883
DS2	4.11	.036	.885
DS3	4.07	.038	.927
DS4	4.01	.039	.963
DS5	4.03	.037	.911
DS6	3.97	.035	.861
RT1	4.04	.038	.930

RT2	4.03	.039	.947
RT3	3.95	.039	.950
RT4	4.02	.036	.875
RT5	3.99	.037	.915
RT6	3.99	.039	.953
TA1	4.06	.041	.997
TA2	4.07	.037	.896
TA3	3.83	.043	1.042
TA4	3.91	.042	1.019
TA5	3.84	.045	1.095
TA6	3.85	.043	1.042
CB1	4.02	.036	.888
CB2	4.09	.037	.894
CB3	4.03	.039	.953
CB4	3.98	.040	.974
CB5	4.00	.038	.941
CB6	3.98	.037	.912

Table 12 presents the mean and standard deviation for various variables. Age, Gender, Education, and Occupation are among the statistics, along with ratings for a number of items denoted by the prefixes MW, TV, EM, CI, TL, EG, DS, RT, TA, and CB. The sample's median age is 3.43, with a 0.054 standard deviation. The standard deviation of the mean gender value, 1.50, is 0.020. The average schooling score is 3.78, with a 0.045 standard deviation. The average rating for a job is 3.11, with a 0.057 standard deviation. With standard errors ranging between 0.034 and 0.045, the ratings for the individual items range from 3.82 to 4.14.

### Correlation

**Table 13:** Correlation Table

Pearson Correlation	MW	TV	EM	CI	TL	EG	DS	RT	TA	CB
MW	1	.770**	.835**	.775**	.731**	.774**	.400**	.457**	.739**	.761**
TV		1	.800**	.765**	.700**	.708**	.311**	.366**	.654**	.678**
EM			1	.814**	.702**	.747**	.344**	.414**	.684**	.711**
CI				1	.683**	.707**	.347**	.377**	.643**	.683**
TL					1	.750**	.355**	.389**	.859**	.699**
EG						1	.376**	.422**	.743**	.894**
DS							1	.800**	.367**	.483**
RT								1	.408**	.498**
TA									1	.646**
CB										1

Table 4.3 represents the Pearson correlation coefficients between various variables. The associations between the variables MW, TV, EM, CI, TL, EG, DS, RT, TA, and CB are displayed in the correlation matrix. TV ( $r = 0.770$ ), EM ( $r = 0.835$ ), CI ( $r = 0.775$ ), TL ( $r = 0.731$ ), EG ( $r = 0.774$ ), DS ( $r = 0.400$ ), RT ( $r = 0.457$ ), TA ( $r = 0.739$ ), and CB ( $r = 0.761$ ) all have significant positive correlations with the variable MW. EM ( $r = 0.800$ ), CI ( $r = 0.765$ ), TL ( $r = 0.700$ ), EG ( $r = 0.708$ ), DS ( $r = 0.311$ ), RT ( $r = 0.366$ ), TA ( $r =$

= 0.654), and CB ( $r = 0.678$ ) all have significant positive associations with TV. Similar to CI, TL, EG, DS, RT, TA, and CB, EM also has high positive correlations with  $r = 0.814$  for CI,  $r = 0.702$  for TL,  $r = 0.414$  for RT, and  $r = 0.747$  for EG. TL ( $r = 0.683$ ), EG ( $r = 0.707$ ), DS ( $r = 0.347$ ), RT ( $r = 0.377$ ), TA ( $r = 0.643$ ), and CB ( $r = 0.683$ ) all show a significant positive connection with CI. With respect to EG ( $r = 0.750$ ), DS ( $r = 0.355$ ), RT ( $r = 0.389$ ), TA ( $r = 0.859$ ), and CB ( $r = 0.699$ ), TL has a significant positive connection. DS, RT, TA, and CB all have significant positive correlations with EG ( $r = 0.376, 0.422, 0.743,$  and  $0.894$ , respectively). RT and TA exhibit a high positive connection with DS ( $r = 0.408$  and  $r = 0.498$ , respectively). The association between RT and TA is moderately positive ( $r = 0.646$ ).

### Regression coefficients

**Table 14: Regression Table (a) TV and MW**

Model		UC		SC	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	TV	.929	.106		8.726	.000
	MW	.758	.026	.770	29.530	.000

"UC=Unstandardized Coefficients, SC= Standardized Coefficients"

The findings of a regression analysis are shown in Table 14 (a), which also includes the t-values and significance levels for the model's variables as well as the UC and SC. The independent variable "TV" has a UC (Beta) of 0.929 and a standard error of 0.106; it is one of the independent variables. According to the t-value of 8.726 ( $p < 0.05$ ), the coefficient for "TV" is substantially different from zero. The SC (Beta) for "TV" is 0.770, suggesting a strong positive effect on the dependent variable. Another independent variable, "MW," has a UC of 0.758, a standard error of 0.026, and a t-value of 29.530 ( $p < 0.05$ ). The SC for "MW" is 0.770, indicating a strong positive effect as well which proves hypothesis 1.

### (b) CI and EM

Model		UC		SC	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	CI	.629	.100		6.269	.000
	EM	.845	.025	.814	34.223	.000

The results of a regression analysis are shown in Table 14(b), which includes the UC and SC, as well as the t-values and significance levels for the model's variables. The independent variable "CI" has a UC (Beta) of 0.629 and a standard deviation of 0.100. The coefficient for "CI" appears to be substantially different from zero, according to the t-value of 6.269 ( $p < 0.05$ ). The SC (Beta) for "CI" is 0.814, indicating a strong positive effect on the dependent variable. The variable "EM" is another independent variable with a UC of 0.845, a standard error of 0.025, and a t-value of 34.223 ( $p < 0.05$ ). The SC for "EM" is 0.814, suggesting a strong positive effect as well which proves hypothesis 2.

### (c) EG and TL

Model		UC		SC	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		

1	EG	1.057	.108		9.815	.000
	TL	.749	.027	.750	27.733	.000

The results of a regression analysis are shown in Table 14(c), which also includes the UC and SC, t-values, and significance levels for each variable in the model. One of the independent variables is the "EG" variable, which has a UC (Beta) of 1.057 and a standard error of 0.108. The t-value of 9.815 indicates that the coefficient for "EG" is significantly different from zero, as the associated p-value is less than 0.05. The SC (Beta) for "EG" is 0.750, suggesting a strong positive effect on the dependent variable. The variable "TL" is another independent variable in the model. With a standard error of 0.027, it has a UC (Beta) of 0.749. The coefficient for "TL" is substantially different from zero, according to the t-value of 27.733, and the p-value is less than 0.05. The SC (Beta) for "TL" is 0.750, indicating a strong positive effect on the dependent variable which proves hypothesis 3.

## (d) RT and DS

Model		UC		SC	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	RT	.804	.100		8.076	.000
	DS	.793	.024	.800	32.628	.000

The findings of a regression analysis are shown in Table 14(d), which also includes the UC and SC, t-values, and significance levels for each variable in the model. With a UC (Beta) of 0.804 and a standard error of 0.100, the variable "RT" is one among the independent variables. Given that the corresponding p-value is less than 0.05 and the t-value of 8.076, the coefficient for "RT" is shown to be substantially different from zero. The SC (Beta) for "RT" is 0.800, indicating a strong positive effect on the dependent variable. The variable "DS" is another independent variable in the model. With a standard error of 0.024, it has a UC (Beta) of 0.793. With a p-value of less than 0.05, the t-value of 32.628 indicates that the coefficient for "DS" is substantially different from zero. The SC (Beta) for "DS" is 0.800, suggesting a strong positive effect on the dependent variable which proves hypothesis 4.

## (e) CB and TA

Model		UC		SC	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.626	.118		13.825	.000
	TA	.609	.029	.646	20.675	.000

The outcomes of regression analysis are shown in Table 14(e), together with the UC and SC, t-values, and significance levels for the variables. This model has a coefficient of 1.626 and a standard error of 0.118 for the constant term (denoted by "Constant"). The t-value of 13.825 demonstrates that the constant term substantially deviates from zero given the p-value of less than 0.05. The variable "TA" is another independent variable in the model. It has a UC (Beta) of 0.609, with a standard error of 0.029. The SC (Beta) for "TA" is 0.646, suggesting a moderately positive effect on the dependent variable. The t-value of 20.675 indicates that the coefficient for "TA" is significantly different from zero, as the associated p-value is less than 0.05 which proves hypothesis 5.

## Conclusion

In conclusion, IITL and the WTO are crucial for fostering international economic cooperation. These procedures have aided in the expansion of international trade and promoted national economic development by establishing a rules-based system of international trade. The study's empirical results support the claim that IITL, the WTO, and their policies have a favorable influence on international economic cooperation. The results emphasize the importance of multilateral trade agreements, efficient dispute resolution procedures, technical support, and trade law enforcement in supporting EG, international collaboration, and trade ties. These findings help us comprehend the role that IITL and the WTO play in fostering international economic cooperation. However, the study has some limitations. The sample size only involves lone country i.e., India, which demerit the scope of this study due to constraint sample size.

## References

- Abbas, M., Jam, F. A., & Khan, T. I. (2024). Is it harmful or helpful? Examining the causes and consequences of generative AI usage among university students. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 21(1), 10.
- Aggarwal, V. K. (2005, February). The dynamics of trade liberalization. In *Ensayo preparado para la presentación de la conferencia Festschrift conference for Robert O. Keohane, Princeton* (pp. 17-19).
- Ahmed, I., Farooq, W., & Khan, T. I. (2021). Customers' Perceptions and their Responses to Objectives of Islamic Banks—A Three-Wave Investigation. *Asian Economic and Financial Review*, 11(1), 43. al politics and job outcomes.
- Amurwanti, D.N., Karim, M.F. and Joanita, N., 2021. Settling outside the WTO: the case of the Indonesia-US kretek cigarette trade dispute, 2010–2014. *South East Asia Research*, 29(1), pp.92–107.
- Bajec, N.L., 2020. The world trade organization reform: a make-or-break moment. *Contemporary Economic and Business Issues*, p.247.
- Barlow, P. and Stuckler, D., 2021. Globalization and health policy space: Introducing the WTOhealth dataset of trade challenges to national health regulations at World Trade Organization, 1995–2016. *Social Science & Medicine*, 275, p.113807.
- Barlow, P. and Thow, A.M., 2021. Neoliberal discourse, actor power, and the politics of nutrition policy: a qualitative analysis of informal challenges to nutrition labelling regulations at the World Trade Organization, 2007–2019. *Social Science & Medicine*, 273, p.113761.
- Bhattacharai, B.R., Regmi, B.P., Gupta, A., Aryal, B., Adhikari, B., Paudel, M. and Parajuli, N., 2022. Importance of advanced analytical techniques and methods for food quality control and pollution analysis for more sustainable future in the least developed countries. *Sustainable Chemistry and Pharmacy*, 27, p.100692.
- Bohnenberger, F. and Weinhardt, C., 2022. Most-Favoured Nation Clauses: A Double-Edged Sword in a Geo-Economic Era. In *A Geo-Economic Turn in Trade Policy? EU Trade Agreements in the Asia-Pacific* (pp. 127–148). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Braun, B., 2019. Building global institutions: the diffusion of management standards in the world economy—an institutional perspective. In *Linking industries across the world* (pp. 3–28). Routledge.
- Cai, Y. and Kim, E., 2019. Sustainable development in world trade law: application of the precautionary principle in Korea-radionuclides. *Sustainability*, 11(7), p.1942.
- Chattu, V.K., Singh, B., Kaur, J. and Jakovljevic, M., 2021. COVID-19 vaccine, TRIPS, and global health diplomacy: India's role at the WTO platform. *BioMed Research International*, 2021.
- Cottier, T. (2009). *The Legitimacy of WTO*. In *The Law and Economics of Globalisation*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Dang, Q.T., Jasovska, P. and Rammal, H.G., 2020. International business-government relations: The risk management strategies of MNEs in emerging economies. *Journal of World Business*, 55(1), p.101042.
- Dent, C. M. (2006). *New free trade agreements in the Asia-Pacific*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gygli, S., Haelg, F., Potrafke, N. and Sturm, J.E., 2019. The KOF globalisation index—revisited. *The Review of International Organizations*, 14, pp.543–574.
- Hana, N., 2019. THE CHALLENGES OF HALAL CERTIFICATION IN INDONESIA HALAL PRODUCT ASSURANCE ACT Perspective of Islamic Law and World Trade Organization Law.
- Hoekman, B. and Wolfe, R., 2021. Reforming the World Trade Organization: Practitioner perspectives from China, the EU, and the US. *China & World Economy*, 29(4), pp.1–34.
- Hoekman, B. M., & Mavroidis, P. C. (2015). *World Trade Organization (WTO): law, economics, and politics*. Routledge.
- Hoekman, B., 2002. Strengthening the global trade architecture for development: the post Doha agenda. *World Trade Review*, 1(1), pp.23–45.
- Iqbal, B.A., Rahman, N. and Elimimian, J., 2019. The future of global trade in the presence of the Sino-US trade war. *Economic and Political Studies*, 7(2), pp.217–231.
- Jamil, R. A., Qayyum, U., ul Hassan, S. R., & Khan, T. I. (2023). Impact of social media influencers on consumers' well-being and purchase intention: a TikTok perspective. *European Journal of Management and Business Economics*, (ahead-of-print).
- Jiménez, D.L., Dittmar, E.C. and Portillo, J.P.V., 2021. The use of trust seals in European and Latin American commercial transactions. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 7(2), p.150.

- Khan, F. A. J. T. I., Anwar, F., Sheikh, R. A., & Kaur, S. (2012). Neuroticism and job outcomes: Mediating effects of perceived organizational politics. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(7), 2508.
- Khan, M. T., Khan, T. I., & Khan, S. (2020). Innovation & Its Diffusion in Business: Concept, Stages & Procedural Practices. *sjsr*, 3(4), 174-186.
- Kuo, Y. K., Khan, T. I., Islam, S. U., Abdullah, F. Z., Pradana, M., & Kaewsang-On, R. (2022). Impact of green HRM practices on environmental performance: The mediating role of green innovation. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 916723.
- Kuo, Y. K., Khan, T. I., Islam, S. U., Abdullah, F. Z., Pradana, M., & Kaewsang-On, R. (2022). Impact of green HRM practices on environmental performance: The mediating role of green innovation. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 916723.
- Latifah, E., Imanullah, M.N. and Mahardika, R.B.W., 2019. The most-favored-nation principle in Indonesian investment law: Legal interpretation of Article 6 of Indonesian Investment Act No. 25 Year 2007. In *Culture and International Law* (pp. 100-109). CRC Press.
- Li, H. X., Hassan, K., Malik, H. A., Anuar, M. M., Khan, T. I., & Yaacob, M. R. (2022). Impulsive and compulsive buying tendencies and consumer resistance to digital innovations: the moderating role of perceived threat of COVID-19. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 912051.
- Löhr, K., Aruqaj, B., Baumert, D., Bonatti, M., Brüntrup, M., Bunn, C., Castro-Nunez, A., Chavez-Miguel, G., Del Rio, M.L., Hachmann, S. and Morales Muñoz, H.C., 2021. Social cohesion as the missing link between natural resource management and peacebuilding: Lessons from cocoa production in Côte d'Ivoire and Colombia. *Sustainability*, 13(23), p.13002.
- Ludema, R. D., & Mayda, A. M. (2013). Do terms-of-trade effects matter for trade agreements? Theory and evidence from WTO countries. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 128(4), 1837-1893.
- Mavroidis, P.C., 2016. Dispute settlement in the WTO: mind over matter. In *Handbook of Commercial Policy* (Vol. 1, pp. 333-377). North-Holland.
- Meuleman, L., 2021. Public administration and governance for the SDGs: Navigating between change and stability. *Sustainability*, 13(11), p.5914.
- Meyer, T. (2018). Free trade, fair trade, and selective enforcement. *Columbia Law Review*, 118(2), 491-566.
- Monkelbaan, J., 2019. Governance for the sustainable development goals. Singapore: Springer.
- Mushtaq, R., Jabeen, R., Begum, S., Khan, A., & Khan, T. (2021). Expanded job scope model and turnover intentions: A moderated mediation model of Core-Self Evaluation and job involvement. *Management Science Letters*, 11(5), 1473-1480.
- Peters, A. (2003). International dispute settlement: a network of cooperational duties. *European Journal of International Law*, 14(1), 1-34.
- Pomfret, R., 2021. 'Regionalism' and the global trade system. *The World Economy*, 44(9), pp.2496-2514.
- Qureshi, A.H., 2019. The World Trade Organization and the promotion of effective dispute resolution: in times of a trade war. In *International Organizations and the Promotion of Effective Dispute Resolution* (pp. 145-159). Brill Nijhoff.
- Qureshi, A.H., 2019. The World Trade Organization and the promotion of effective dispute resolution: in times of a trade war. In *International Organizations and the Promotion of Effective Dispute Resolution* (pp. 145-159). Brill Nijhoff.
- Reade, C., McKenna, M. and Oetzel, J., 2019. Unmanaged migration and the role of MNEs in reducing push factors and promoting peace: A strategic HRM perspective. *Journal of International Business Policy*, 2, pp.377-396.
- Rodriguez, F. and Rodrik, D., 2000. Trade policy and economic growth: a skeptic's guide to the cross-national evidence. *NBER macroeconomics annual*, 15, pp.261-325.
- Sarwat, N., Ali, R., & Khan, T. I. (2021). Challenging, hindering job demands and psychological well-being: The mediating role of stress-related presenteeism. *Research Journal of Social Sciences and Economics Review*, 2(1), 135-143.
- Singh, T. (2010). Does international trade cause economic growth? A survey. *The World Economy*, 33(11), 1517-1564.
- Tesema, S., 2021. The Potential Market Benefits and Challenges of accession of World Trade Organization Ethiopia—the case of Leather Industry in Ethiopia (Doctoral dissertation, ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY).
- Usman, M. and Hammar, N., 2021. Dynamic relationship between technological innovations, financial development, renewable energy, and ecological footprint: fresh insights based on the STIRPAT model for Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation countries. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 28(12), pp.15519-15536.
- Wang, F., Li, Y., Zhang, W., He, P., Jiang, L., Cai, B., Zhang, J., Zhang, P., Pan, H. and Jiang, H., 2020. China's trade-off between economic benefits and sulfur dioxide emissions in changing global trade. *Earth's Future*, 8(1), p.e2019EF001354.
- Zhan, J.X., 2021. GVC transformation and a new investment landscape in the 2020s: Driving forces, directions, and a forward-looking research and policy agenda. *Journal of International Business Policy*, 4(2), pp.206-220.
- Zhao, L., 2023. The Reconstruction and Innovation of International Economic and Trade Rules. In *Modern China and International Rules: Reconstruction and Innovation* (pp. 41-71). Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore.
- Zoladkiewicz, K. and Orłowska, R., 2020. Imperfection of the World Trade Organization as a Hazard for International Business. *Engineering Economics*, 31(3), pp.358-370.