**Who We Are and How we Vote: A Metanarrative Analysis and the UNGA**

**Abstract**

**Identities play a central role in constituting national and transnational interests and are therefore considered a relevant reference for understanding political behaviors. However, scholars of politics have yet to agree on a way to operationalize them. This paper highlights the concept of metanarrative and its ability to characterize similarities and differences between nations’ identities and explain their actions. Focusing on the seventy-second session of the United Nations General Assembly, we offer an empirical model that incorporates the concept of metanarratives into traditional explanations of voting behaviors of nations. We show that affinity between metanarratives embraced by different nations is positively correlated with similarity in their voting patterns. This effect holds when controlling for key explanatory factors of voting behavior. Additionally, we test whether the content of a nation’s metanarrative can anticipate its likelihood of voting in favor of motions regarding one of the UNGA’s most central political topics – human rights. While** results were directionally consistent, the effect held when controlling for some but not all **other explanatory factors of voting behavior**.

**Who We Are and How we Vote: A Metanarrative Analysis and the UNGA**

Identities are normatively significant as well as behaviorally consequential aspects of politics (Smith 2004). Groups’ goals, preferences, and interests largely stem from their identity (Berenskoetter 2010; Brubaker et al. 2004; Risse et al. 1999). Furthermore, identities influence collectives’ understanding of the political sphere and consequently shape their practical actions (Abdelal et al. 2006; Georgiadis & Manning 2013; Hansen 2013 [2006]; Hintz 2018; Kunovich 2009). Thus, identities have been shown to structure behavior in both national and international arenas (March & Olsen 1998; Shain & Barth 2003).

Despite the common understanding that identities shed light on foreign policy decision-making (Carlsnaes 2013), scholars of politics have yet to agree on a way to operationalize them (Hopf 2002). Some scholars have highlighted the difficulty of measuring identities and suggested that they are too elusive to be used as a valuable variable for the social sciences (Brubaker & Cooper 2000). Others have utilized the concept of identities as part of empirical studies on political behaviors (e.g., [Abdelal et al. 2009](https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780199756223/obo-9780199756223-0190.xml#obo-9780199756223-0190-bibItem-0122); Brady & Kaplan 2000; Drulák et al. 2003; Hornung et al. 2019). Nevertheless, scholars argue that it still seems to have less impact on political research than might be expected (Huddy 2001).

This paper addresses the challenge from different theoretical and empirical points of view. Leaning on narrative literature, we suggest employing a *metanarrative analysis*. Metanarratives are culturally shared dominant stories that guide values, beliefs, and behaviors and, therefore, help communities understand desirable social conventions (Andrews 2007; McLean & Syed 2015; Squire et al. 2014). By offering a comprehensive framework through which the specific stories countries collectively tell about themselves are generated, metanarratives help construct national identities (e.g., Bamberg 2004; Connerton 1989; Hammack 2011b; Thorne & McLean 2003). However, a metanarrative analysis goes beyond the specific events placed in the chronicles of a particular nation, hence addressing a more abstract level of the story and allowing a comparative perspective (de Rivera & Sarbin 1998). Therefore, we suggest that metanarrative analysis is a practical approach not only to characterize similarities and differences between nations but also to explain their actions. We test this claim on nations’ voting behavior in the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA).

Employing network analysis to study the behavioral consequences of national metanarratives, we offer an empirical model that incorporates the concept of metanarratives into traditional explanations of voting behaviors of nations in the UNGA. We gauge each country’s metanarrative from its constitution preamble and show how affinity between metanarratives embraced by different nations is positively correlated with similarity in their voting patterns in the UNGA. This effect holds when controlling for key explanatory factors of voting behavior, such as level of democracy, wealth, and political as well as regional affiliation. We also test whether the content of a nation’s metanarrative can anticipate the likelihood of it voting in favor of a central political topic – human rights. This effect holds when controlling for some explanatory factors of voting behavior, but not for all. Finally, we discuss the potential contribution of metanarrative analysis to our understanding of national identities and their effect on voting behavior in international arenas.

**Identities, Metanarratives, and the International Arena**

Identities determine states’ preferences as well as serve as a source of justification for foreign policy decisions (Carlsnaes 2013; Price & Reus-Smit 1998). Due to the central role identities play in the process of constituting national and transnational interests, they are considered a relevant frame of reference for understanding political behaviors (Adler 2013). For example, identities have been used to study Soviet and Russian foreign policy (Hopf 2002), the development of security communities (Adler & Barnett 1998), regional order in the Arab political sphere (Barnett 1998), Jordan’s foreign policy (Lynch 1999), and the regional formation of the European community (Checkel & Katzenstein 2009; Oshri et al. 2016).

Past work has regarded identity as a narrative construct that has significant influence over international politics in a variety of issues such as the design of security communities (Williams & Neumann 2000), international order at times of crisis (Mattern 2005), and the formation of cross-national communities (Neumann 1999). This growing use of narratives as a frame of reference for identities, i.e., *narrative identity* (Ezzy 1998; Hammack 2008; Ricoeur 1991; Sheafer et al. 2011), relies on the notion that narratives consist of stories people tell in order to organize their experiences and construct their perception of reality (Bruner 1991; Monroe 2001; Roselle et al. 2014; Selbin 2013). By telling stories, people make sense of the social and political world and thus constitute their selves (Bueger 2013; Meyer 2010; Miskimmon et al. 2017; Tilly 2002; Singer 2004; Somers 1994)*.*

As for individuals, narratives serve a purpose within collectives such as nations (Shenhav 2015). Nations use stories to weave their reconstructed past and imagined future in order to provide foundations for their collective identity (Berenskoetter 2014). It gives them a sense of purpose and meaning (McAdams & McLean 2013). These national stories not only help nations define who they are but also endows them with the understanding of how to act (Somers 1992).

Following the reason that identity influences actions, it would make sense to analyze national narratives to understand political behaviors. Yet, this approach poses some difficulty when addressing international arenas, as national narratives are unique to each country. Hence, they refer to specific characters, events, actions, and so forth (Oren et al. 2015). We assert that making insightful observations regarding the global ring requires analyzing a narrative level that crosses a specific time and place (Hobson & Lawson 2008). Therefore, we wish to highlight the potential contribution of a *metanarrative analysis* for such studies.

The notion of metanarratives has been previously addressed in relation to international arenas, mostly under the term *grand narrative* (Lyotard 1984 [1979]). For example, Linklater (2009) studied metanarratives’ ability to systematically reflect the normative principles that regulate global interconnectedness. Diez (2001) and Cebeci (2012) examined metanarratives’ contribution to understanding European policy and governance. Mattern )2005) has pointed at the importance of deconstructing metanarratives. However, their effect on voting behavior has not been studied to date.

Metanarratives function as a platform through which distinguished social identities of collectives are shaped and specific narratives are designed (Auerbach 2010; Bamberg 2005; Elkins 2013 [2005]). By placing specific narratives within a wider context, national metanarratives present communities with desirable social conventions while creating a sense of a unique and united entity (Andrews 2007; Bamberg 2004; Ross 2007; Thorne & McLean 2003). If narratives fundamentally rest upon stories (Hammack & Pilecki 2012), then a metanarrative is the story behind the story (Auerbach 2010; van Eeten 2006; Somers & Gibson 1994).[[1]](#footnote-1) In other words, a metanarrative serves as the reason that constitutes all specific stories. This reason is expressed by “a cast of characters who are the subjects or objects of action” and by the values that lie at the base of these characters’ views (Causadias et al. 2018: 829).[[2]](#footnote-2) Thus, a metanarrative can be gauged through the pillars that comprised it: actions, actors, and values. Addressing metanarratives via these structural components is also in line with Jones et al. (2014) and Merry’s (2016) work on narrative policy, and Fisher's (1987) understanding of story components.

This approach allows to deconstruct metanarratives’ abstracted nature, yet at the same time, benefit from the comparative perspective they offer. Specifically, such analysis enables the organization of different stories according to conceptual frames, hence creating a comparable thematic coherence (Pyrhönen 2010). For example, to various extents, representatives of different states relate to past injustices inflicted on oppressed minority groups. Such is the case for the United States and the issue of slavery, South Africa and the Apartheid policy, and Australia and how it treated the native aborigines upon arrival to the land. While each of these explicitly relates to the history of a different nation, there are commonalities to the way they all address it: by relating to types of actors such as “*Minority Groups*” or “*The State*”; the action of “*Recognizing Past Injustice*”; and the value of “*Democratic Ideas*” for acknowledging the wrongness of their past behavior. This example suggests that while national stories are distinct, metanarratives are not necessarily exclusive and can quite easily be compared. Exploring them through their structural components allows both to signify the meaning of a given national story as well as to compare it with alternative stories other nations tell about themselves. Assessing such points of resemblance and divergence can be valuable for gauging proximity between countries.

*The metanarrative proximity hypothesis*. The concept of proximity between nations has been previously highlighted as an influential factor of a broad range of political phenomena in an international context, such as international aid (Ball 2010), economic ties (Shoemaker et al. 2007), public diplomacy (Sheafer et al. 2013; Sheafer et al. 2014), and probability for war engagement (Maoz et al. 2006). Often, the proximity between nations is measured by the extent to which they are similar (or dissimilar) in key identity characteristics such as dominant language, religion, and ethnicity. While these conventional measures can capture symmetries and thus measure affinity between nations, they do it in a limited way, as they account for dichotomous identity features, for example, whether a pair of nations share a common language (Felbermayr & Toubal 2010).

Metanarratives can articulate a broader notion of identity, as they are not limited to traditional measures such as religion or language. If a nation regards a feature such as religion as a significant part of its identity, it will be encapsulated in its metanarrative. However, a metanarrative is not limited to pre-determined measures but allows the content of the nation's identity to dictate the indices by which proximity should be measured. Thus, if a different characteristic is more representative of the nation’s identity than religion or language are (for instance, stressing the importance of national unity), it will be embodied in its metanarrative. Accordingly, utilizing a metanarrative analysis allows a higher resolution measurement of similarity between nations. Moreover, as we will demonstrate in the next section, a metanarrative resemblance can be measured across a continuum rather than dichotomously, thus allowing a more complex observation of the international arena.

Considering the normative nature of metanarratives and how they help communities understand how they should act (Hammack 2008, 2011a), we hypothesize that nations that share similar metanarratives would be more likely to vote alike than nations that embrace different metanarratives. That is,

H1: the more proximate nations are in their metanarratives, the more similar their voting pattern at the UNGA is.

*The metanarrative motivated action hypothesis*. The question of what determines nations’ voting choices in the UNGA has been previously discussed but has not been decided (Boockmann & Dreher 2011). Some scholars argue that political behavior in the global arena represents contestation between states over matters of foreign policy and that contestation takes place in “a low-dimensional ideological space” (Voeten 2021: 14). Voting choices are thus made in accordance with cohesive ideological ideas regarding how different issues should be resolved and by whom. Others suggest that states’ decisions are made both according to their common foreign policy interests and in line with their sense of understanding of the situation (Finnemore & Sikkink 1998; March & Olsen 1998). Thus, voting choices in the UNGA stem from the desire to achieve specific goals, existing alliances, and ethical perspectives.

Being a key source for identity formation that guides nations on how to act, we expect the concept of metanarratives to add another tier to existing explanations for voting behavior in international arenas. Thus, there is room to explore whether metanarratives can enhance our ability to predict nations’ specific positions on certain issues. Most UNGA resolutions are concerned with six main categories: security (including disarmament), decolonization, environment, Middle East (including Israeli-Palestinian conflict-related votes), UN internal issues, and human rights (Hosli et al. 2010). So, if, for example, a nation’s metanarrative emphasizes the importance of independence and sovereignty, we would expect it to be reflected in votes pertaining to decolonization. Similarly, if a nation expresses its devotion to the idea of protecting the environment, we assume it will influence its voting choices on related matters.

Of the six main resolution categories, human rights are considered one of the most significant policy areas the UN deals with (Boockmann & Dreher 2011). Various bodies within the UN are designated to attend to this matter, and many UNGA members view this issue as an urgent issue to be discussed (Luif 2003). Considering the importance of this issue, it could be used as a good indication to study the influence of metanarratives on the content of nations’ voting choices. Thus, we hypothesize that:

H2: Nations that specify the value of *Democratic Ideas* in their metanarrative are more likely to vote in favor of human rights-related motions than nations who specify other values.

**Comparative Metanarrative Analysis and Voting in the UNGA**

Using UNGA rollcall voting records, constitution preambles, and methods of network analysis, we present a model for measuring proximity between nations based on their individual metanarrative. We also explain how we overcome possible statistical challenges inherent to such an analysis. In addition, we test whether the content of metanarratives enhances our ability to predict the likelihood of actual voting choices related to the issue of human rights in the UNGA.

**Data**

To examine the correlation between metanarratives and political behavior, we analyzed two main datasets: constitution preambles, as a source for gauging metanarratives, and UNGA members’ rollcall voting records.

*Constitution preambles.* As of 2021, the United Nations included 193 member states. Out of these, 158 countries have published a constitution containing a preamble.[[3]](#footnote-3) Our choice to focus on constitution preambles stems from the goals these documents are designed to accomplish: alongside their institutional role of laying a stable political framework and assigning institutions their political power (Elkins et al. 2009; Elster 1988), constitutions establish common ground rules, signify collective values, and indicate the nation's future aspirations (Aucoin 2010; Henkin 1994). The constitution’s underlying philosophy is often presented in its preamble (Voermans et al. 2017). This section both presents the country’s ideals and its national story, thus playing an essential part in the continuous construction and consolidation of the national identity (Addis 2018; Breslin 2009; Law 2016; Orgad 2010; von Arnauld 2017). Constitutions were taken from the constitution project database, which is consisted of English translations of current constitutions (Melton et al. 2013).[[4]](#footnote-4)

*All UNGA voting*. To test the metanarrative proximity hypothesis, we measure shared political and policy interests. To do so, we use the voting similarity between states in the UNGA (e.g., Davis & Wilf 2017; Girod & Tobin 2016; Reed et al. 2008; Wolford 2014; Ward & Dorussen 2016). UNGA voting records have become a standard data source for this type of research as it is the only forum in which such a large number of nations regularly converge and express their positions regarding a broad range of international issues (e.g., Bailey & Voeten 2018; Bailey et al. 2017; Kim & Russett 1996; Voeten 2013).

Data were derived from voting records regarding all resolutions brought to vote during the seventy-second session of the UNGA (2017/2018). Testing the validity of both hypotheses required the constitutional texts to match the time voting choices took place. Both before and after this session, some nations were going through different degrees of constitutional modification. Thus, the particular interest in this session derives from the timing of constitutional writing it captures, as it allowed to include all countries with a constitution preamble (158 nations). Following the literature on roll call voting, we exclude all those with fewer than 2.5% votes supporting the minority side (i.e., unanimous or nearly unanimous votes) and nations who voted less than 20 times (e.g., Poole & Rosenthal 2000 [1997]; Rosenthal & Voeten 2004; Thomassen et al. 2004). The final dataset consisted of 154 countries and a total of 95 resolutions. Voting records were taken from the index to proceedings of the UNGA.[[5]](#footnote-5)

*UNGA voting on human rights issues.* Following previous work, our sample consists of all resolutions that their title specifies the words “right” or “rights” (e.g., Boockmann & Dreher 2011).[[6]](#footnote-6) We also include resolutions dealing with violations of human rights, such as racism and discrimination, thus examining a total of 19 resolutions taken from the seventy-second UNGA session.

**Method**

*Gauging metanarratives*. Building on Causadias and colleagues (2018) and their understanding of the concept of metanarratives, we gauge each country’s metanarrative by extracting the most salient structural component appearing in the constitution preamble. We expect national stories to refer to more than one type of action, actor, or value. Thus, to determine what are the most prominent action, actor, and value in the text, we coded each preamble using Discourse Network Analyzer software (Leifeld, 2010). This software allows empirical analysis of political discourse producing numeric coding of texts. The relative share of each specific component was calculated by dividing the number of times it appeared in the text by the total number of component types.[[7]](#footnote-7)

Codebook for analyzing the constitutional texts was built based on a preliminary reading of all 158 constitution preambles. The codebook contained 19 actions, 22 actors, and 36 values, a total of 77 types of metanarrative components (for a complete list see Appendix A). The coding process is demonstrated using the following sentence, taken from the 2005 Sudanese constitution:

“We the people of the Sudan, grateful to Almighty God who has bestowed upon us the wisdom and will to reach a comprehensive peace agreement that has definitively put an end to the longest running conflict in Africa” (Sudan’s constitution preamble 2005).

This sentence contains references to the following actors: *The People* (“we the people of the Sudan”), *A Religious Figures* (“Almighty God”); Actions: *Struggle & Revolution* (“longest running conflict”), *Peace & Reconciliation Processes* (“reach a comprehensive peace agreement”); and Value: *Religion & Sacredness* (“grateful to Almighty God who has bestowed upon us the wisdom”). As can be seen in this example, one sentence can include more than one structural component.

To test the reliability of the coding, two independent coders, both advanced graduate students, coded 100 randomly chosen sentences. Coders attributed relevant types of metanarrative components taken from the pre-determined constitution preamble codebook. Coders were asked to choose between 77 component types. In case none of these seemed relevant, coders were able to choose a component called “other.” Intercoder Krippendorff’s alpha test showed reliability of < 0.85 (for a complete list of all national metanarratives see Appendix B).

*Assessing metanarrative proximity.* The scale reflects the extent to which a nation’s metanarrative is consistent with that of other nations, based on their respective attribution to the most common action, actor, and value structural components. To quantify the proximity between each pair of nations’ metanarratives, we created a four-point scale that reflects the number of shared components. The scale ranged from 0 (the two countries did not share any of the three structural components) to 3 (the two countries shared all three components, meaning they had identical metanarratives).

*Assessing voting similarity between nations.* For this purpose, we adopted a model that derives nations’ relative position from their voting in the UNGA. The NOMINATE algorithm (Poole & Rosenthal 2000 [1997]) sets an ideal point for each nation that represents their preferred outcomes relative to other states. Therefore, two countries exhibiting similar preferences would be assigned similar values, while countries that have more distinct preferences will be assigned relatively different values. To quantify their level of similarity, we calculated the difference between the values of each pair of nations. This is an acceptable scaling procedure for analyzing political choice data. It was previously used to study choice behavior in the American congress and its effect on polarization (McCarty et al. 2016), political competition in the European parliament (Thomassen et al. 2004), and most relevantly to this paper, Cold War and Post-Cold-War voting behavior in the UNGA (Voeten 2000).

*Network analysis*. Comparing all pairs of the 154 nations in our dataset produced 11,781 dyads. Since these dyads were not independent of each other, we applied a common approach in network research and analyzed the data using Quadratic Assignment Procedure (QAP) regression (Dreiling & Darves 2011; Krackhardt 1988; Mizruchi [1992](https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/full/10.1086/657524#rf69)). In QAP models, the data is permuted numerous times via bootstrapping to simulate a distribution of hypothetical correlations between the two variables (1,000 times in this study). Then, the coefficient in the data is tested against the simulated distribution, yielding unbiased parameter estimates and significance *p* values (Burris 2005; Cranmer et al. 2017; Krackhardt 1988; Schreiber & Carley 2007; Whitbred et al. 2011).[[8]](#footnote-8) QAP was implemented using r ‘sna’ package (Butts 2008).

*Measuring UNGA roll call votes regarding human rights issues.* Voting in the UNGA includes three possible options: voting in favor, voting against, and abstaining. Substantial disagreement exists regarding the question of how to treat abstentions in the UNGA. Some scholars view abstention as a softer way of opposing a decision and therefore merge them together (Voeten 2000; Volgy et al. 2003). Others consider this vote choice to have some meaning and thus include it in their scale when calculating the votes (e.g., Russett 1967; Rai 1972; Thacker 1999; Luif 2003). We test for both by building two scales. The first scales voting such that a vote in favor is coded as 1, and both abstention and opposing votes are coded as 0. The second scales voting such that a vote in favor is coded as 1, opposing is coded as 0, and an abstention as 0.5.

*Controls.* To test whether metanarratives explain nations’ vote choices above and beyond other factors, we controlled for the influence of the following variables:

Level of democracy and wealth*.* Previous studies have found states’ relative position in international organizations to be strongly influenced by their level of democracy and wealth (e.g., Carter & Stone 2015; Lai & Morey 2006; Kim & Russett 1996; Russett & Oneal 2001; Thacker 1999; Lebovic & Voeten 2006). We measured the level of democracy using a score taken from the 2018 Freedom House analysis of political rights and civil liberties (House 2018).[[9]](#footnote-9) This data set utilizes a seven-point scale to measures the extent to which a country is free (from one for being fully free to seven for being not free). We include gross national income per capita (Atlas method) as a proxy for economic development (The World Bank national accounts dataset 2018).[[10]](#footnote-10)

Constitutions’ age. It is possible that constitutions that were written around the same time express similar content due to dynamic trends in global political discourse. For example, following the dissolution of the Soviet Union, 15 countries gained independence and published a constitution containing a preamble; 12 of them did so between the years 1992-1996 and had not since replaced their constitution. Therefore, we control for the difference between pairs of nations in the year their constitutions were published. Controlling for constitutions’ age allows us to test whether the proximity in metanarratives can explain the similarity in voting behavior, over and above any effect of constitution writing trends.

Political and regional affiliations. Scholars indicate that nations’ conduct in the UNGA is influenced, to some extent, by their affiliation with various interest groups (Volger 2010). To examine whether metanarratives provide an explanation that exceeds associations with such groups, we control for regional affiliation as well as political alliance ties with the following: G-77, Non-Aligned Movement (MAM), European Union (EU), African Union (AU), League of Arab States.[[11]](#footnote-11)

**Findings**

*Metanarrative proximity hypothesis*. The premise of the approach developed here is that proximate identities will be indicated by proximate metanarratives. Consequently, we predicted that pairs of nations that have more proximate metanarratives would also demonstrate relatively similar voting patterns in the UNGA (H1). As described in the method section, due to the dyadic structure of the data, we employed a QAP regression model.

Supporting H1, we found a significant correlation between metanarrative proximity and voting similarity *(β =-0.07*, *p* < = .001), such that higher metanarrative proximity was associated with higher voting similarity.[[12]](#footnote-12) In other words, we find that the more nations are similar in their metanarratives, the smaller the distance is between their political positions, as reflected in their voting behavior at the UNGA. This effect holds even when controlling for other key possible predictors of political behavior: gross national income, freedom level, regional and political affiliations. It also holds when controlling for the possible effect of constitution writing trends (see table 1).

*Table 1:* Summary of QAP regression analyses predicting similarity in UNGA voting with proximity in national metanarrative, with and without control variables.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Model 1** |  | **Model 2** |
|  | **β** | ***p value*** |  |  **β** | ***p value*** |
| Metanarrative Proximity  | -0.071 | .001 |  | -0.045 | .004 |
|  Control for: |  |  |  |  |  |
|  GNI |  |  |  | 0.085 | <.001 |
|  Democracy  |  |  |  | 0.039 | <.001 |
|  Constitution Age |  |  |  | 0.007 |  .558 |
|  Regional Affiliation |  |  |  | -0.007 | .679 |
|  Political Group Ties |  |  |  | -0.102 | <.001 |
| R-square | .028 |  | .272 |
| N | 11,781 |  | 11,781 |

*Note:* N=11,781 dyads among 154 member states of the UN.

Regression coefficients are standardized.

Voting data is taken from the seventy-second sessions of the UNGA

*Robustness Tests*. As noted, our analysis focuses on the seventy-second session of the UNGA due to the timing of constitutional writing it captures (both prior to and following this session, some nations were going through different degrees of constitutional modification. Changing the constitutional text may entail a change in the metanarrative). To test the robustness of our findings regarding H1, we recoded the preambles of eight nations that had either changed or amended their constitution after 2017 and reran the QAP regression on voting data taken from the seventy-third and seventy-fourth UNGA sessions (2018/2019 and 2019/2020, respectably).[[13]](#footnote-13) The dataset for these two sessions consisted of 158 countries and a total of 206 resolutions. Voting records were taken from the index to proceedings of the UNGA.[[14]](#footnote-14) Results remained significant (r = *-0.09*, *p* < = .001) and held when controlling for key explanatory factors of voting behavior (see table 2).

*Table 2:* Summary of QAP regression analyses predicting similarity in UNGA voting with proximity in national metanarrative, with and without control variables.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Model 1** |  | **Model 2** |
|  | **β** | ***p value*** |  |  **β** | ***p value*** |
| Metanarrative Proximity  | -0.095 | .001 |  | -0.043 | .007 |
|  Control for: |  |  |  |  |  |
|  GNI |  |  |  | 0.137 | <.001 |
|  Democracy  |  |  |  | 0.033 | <.001 |
|  Constitution Age |  |  |  | 0.051 | .042 |
|  Regional Affiliation |  |  |  | 0.009 | .657 |
|  Political Group Ties |  |  |  | -0.155 | <.001 |
| R-square | .034 |  | .386 |
| N | 12,403 |  | 12,403 |

*Note:* N=12,403 dyads among 158 member states of the UN.

Regression coefficients are standardized.

Voting data is taken from the seventy-third and seventy-fourth sessions of the UNGA.

*Metanarrative motivated action hypothesis.* Thus far, we have shown that countries with akin metanarratives vote in a similar way at the UNGA. This finding, however, does not inform us of the *content* of political behavior that is associated with specific metanarratives. Below, we test whether the content of nations’ metanarratives can anticipate their likelihood of voting in favor of particular issues. Specifically, we test whether emphasizing *Democratic Ideas* as the main value in the metanarrative is correlated with greater support in human rights-related votes (H2).

110 out of 158 UN member nations that have a constitution preamble specified *Democratic Ideas* as their main value*.* This finding goes in line with previous work, indicating that human rights language is present in most constitutions (Beck et al. 2019). However, human rights rhetoric is not necessarily a product of regime characteristics (Beck et al. 2012). Accordingly, some of these nations are ranked as unfree autocracies (e.g., Azerbaijan, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Syrian Arab Republic). A vote on their part in favor of human rights-related issues would therefore not necessarily be an obvious choice.

We dummy coded nations by their metanarrative value such that nations that highlighted *Democratic Ideas* as their main value were coded as “1”, and all other nations were coded as “0”. Support in human rights-related motions in the UNGA was computed by coding a yay vote as “1”, an absentee as “0.5,” and a “nay” vote as “0”.

Analysis showed that nations that highlight *Democratic Ideas* as the main value in their metanarrative supported petitions in human rights issues (*M* = 15.33, SD = 2.72) more than nations that highlight other values (*M* = 13.90, SD = 3.07, *t*(152) = 2.75, *p* = .007). This effect holds when controlling for the level of freedom of a country as a proxy for democracy, GNI as a proxy for their economic strength, and the age of each constitution. However, while results were directionally consistent, the effect was not significant when controlling for regional affiliation and political ties (see table 3).[[15]](#footnote-15)

*Table 3:* Summary of regression analyses predicting voting in favor of human rights-related motions in the UNGA, with and without control variables.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** |
|  | **B** | ***p value*** | **B** | ***p value*** | **B** | ***p value*** |
| Metanarrative Proximity  | 0.227 | .004 | 0.152 | .055 | 0.092 | .159 |
|  Control for: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  GNI |  |  | -0.240 | .006 | -0.003 | .964 |
|  Democracy  |  |  | 0.158 | .059 | -0.072 | .350 |
|  Constitution Age |  |  | 0.016 | .825 | 0.010 | .860 |
|  Regional Affiliation |  |  |  |  | 0.041 | .675 |
|  Political Group Ties: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  G-77 |  |  |  |  | 0.422 | <.001 |
|  EU |  |  |  |  | -0.059 | .401 |
|  AU  |  |  |  |  | 0.019 | .827 |
|  MAM |  |  |  |  | 0.297 | .004 |
|  Arab League |  |  |  |  | 0.093 | .150 |
| R-square | .045 | .137 | .479 |
| N | 154 | 154 | 154 |

*Note:* N= 154 member states of the UN.

Voting data is taken from the seventy-second sessions of the UNGA.

**Summary**

Identities have long been a central focus of research, as they have been shown to explain political behaviors. Despite acknowledging their importance, scholars of politics have yet to agree on a way to operationalize identities. This paper offers new theoretical and methodological directions through which the challenge of analyzing identities and understanding their meaning in the international arena may be met. Relying on narrative theory, and particularly utilizing the concept of metanarratives, we focus our analysis on voting behavior in the UNGA and add another tier to existing explanations.

The attempt to incorporate a metanarrative analysis in social science research is gaining momentum (e.g., Syed & McLean 2020). Past work has emphasized the importance of the concept of metanarratives in a range of political aspects (e.g., Auerbach 2016; Razakamaharavo 2018; Roe 1994; Shenhav et al. 2020). This paper contributes to the existing literature by bringing attention to the structural character of metanarratives. It stipulates and organizes the meaning of the national metanarrative presented in each constitutional text (as this process extracts its particular content), and at the same time, enables the comparison of metanarratives on a united and coherent continuum, as the constitutional texts exhibit the same types of components regardless of specific time and place. Moreover, while previous work mostly focused on the theoretical implications of metanarratives, this paper offers an empirical model that incorporates them in a comparative analysis.

Our findings indicate that a metanarrative analysis can contribute to the mapping of inter-country relations within the global arena. Supporting the *metanarrative proximity hypothesis*, the level of proximity between nations’ metanarratives predicted the similarity of their voting behaviors. Further research is required in order to test whether such proximity correlates with different types of formal and informal international alliances such as mutual defense pacts, non-aggression treaties, etc. Results also lend some support for the *Metanarrative motivated action hypothesis* accordingly the content of the national metanarrative, and specifically their attribution to the value of *Democratic Ideas,* can explain a nation’s voting choice regarding human rights-related motions, as indicated in models 1 and 2 (see table 2). However, as indicated in model 3 (see table 2), results were not significant for all control variables.

On a more general note, we believe these results provide preliminary evidence for the explanatory power of metanarratives. Of course, there are limitations to this current research. Our analysis included nations who had written a constitution containing a preamble, which constitutes for most but not all UN members. Future work can analyze alternative constitutive documents to gauge each nation’s metanarrative. This may include annual speeches made by heads of state in UNGA summits or declarations made by leading opposition leaders. Future research can also examine the role of metanarrative in other international arenas, such as the European Parliament or other organs in the UN. Nevertheless, this study does provide an encouraging indication for the potential contribution of metanarrative analysis to understanding political behaviors in international arenas.

**Acknowledgment**

This research was supported by the Israel Science Foundation (Grants No. 1400/14).

**References**

Abdelal, Rawi, Herrera, Yoshiko M., Johnston, Alastair I., and McDermott Rose. 2006. “Identity as a Variable.” *Perspectives on Politics* 4 (4): 695-711.

Abdelal, Rawi, Herrera, Yoshiko M., Johnston, Alastair Iain, and McDermott Rose. 2009. *Measuring Identity: A Guide for Social Scientists*. Cambridge University Press.

Addis, Adeno. 2018. “Constitutional Preambles as Narratives of Peoplehood.” *ICL Journal* 12 (2): 125-181.

Adler, Emanuel, and Barnett, Michael. eds. 1998. *Security Communities*. Cambridge University Press.

Adler, Emanuel. 2013. “Constructivism in International Relations: Sources, Contributions, and Debates.” In *Handbook of International Relations* (2nd edition), edited by Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse and Beth A. Simmons, 112-144. London: SAGE.

Andrews, Molly. 2007. *Shaping History: Narratives of Political Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Aucoin, Louis. 2010. “Introduction.” In *Framing the State in Times of Transition:‎ Case Studies in Constitution Making*, edited by Laurel E. Miller with Louis Aucoin, xii-xvii. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Auerbach, Yehudith. 2010. “National Narratives in a Conflict of Identity.” In *Barriers to Peace in the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*, edited by Yaacov Bar-Siman-Tov, 99-134. The Jerusalem Institute for Israel Studies.

Auerbach, Yehudith. 2016. “Lack of Trust as a Barrier to Reconciliation in the Israeli–Palestinian Conflict: Attitudes of Israeli (Jewish) Elite Members Toward Reconciliation with the Palestinians.” In *The Role of Trust in Conflict Resolution*, edited by Ilai Alon and Daniel Bar-Tal, 241-257. Cham: Springer.

Bailey, Michael A., and Voeten Erik. 2018. “A Two-Dimensional Analysis of Seventy Years of United Nations Voting.” *Public Choice* 176 (1): 33-55.

Bailey, Michael A., Strezhnev, Anton, and Voeten Erik. 2017. “Estimating Dynamic State Preferences from United Nations Voting Data.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 61 (2): 430-456.

Ball, Richard. 2010. “Cultural Values and Public Policy: The Case of International Development Aid.” *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance* 50 (1): 3–16.

Bamberg, Michael. 2004. “Considering Counter Narratives.” In *Considering Counter-Narratives: Narrating, Resisting, Making Sense* (Vol. 4), edited by Michael Bamberg and Molly Andrews, 351-371. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing.

Bamberg, Michael. 2005. “Master Narrative.” In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*, edited by David Herman, Jahn Manfred and Marie-Laure Ryan, 287-288. London: Routledge.

Barnett, Michael N. 1998. *Dialogues in Arab Politics: Negotiations in Regional Order*. Columbia University Press.

Beck, Colin J., Drori, Gili S., and Meyer John W. 2012. “World Influences on Human Rights Language in Constitutions: A Cross-National Study.” *International Sociology* 27 (4): 483-501.

Beck, Colin J., Meyer, John W., Hosoki, Ralph I., and Drori Gili S. 2019. “Constitutions in World Society: A New Measure of Human Rights.” In *Constitution-Making and Transnational Legal Order*, edited by Gregory Shaffer, Tom Ginsburg, and Terence C. Halliday, 85-109. Cambridge University Press.

Berenskoetter, Felix. 2010. “Identity in International Relations.” In O*xford Research Encyclopedia of International Studies*, Editor in Chief: Renee Marlin-Bennett.

Berenskoetter, Felix. 2014. “Parameters of a National Biography.” *European Journal of International Relations* 20 )1(: 262-288.

Boockmann, Bernhard, and Dreher Axel. 2011. “Do Human Rights Offenders Oppose Human Rights Resolutions in the United Nations?.” *Public Choice* 146 (3-4): 443-467.

Brady, Henry E., and Kaplan Cynthia S. 2000. “Categorically Wrong? Nominal Versus Graded Measures of Ethnic Identity.” *Studies in Comparative International Development* 35(3): 56-91.

Breslin, Beau. 2009. *From Words to Worlds: Exploring Constitutional Functionality*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Brubaker, Rogers, and Cooper Frederick. 2000. “Beyond ‘Identity’.” *Theory and Society* 29(1): 1-47.

Brubaker, Rogers, Loveman, Mara, and Stamatov Peter. 2004. “Ethnicity as Cognition.” *Theory and Society* 33(1): 31-64.

Bruner, Jerome. 1991. “The Narrative Construction of Reality.” *Critical Inquiry* 18 (1): 1-21.

Bueger, Christian. 2013. “Practice, Pirates and Coast Guards: The Grand Narrative of Somali Piracy.” *Third World Quarterly* 34 (10): 1811-1827.‏

Burris, Val. 2005. “Interlocking Directorates and Political Cohesion Among Corporate Elites.” *American Journal of Sociology* 111 (1): 249-283.

Butts, Carter T. 2008. “Social Network Analysis with sna.” *Journal of Statistical Software* 24 (6): 1-51.

Carlsnaes, Walter. 2013. “Foreign Policy.” In *Handbook of International Relations* (2nd edition), edited by Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse and Beth A. Simmons. London: SAGE.

Carter, David B., and Stone Randall W. 2015. “Democracy and Multilateralism: The Case of Vote Buying in the UN General Assembly.” *International Organization* 69 (1): 1-33.

Causadias, José M., Updegraff, Kimberly A., and Overton Willis F. 2018. “Moral Meta-Narratives, Marginalization, and Youth Development.” *American Psychologist* 73 (6): 827-839.‏

Cebeci, Münevver. 2012. “European Foreign Policy Research Reconsidered: Constructing an ‘Ideal Power Europe’ Through Theory?.” *Millennium* 40 (3): 563-583.

Checkel, Jeffrey T., and Katzenstein, Peter J. eds. 2009. *European Identity*. Cambridge University Press.

Connerton, Paul. 1989. *How Societies Remember*. Cambridge University Press.

Cranmer, Skyler J., Leifeld Philip, McClurg, Scott D., and Rolfe Meredith. 2017. “Navigating the Range of Statistical Tools for Inferential Network Analysis.” *American Journal of Political Science* 61 (1): 237-251.

Davis, Christina L., and Wilf Meredith. 2017. “Joining the Club: Accession to the GATT/WTO.” *The Journal of Politics* 79 )3): 964-978.

de Rivera, Joseph E., and Sarbin Theodore R. Eds. 1998. *Believed-In Imaginings: The Narrative Construction of Reality*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.‏

Diez, Thomas. 2001. “Europe as a Discursive Battleground: Discourse Analysis and European Integration Studies.” *Cooperation and Conflict* 36 )1): 5-38.

Dreiling, Michael, and Darves Derek. 2011. “Corporate Unity in American Trade Policy: A Network Analysis of Corporate-Dyad Political Action.” *American Journal of Sociology* 116 (5): 1514-1563.

Drulák, Petr, Ĉesal, Jirí, and Hampl Stanislav. 2003. “Interactions and Identities of Czech Civil Servants on Their Way to the EU.” *Journal of European Public Policy* 10(4): 637-654.

Elkins, James. 2013 [2005]. *Master Narratives and Their Discontents*. New York and London: Routledge.

Elkins, Zachary, Ginsburg, Tom, and Melton James. 2009. *The Endurance of National Constitutions*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Elster, Jon. 1988. “Introduction.” In *Constitutionalism and Democracy*, edited by Jon Elster and Rune Slagstad, 1-18. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ezzy, Douglas. 1998. “Theorizing Narrative Identity: Symbolic Interactionism and Hermeneutics.” *Sociological Quarterly* 39 (2): 239-252.

Felbermayr, Gabriel J., and Toubal Farid. 2010. “Cultural Proximity and Trade.” *European Economic Review* 54 (2): 279-293.

Finnemore, Martha, and Sikkink Kathryn. 1998. “International Norm Dynamics and Political Change.” *International Organization* 52 (4): 887-917.

Genette, Gerard. 1980 [1970]. *Narrative Discourse*. Translated by Jane E. Lewin. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Georgiadis, Andreas, and Manning Alan. 2013. “One Nation Under a Groove? Understanding National Identity.” *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* 93: 166-185.

Girod, Desha M., and Tobin Jennifer L. 2016. “Take the Money and Run: The Determinants of Compliance with Aid Agreements.” *International Organization* 70 (1): 209-239.‏

Hammack, Phillip L. 2008. “Narrative and the Cultural Psychology of Identity.” *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 12 (3): 222-247.‏

Hammack, Phillip L. 2011a. *Narrative and the Politics of Identity: The Cultural Psychology of Israeli and Palestinian Youth*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Hammack, Phillip L. 2011b. “Narrative and the Politics of Meaning.” *Narrative Inquiry* 21 (2): 311–318.

Hammack, Phillip L., and Pilecki Andrew. 2012. “Narrative as a Root Metaphor for Political Psychology.” *Political Psychology* 33 (1): 75–103.

Hansen, Lene. 2013 [2006]. *Security as Practice: Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War*. Routledge.

Henkin, Louis. 1994. “A New Birth of Constitutionalism: Genetic Influences and Genetic Defects.” In *Constitutionalism, Identity, Difference, and Legitimacy: Theoretical Perspectives*,edited by Michel Rosenfeld, 39-54. Durham, U.K.: Duke University Press.

Henry, Adam D. 2011. “Ideology, Power, and the Structure of Policy Networks.” *Policy Studies Journal* 39 (3): 361–383.

Hintz, Lisel. 2018. *Identity Politics Inside Out: National Identity Contestation and Foreign Policy in Turkey*. Oxford University Press.

Hobson, John M., and Lawson George. 2008. “What is History in International Relations?.” *Millennium* 37 (2): 415-435.

Hopf, Ted. 2002. *Social Construction of International Politics: Identities & Foreign Policies, Moscow, 1955 and 1999*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Hornung, Johanna, Bandelow, Nils C., and Vogeler Colette S. 2019. “Social Identities in the Policy Process.” *Policy Sciences* 52(2): 211-231.

Hosli, Madeleine O., Van Kampen, Evelyn, Meijerink, Frits, and Tennis Katherine. 2010. “Voting Cohesion in the United Nations General Assembly: The Case of the European Union.” *ECPR Fifth Pan-European Conference* 24: 1-43.‏

Huddy, Leonie. 2001. “From Social to Political Identity: A Critical Examination of Social Identity Theory.” *Political Psychology* 22(1): 127-156.

Jaworski, Adam, and Nikolas Coupland. eds. 1999. *The Discourse Reader* (Vol. 2). London: Routledge.‏

Jones, Michael D., McBeth, Mark K., and Shanahan Elizabeth A. eds. 2014. *The Science of Stories: Applications of the Narrative Policy Framework in Public Policy Analysis*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Kim, Soo Yeon, and Russett Bruce. 1996. “The New Politics of Voting Alignments in the United Nations General Assembly.” *International Organization* 50 (4): 629-652.

Krackhardt, David. 1988. “Predicting with Networks: Nonparametric Multiple Regression Analysis of Dyadic Data.” *Social Networks* 10 (4): 359-381.

Kunovich, Robert M. 2009. “The Sources and Consequences of National Identification.” *American Sociological Review* 74(4): 573-593.

Lai, Brian, and Morey Daniel S. 2006. “Impact of Regime Type on the Influence of US Foreign Aid.” *Foreign Policy Analysis* 2 (4): 385-404.

Law, David S. 2016. “Constitutional Archetypes.” *Texas Law Review* 95 (2): 153-244.

Lebovic, James H., and Voeten Erik. 2006. “The Politics of Shame: The Condemnation of Country Human Rights Practices in the UNCHR.” *International Studies Quarterly* 50 (4): 861-888.

Lee, In‐Won, Feiock Richard C., and Lee Youngmi. 2012. “Competitors and Cooperators: A Micro‐Level Analysis of Regional Economic Development Collaboration Networks.” *Public Administration Review* 72 (2): 253-262.

Leifeld, Philip. 2010. Discourse Network Analyzer (DNA) Manual. Max Planck Institute for Research on Collective Goods, Bonn. Available at: <http://www.philipleifeld.de/cms/upload/Downloads/dna-manual-1.29.pdf>

Linklater, Andrew. 2009. “Grand Narratives and International Relations.” *Global Change, Peace & Security* 21 (1): 3-17. ‏

Luif, Paul. 2003. *EU Cohesion in the UN General Assembly* (Vol 49). Paris: European Union Institute for Security Studies.

Lynch, Marc. 1999. *State Interests and Public Spheres: The International Politics of Jordan's Identity*. Columbia University Press.

Lyotard, Jean-François. 1984 [1979]. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Translated by Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Maoz, Zeev, Kuperman, Ranan D., Terris, Lesley, and Talmud Ilan. 2006. “Structural Equivalence and International Conflict: A Social Networks Analysis.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 50 (5): 664-689.

March, James G., and Olsen Johan P. 1998. “The Institutional Dynamics of International Political Orders.” *International Organization* 52(4): 943-969.

Mattern, Janice B. 2005. *Ordering International Politics: Identity, Crisis and Representational Force*. New York and London: Routledge.

McAdams, Dan P., and McLean Kate C. 2013. “Narrative Identity.” *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 22 (3): 233-238.

McCarty, Nolan, Poole, Keith T., and Rosenthal Howard. 2016. *Polarized America: The Dance of Ideology and Unequal Riches*. MIT Press.

McLean, Kate C., and Syed Moin. 2015. “Personal, Master, and Alternative Narratives: An Integrative Framework for Understanding Identity Development in Context.” *Human Development* 58(6): 318-349.

Melton, James, Elkins, Zachary, Ginsburg, Tom, and Leetaru Kalev. 2013. “On the Interpretability of Law: Lessons from the Decoding of National Constitutions.” *British Journal of Political Science* 43 (2): 399-423.

Merry, Melissa K. 2016. “Constructing Policy Narratives in 140 Characters or Less: The Case of Gun Policy Organizations.” *Policy Studies Journal* 44 (4): 373-395.

Meyer, Sandra. 2010. “The Quest for Identity and its Literary Representation through Metanarrative and Metafictional Elements in Kate Atkinson's Emotionally Weird and Human Croquet.” *English Studies* 91 (4): 443–456.

Miskimmon, Alister, O'Loughlin, Ben, and Roselle Laura. 2017. *Forging the World: Strategic Narratives and International Relations*. University of Michigan Press.

Mizruchi, Mark S. 1992. *The Structure of Corporate Political Action: Interfirm Relations and their Consequences*. Harvard University Press.

Monroe, Kristen R. 2001. “Morality and a Sense of Self: The Importance of Identity and Categorization for Moral Action.” *American Journal of Political Science* 45 (3): 491-507.

Neumann, Iver B. 1999. *Uses of the Other: “The East” in European Identity Formation* (Vol. 9). University of Minnesota Press.

Oren, Neta, Nets‐Zehngut, Rafi, and Bar‐Tal Daniel. 2015. “Construction of the Israeli‐Jewish Conflict‐Supportive Narrative and the Struggle Over its Dominance.” *Political Psychology* 36 (2): 215-230.

Orgad, Liav. 2010. “The Preamble in Constitutional Interpretation.” *International Journal of Constitutional Law* 8 (4): 714-738.

Oshri, Odelia, Sheafer, Tamir, and Shenhav Shaul R. 2016. “A Community of Values: Democratic Identity Formation in the European Union.” *European Union Politics* 17 (1): 114–137.

Poole, Keith T., and Rosenthal Howard. 2000 [1997]. *Congress: A Political-Economic History of Roll Call Noting*. Oxford University Press on Demand.

Price, Richard, and Reus-Smit Christian. 1998. “Dangerous Liaisons? Critical International Theory and Constructivism.” *European Journal of International Relations* 4 (3): 259-294.

Prince, Gerald. 1980. “Aspects of a Grammar of Narrative.” *Poetics Today* 1 (3): 49–63.

Pyrhönen, Heta. 2010. “Thematic Approaches to Narrative”. In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*, edited by David Herman, Jahn Manfred and Ryan Marie-Laure, 597-598. London: Routledge.

Rai, Kul B. 1972. “Foreign Policy and Voting in the UN General Assembly.” *International Organization* 26 (3): 589-594.‏

Razakamaharavo, Velomahanina T. 2018. “Processes of Conflict De-Escalation in Madagascar (1947–1996).” *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology* 24 (1): 54-63.

Reed, William, Clark, David H., Nordstrom, Timothy, and Hwang Wonjae. 2008. “War, Power, and Bargaining.” *The Journal of Politics* 70 (4): 1203-1216.

Ricoeur, Paul. 1991. “Narrative Identity.” *Philosophy Today* 35 (1): 73-81.

Rimmon-Kenan, Shlomith. 2002 [1983]. *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics* )2nd edition(. London: Routledge.

Risse, Thomas, Engelmann-Martin, Daniela, Knope, Hans-Joachim, and Roscher Klaus. 1999. “To Euro or Not to Euro? The EMU and Identity Politics in the European Union.” *European Journal of International Relations* 5(2): 147-187.

Roe, Emery. 1994. *Narrative Policy Analysis: Theory and Practice*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Roselle, Laura, Miskimmon, Alister, and O’Loughlin Ben. 2014. “Strategic Narrative: A New Means to Understand Soft Power.” *Media, War and Conflict* 7 (1): 70-84.

Rosenthal, Howard, and Voeten Erik. 2004. “Analyzing Roll Calls with Perfect Spatial Voting: France 1946–1958.” *American Journal of Political Science* 48 (3): 620-632.

Ross, Marc H. 2007. *Cultural Contestation in Ethnic Conflict*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Russett, Bruce M. 1967. *International Regions and the International System*. Greenwood Press.

Russett, Bruce, and Oneal John R. 2001. *Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations*. New York, NY: Norton.

Schreiber, Craig, and Carley Kathleen M. 2007. “Agent Interactions in Construct: An Empirical Validation Using Calibrated Grounding.” *BRIMS Conference Proceedings*. Norfolk: VA. ‏

Selbin, Eric. 2013. Revolution, Rebellion, Resistance: The Power of Story. Zed Books Ltd.

Shain, Yossi, and Barth Aharon. 2003. “Diasporas and International Relations Theory.” *International Organization* 57(3): 449-479.

Sheafer, Tamir, Ben-Nun Bloom, Pazit, Shenhav, Shaul R., and Segev Elad. 2013. “The Conditional Nature of Value-Based Proximity Between Countries: Strategic Implications for Mediated Public Diplomacy.” *American Behavioral Scientist* 57 (9): 1256-1276.

Sheafer, Tamir, Shenhav, Shaul R., Takens, Janet, and Van Atteveldt Wouter. 2014. “Relative Political and Value Proximity in Mediated Public Diplomacy: The Effect of State-Level Homophily on International Frame Building.” *Political Communication* 31 (1): 149-167.

Sheafer, Tamir, Shenhav, Shaul, R., and Goldstein Kenneth. 2011. “Voting for Our Story: A Narrative Model of Electoral Choice in Multiparty Systems.” *Comparative Political Studies* 44 (3): 313-338.‏

Shenhav, Shaul R. 2015. *Analyzing Social Narratives*. New York: Routledge.

Shenhav, Shaul R., Sheafer, Tamir, van Hoof, Anita, Kleinnijenhuis, Jan, Kaplan, Yael R., Zoizner, Alon, and Hopmann David N. 2020. “Story Incentive: The Effect of National Stories on Voter Turnout.” *European Political Science Review*: 1-16. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1755773920000399>.

Shoemaker, Pamela J., Lee, Jong H., Han, Gang, and Cohen Akiba A. 2007. “Proximity and Scope as News Values.” In *Media Studies: Key Issues and Debates*, edited by Eoin Devereux, 231-248. Sage.

Shrestha, Manoj K., and Feiock Richard C. 2009. “Governing US Metropolitan Areas: Self-Organizing and Multiplex Service Networks.” *American Politics Research* 37 (5): 801–823.

Singer, Jefferson A. 2004. “Narrative Identity and Meaning Making Across the Adult Lifespan: An Introduction.” *Journal of Personality* 72 (3): 437–460.

Smith, Rogers. 2004. “Identities, Interests, and the Future of Political Science.” *Perspectives on Politics* 2(2): 301–12.

Somers, Margaret R. 1992. “Narrativity, Narrative Identity, and Social Action: Rethinking English Working-Class Formation.” *Social Science History* 16 (4): 591-630.

Somers, Margaret R. 1994. “The Narrative Constitution of Identity: A Relational and Network Approach.” *Theory and Society* 23 (5): 605-649.‏

Somers, Margaret R., and Gibson Gloria D. 1994. “Reclaiming the Epistemological ‘Other’: Narrative and the Social Constitution of Identity.” In *Social Theory and the Politics of Identity*, edited by Craig J. Calhoun, 37-99. Oxford: Blackwell.

Squire, Corinne, Davis, Mark, Esin, Cigdem, Andrews, Molly, Harrison, Barbara, Hyden, Lars-Christer, and Hyden Margareta. 2014. *What is Narrative Research?*. Bloomsbury Publishing.‏

Syed, Moin, and McLean Kate C. 2020, June 30. *Master Narrative Methodology: A Primer for Conducting Structural-Psychological Research*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/8d7t9>

Thacker, Strom C. 1999. “The High Politics of IMF Lending.” *World Politics* 52 (October): 38-75.

The State of Sudan. 2005. “Sudan's Constitution of 2005.” In Comparative Constitute Project: Informing Constitutional Design. <https://www.constituteproject.org/constitution/Sudan_2005.pdf?lang=en>.

Thomassen, Jacques J., Noury, Abdul G., and Voeten Erik. 2004. “Political Competition in the European Parliament: Evidence from Roll Call and Survey Analyses.” In *European Integration and Political Conflict*, edited by Gary Marks and Marco R. Steenbergen, 141-164. Cambridge University Press.‏

Thorne, Avril, and McLean Kate C. 2003. “Telling Traumatic Events in Adolescence: A Study of Master Narrative Positioning”. In *Autobiographical Memory and the Construction of A Narrative Self: Developmental and Cultural Perspectives*, edited by Robyn Fivush and Catherine A. Haden, 169-185. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Tilly, Charles. 2002. *Stories, Identities, and Political Change*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.‏

Van Eeten, Michel J. 2006. “18 Narrative Policy Analysis”. In *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis: Theory, Politics and Methods*, edited by Frank Fischer, Gerald J. Miller and Mara S. Sidney, 251-269. Cheltenham, Boca Raton, Florida: CRC press.

Voermans, Wim, Stremler, Maarten, and Cliteur Paul. 2017. *Constitutional Preambles: A Comparative Analysis*. Edward Elgar Publishing.‏

Voeten, Erik. 2000. “Clashes in the Assembly.” *International Organization* 54 (2): 185-215.

Voeten, Erik. 2013. “Data and Analyses of Voting in the United Nations General Assembly.” In *Routledge Handbook of International Organization*, edited by Bob Reinalda, 54-66. London: Routledge.‏

Voeten, Erik. 2021. *Ideology and the Distributive Politics of International Institutions*. Princeton University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780691207339>

Volger, Helmut. Ed. 2010. *A Concise Encyclopedia of the United Nations* (2nd edition). Leiden: The Netherlands; Boston: Martinus Nijhoff.

Volgy, Thomas J., Frazier, Derrick V., and Ingersoll, Robert S. 2003. “Preference Similarities and Group Hegemony: G-7 Voting Cohesion in the UN General Assembly.” *Journal of International Relations and Development* 6 (1): 51- 70.

Von Arnauld, Andreas. 2017. “Norms and Narrative.” *German Law Journal* 18 (2): 309-330.

Ward, Hugh, and Dorussen Han. 2016. “Standing Alongside Your Friends: Network Centrality and Providing Troops to UN Peacekeeping Operations.” *Journal of Peace Research* 53 (3): 392-408.‏

Weible, Christopher M., and Sabatier Paul A. 2005. “Comparing Policy Networks: Marine Protected Areas in California.” *Policy Studies Journal* 33 (2): 181–201.

Whitbred, Robert, Fonti, Fabio, Steglich, Christian, and Contractor Noshir. 2011. “From Microactions to Macrostructure and Back: A Structurational Approach to the Evolution of Organizational Networks.” *Human Communication Research* 37 (3): 404-433.‏

Williams, Michael C., and Neumann Iver B. 2000. “From Alliance to Security Community: NATO, Russia, and the Power of Identity.” *Millennium* 29 (2): 357-387.

Wolford, Scott. 2014. “Power, Preferences, and Balancing: The Durability of Coalitions and the Expansion of Conflict.” *International Studies Quarterly* 58 (1): 146-157.

**Appendix A**

*Table 3.* All types of values, actors, and actions appearing in the analyzed corpus

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Values** | **Actors** | **Actions** |
| Affinity to the Land | A Party | Aid & Assistance |
| Authoritarian Ideas | African Community | Competitiveness & Achievements |
| Capitalist\Liberal Ideas | Arab Community | Constitution Adoption & Implementation |
| Cooperation & Unity within the Nation | British Crown Community | Economic Improvement\Deterioration |
| Creativity | European Community | Elections, Referendums & Change of Governmental Personal |
| Democratic Ideas | Immigrants & Refugees | Encourage immigration |
| Diversity | Intellectuals & Scientists | Formation\ Dissolution of a Party |
| Effectiveness & Capability | International Community | Fulfilling Civic Duties |
| Feminism | Minority Groups | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Gratefulness | Other People | International Collaboration |
| Happiness | Our Ancestors | Limit Immigration |
| Hope | Religious Figure | National Catastrophe |
| Integrity | Royals | Opposing Colonialism & Imperialism |
| Intellectual Ideas | Security Forces | Peace & Reconciliation Processes |
| Justice & Morality | Statesman | Realizing the Potential of Every Citizen |
| Maintaining Family Values | The Court | Recognizing Past Injustices |
| Maintaining Tradition | The Enemy | Security & Defense |
| Moderation | The Individual | State Building & Reform |
| Modernization | The People | Struggle & Revolution |
| Patriotism | The State |  |
| Pride & Prestige | The Workers |  |
| Progress & Development | Weak & Disabled |  |
| Prosperity |  |  |
| Protection of the Environment |  |  |
| Quality of Life |  |  |
| Religion & Sacredness |  |  |
| Responsibility |  |  |
| Rule of Law |  |  |
| Secularism |  |  |
| Self-Orientation |  |  |
| Social Democratic Ideas |  |  |
| Socialist Ideas |  |  |
| Stability |  |  |
| Strength & Power |  |  |
| Tranquility |  |  |
| Universal Values |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Appendix B**

*Table 4.* A Full List of all National Metanarratives According to Country

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Value** | **Actor** | **Action** |
| Afghanistan | Religion & Sacredness | The State | Struggle & Revolution |
| Albania | Cooperation & Unity | The People | Peace & Reconciliation Processes |
| Algeria | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Andorra | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Angola | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Antigua and Barbuda | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Argentina | Religion & Sacredness | The State | Constitution Adoption & Implementation |
| Armenia | Democratic Ideas | The State | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Australia | Cooperation & Unity | The State | Constitution Adoption & Implementation |
| Azerbaijan | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Bahamas | Religion & Sacredness | Religious Figure | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Bahrain | Religion & Sacredness | Statesman | Competitiveness & Achievements |
| Bangladesh | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Barbados | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Belarus | Democratic Ideas | The State | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Belize | Democratic Ideas | The State | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Benin | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Bhutan | Religion & Sacredness | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Bolivia (Plurinational State) | Cooperation & Unity | The People | Struggle & Revolution |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina | Democratic Ideas | International Community | Peace & Reconciliation Processes |
| Brazil | Democratic Ideas | The State | State Building & Reform |
| Brunei Darussalam | Rule of Law | Statesman | State Building & Reform |
| Bulgaria | Democratic Ideas | Statesman | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Burkina Faso | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Burundi | Democratic Ideas | The People | Peace & Reconciliation Processes |
| Cabo Verde | Democratic Ideas | The State | State Building & Reform |
| Cambodia | Democratic Ideas | The State | Struggle & Revolution |
| Cameroon | Democratic Ideas | The People | Security and defense |
| Canada | Cooperation & Unity | British Crown Community | State Building & Reform |
| Central African Republic | Democratic Ideas | The State | Peace & Reconciliation Processes |
| Chad | Democratic Ideas | The People | Struggle & Revolution |
| China | Socialist Ideas | The State | Struggle & Revolution |
| Colombia | Democratic Ideas | The People | Constitution Adoption & Implementation |
| Comoros | Democratic Ideas | The People | Security & Defense |
| Congo (Republic of the) | Democratic Ideas | The State | Peace & Reconciliation Processes |
| Costa Rica | Democratic Ideas | Statesman | Constitution Adoption & Implementation |
| Côte d'Ivoire | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Cuba | Socialist Ideas | The People | Struggle & Revolution |
| Czechia | Democratic Ideas | The State | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Dem People's Rep of Korea | Socialist Ideas | Statesman | Struggle & Revolution |
| Dem Republic of the Congo | Cooperation & Unity | The People | Recognizing Past Injustices |
| Djibouti | Democratic Ideas | The People | International Collaboration |
| Dominica | Democratic Ideas | The People | Constitution Adoption & Implementation |
| Dominican Republic | Democratic Ideas | Statesman | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Ecuador | Diversity | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Egypt | Democratic Ideas | The People | Struggle & Revolution |
| El Salvador | Democratic Ideas | Statesman | Constitution Adoption & Implementation |
| Equatorial Guinea | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Eritrea | Democratic Ideas | The People | Struggle & Revolution |
| Estonia | Progress & Development | The People | Constitution Adoption & Implementation |
| Ethiopia | Cooperation & Unity | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Fiji | Diversity | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| France | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Gabon | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Gambia | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Georgia | Social Democratic Ideas | The State | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Germany | Cooperation & Unity | The People | Constitution Adoption & Implementation |
| Ghana | Democratic Ideas | The People | Constitution Adoption & Implementation |
| Greece | Religion & Sacredness | Religious Figure | Constitution Adoption & Implementation |
| Grenada | Democratic Ideas | The People | Fulfilling Civic Duties |
| Guatemala | Democratic Ideas | The State | Constitution Adoption & Implementation |
| Guinea | Democratic Ideas | The People | International Collaboration |
| Guinea-Bissau | Democratic Ideas | The People | State Building & Reform |
| Guyana | Democratic Ideas | The People | State Building & Reform |
| Haiti | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Honduras | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Hungary | Cooperation & Unity | The People | Struggle & Revolution |
| India | Democratic Ideas | The People | Constitution Adoption & Implementation |
| Indonesia | Justice & Morality | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Iran (Islamic Republic) | Religion & Sacredness | The People | Struggle & Revolution |
| Iraq | Religion & Sacredness | The People | Struggle & Revolution |
| Ireland | Religion & Sacredness | The People | Constitution Adoption & Implementation |
| Israel[[16]](#footnote-16) | Affinity to the Land | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Japan | Democratic Ideas | The People | Peace & Reconciliation Processes |
| Jordan | --- | Statesman | Constitution Adoption & Implementation |
| Kazakhstan | Cooperation & Unity | The People | State Building & Reform |
| Kenya | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Kiribati | Democratic Ideas | The People | Constitution Adoption & Implementation |
| Kosovo | Democratic Ideas | The State | Peace & Reconciliation Processes |
| Kuwait | Democratic Ideas | The State | Constitution Adoption & Implementation |
| Kyrgyzstan | Cooperation & Unity | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Lao People's Dem Republic | Democratic Ideas | The State | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Latvia | Democratic Ideas | The State | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Lebanon | Democratic Ideas | The State | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Liberia | Cooperation & Unity | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Libya | Democratic Ideas | The People | Struggle & Revolution |
| Liechtenstein | Religion & Sacredness | Statesman | Constitution Adoption & Implementation |
| Lithuania | Maintaining Tradition | The State | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Madagascar | Democratic Ideas | The People | Peace & Reconciliation Processes |
| Malawi | Democratic Ideas | The People | Constitution Adoption & Implementation |
| Mali | Democratic Ideas | The People | Struggle & Revolution |
| Marshall Islands | Democratic Ideas | The People | Peace & Reconciliation Processes |
| Mauritania | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Micronesia (Fed States) | Cooperation & Unity | The People | Peace & Reconciliation Processes |
| Mongolia | Democratic Ideas | The State | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Montenegro | Democratic Ideas | The State | Peace & Reconciliation Processes |
| Morocco | Democratic Ideas | The State | International Collaboration |
| Mozambique | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Myanmar | Democratic Ideas | The State | State Building & Reform |
| Namibia | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Nauru | Religion & Sacredness | The People | Constitution Adoption & Implementation |
| Nepal | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Nicaragua | Democratic Ideas | Statesman | Struggle & Revolution |
| Niger | Democratic Ideas | The People | Peace & Reconciliation Processes |
| Nigeria | Democratic Ideas | The People | Constitution Adoption & Implementation |
| Pakistan | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Panama | Democratic Ideas | The State | Constitution Adoption & Implementation |
| Papua New Guinea | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Paraguay | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Peru | Religion & Sacredness | Statesman | Struggle & Revolution |
| Philippines | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Poland | Democratic Ideas | The State | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Portugal | Democratic Ideas | The State | Struggle & Revolution |
| Republic of Korea | Democratic Ideas | The People | State Building & Reform |
| Republic of Moldova | Democratic Ideas | Statesman | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Russian Federation | Democratic Ideas | The State | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Rwanda | Cooperation & Unity | The People | Peace & Reconciliation Processes |
| St. Kitts and Nevis | Democratic Ideas | The People | Constitution Adoption & Implementation |
| St. Lucia | Democratic Ideas | The People | Peace & Reconciliation Processes |
| St. Vincent & Grenadines | Democratic Ideas | The People | Constitution Adoption & Implementation |
| Samoa | Religion & Sacredness | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Sao Tome and Principe | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Senegal | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Serbia | Democratic Ideas | The State | Constitution Adoption & Implementation |
| Seychelles | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Slovakia | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Slovenia | Strength & Power | The State | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Solomon Islands | Democratic Ideas | The People | Constitution Adoption & Implementation |
| South Africa | Democratic Ideas | The People | State Building & Reform |
| South Sudan | Democratic Ideas | The People | Peace & Reconciliation Processes |
| Spain | Democratic Ideas | The People | State Building & Reform |
| Sri Lanka | Democratic Ideas | The People | Constitution Adoption & Implementation |
| Sudan | Democratic Ideas | The People | Peace & Reconciliation Processes |
| Suriname | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Eswatini (Formerly known as Swaziland) | Progress & Development | The People | State Building & Reform |
| Switzerland | Cooperation & Unity | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Syrian Arab Republic | Democratic Ideas | The State | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Tajikistan | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Thailand | Democratic Ideas | The State | State Building & Reform |
| The FYR Macedonia | Democratic Ideas | The State | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Timor-Leste | Democratic Ideas | The State | Struggle & Revolution |
| Togo | Democratic Ideas | The People | International collaboration |
| Tonga | Rule of Law | Statesman | State Building & Reform |
| Trinidad and Tobago | Democratic Ideas | The People | Constitution Adoption & Implementation |
| Tunisia | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Turkey | Democratic Ideas | The State | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Turkmenistan | Cooperation & Unity | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Tuvalu | Maintaining Tradition | The People | Constitution Adoption & Implementation |
| Uganda | Democratic Ideas | The People | Constitution Adoption & Implementation |
| Ukraine | Democratic Ideas | The State | Independence & Sovereignty |
| United Arab Emirates | Religion & Sacredness | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| United Kingdom[[17]](#footnote-17) | Democratic Ideas | Statesman | State Building & Reform |
| United Rep of Tanzania | Democratic Ideas | The People | State Building & Reform |
| United States | Justice & Morality | The People | State Building & Reform |
| Vanuatu | Cooperation & Unity | The People | Struggle & Revolution |
| Venezuela (Bolivarian Rep) | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Vietnam | Socialist Ideas | The State | Struggle & Revolution |
| Zambia | Democratic Ideas | The People | Independence & Sovereignty |
| Zimbabwe | Democratic Ideas | The People | Struggle & Revolution |

1. For further discussion on the definition of narrative also see: Genette 1980 [1970]; Jaworski & Coupland 1999; Prince 1980; Rimmon-Kenan 2002 [1983]; Shenhav 2015. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. For further discussion on metanarratives as value-oriented concepts, see McLean & Syed 2015. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Out of the 158 constitution preambles included in this study, 154 were written either in the twentieth or the twenty-first century. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. <https://comparativeconstitutionsproject.org> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. <https://www.un.org/en/library/page/index-proceedings-general-assembly-regular-sessions> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. These do not include Israeli-Palestinian conflict-related resolutions as these belong to the Middle East category (Boockmann & Dreher 2011; Kim & Russett 1996; Voeten 2000). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. While a nation may strongly express more than just one type of actor, action, or value, we focused on the most salience ones due to the extensiveness of our analysis (over 150 nations). [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. For more applications of QAP in political networks research, see Henry 2011; Lee et al. 2012; Shrestha & Feiock 2009; Weible et al. 2005. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. <https://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/2020-02/FreedomintheWorld2018COMPLETEBOOK_0.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GNP.PCAP.CD> [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. <https://www.un.org/en/model-united-nations/groups-member-states> [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. We operationalized the voting similarity variable as the difference between the values derived for pairs of nations using the NOMINATE algorithm (see the methods sections). Therefore, a correlation between higher similarity in nations’ metanarrative and voting was denoted with a *negative* coefficient. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. The eight nations are Algeria, Burundi, Chad, China, Comoros, Cuba, Georgia, and Sudan. Metanarratives are considered relatively stable by nature but not unchangeable. Accordingly, some of these countries did not change their metanarrative (Algeria, Burundi, China, Cuba), and some changed only one of the three possible structural components (Chad, Comoros, Georgia, and Sudan). [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. https://library.un.org/index-proceedings/general-assembly [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. The results were directional consistent when scaling absentees same as a nay vote, but not significant. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. As proxy for a codified constitution, we analyzed The Declaration of the Establishment of the State of Israel. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. As proxy for a codified constitution, we analyzed the Magna Carta. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)