

MIGRATION AND PREFECTURAL IDENTIFICATION IN FOUR JAPANESE PREFECTURES

TATSUZO SUZUKI AND TED T. JITODAI

(Received Mar. 19, 1977; revised July 23, 1977)

One of the important features of urban-industrial societies is the mobility of its population. Such mobility results from: (1) the shift of population from rural to urban-industrial areas as a result of increased agricultural productivity and decreased demand for agricultural workers, along with an expansion of the industrial sector; (2) an overall increase in the mobility of all workers and families because of rapid changes occurring in the social and economic structure [1].

Migration has played an important and essential role in Japan. Indeed, the country's industrial development was intimately linked to the transformation of its farm peasants into industrial workers. This meant massive movements of people from the rural to urban sectors. This shift began relatively early but increased to substantial numbers in the early twentieth century (Wilkinson [15], pp. 1-60). By 1930, such large urban centers as Tokyo contained about as many in-migrants as people who were born and raised there (Taeuber [11], pp. 148-170).

Japan's spectacular post World War II economic and social recovery further accelerated this rural to urban trend. All during the 1950's and 1960's, dramatic shifts in population were noted. For example, in the period 1960 to 1965, twenty-six of the forty-six prefectures and 76 percent of the municipalities (mostly in rural areas) throughout Japan registered a decrease in population. This also occurred (but not quite as dramatically) between 1965 and 1970. The great economic expansion during this period made it more possible for underemployed rural workers to find jobs in the rapidly expanding industrial sectors.

It has only been recent that this rural-urban migration has begun to subside. Recent evidence indicates that more and more of today's migrants are composed of urban workers shifting jobs or job locations, along with families who are shifting residences within the large metropolitan areas. Currently over eight million people move yearly in Japan. This constitutes over seven percent of her population (Kuroda [6], p. 44).

The prevalence of such mobility should have important consequences for both the sending and receiving areas. What are the social and

economic consequences when areas are de-populated by out-migration? What are the consequences when areas are composed of a large number of migrants? What types of problems emerge for those who move?

Traditional studies of internal migration have approached these consequences indirectly either by studying the volume of migration or else such stable characteristics of the migrants as age and education. Demographic sources for migration analysis usually make available only occupational or labor force status as behavioral characteristics of migrants in the place of destination. While these are very important, they do not exhaust the socially significant correlates of migration.

Only recently have more intensive analyses of migrant behavior—based on sample surveys—been made. For example, studies on the social and political participation patterns of migrants in Western societies have been conducted. These studies reveal that migration does create problems for the migrants—problems of adjusting to a new setting. Yet, over a period of time they do overcome many of these problems and become integrated into the social life of the community to which they have migrated. For example, the extent to which they join voluntary associations, clubs, churches, does not differ from those who were born and raised there. They also vote in elections, participate in local and national political affairs in ways no different from the natives.

Studies also show that some of these problems are more or less severe depending upon the background of the migrants—some are better equipped to cope with the varied problems of movement and settlement. In a large urban community [2] for example, migrants who come from similar urban settings are better integrated than those from rural areas. Migrants of higher socio-economic status have fewer problems than those of lower socio-economic status. These differences are most pronounced during the initial period of residence. With increasing length of residence, these differences become substantially reduced or eliminated (for review of findings see Beijer [1], pp. 13–35; Jansen [3], pp. 3–35).

Many of these conclusions were based on research studies conducted in Western societies, such as the United States. Whether such conclusions are valid for migrants in a non-Western industrial society, such as Japan, is still not certain. The available evidence from studies of migrants in Japan show that in some ways their experiences may have differed from those in other societies. In particular, Japanese migratory patterns were controlled more by a variety of traditional practices which guided the migration to certain areas and also aided the migrant in his settlement in that new area. The result was that migrants in Japan may not have experienced the varied problems of adjustment, or else experienced them less intensely, than migrants in other societies (Vogel [13], White [14], pp. 29–36).

This paper is concerned with another dimension of Japanese migrant behavior—the degree to which they do (or do not) identify with their destination areas. The significance of this dimension is that if any area such as a community is composed of people who do not feel they are part of that community—do not identify with it—this fact would have important consequences. For instance, can a community develop a sensitized membership of people who really care about its many problems if they do not have, or feel, any sense of commitment to that community?

It is reasonable to assume that migration may create such feelings. Movement involves the severance of existing social ties—the migrant leaves behind a complex set of communal relationships, and he or she must establish a new set in the destination area. To the extent that such ties are not firmly established, a migrant may feel estranged or foreign. Under such circumstances his or her identification with the new area could be relatively weak—the person may not feel settled or integrated, and thus may feel a stronger sense of attachment to some previous place of residence. Therefore, a community composed of a large number of migrants may be one composed of a large body of people whose orientations and concerns lie elsewhere.

We also assume that community identification, like other patterns of migrant behavior, is related to the migrant's previous residence (whether urban or rural) and to certain other characteristics, such as socio-economic status. These factors may strengthen or hinder the migrant's ability to become integrated and in turn affect his/her sense of identification. Also, identification is related to how long a migrant has lived in the community, with the tendency to identify with the destination area increasing with longer residence. Moreover, important consideration should be given to the very nature of the receiving area itself. Of special significance is the size of the receiving area; if it is large and impersonal, this will certainly intensify any feelings of estrangement.

The data

The data for this study came from a 1971 sample survey of four prefectural areas in Japan, conducted by the Institute of Statistical Mathematics, Tokyo. Two of these prefectures (Tokyo, Osaka) are large metropolises, highly urban, with very large populations. The remaining two are highly rural with substantially smaller populations. Thus, in 1970 the population of the Tokyo prefecture was 11,408,071, and Osaka was 7,620,480, whereas Iwate was 1,371,313 and Kagoshima 1,729,150. Moreover, the percentages of urban residents in these prefectures were

as follows:

Tokyo	98%	Iwate	52%
Osaka	97%	Kagoshima	50%

A random sample of adults was selected for interviews in each area. Table 1 presents the sizes of the sample drawn from each prefecture. All respondents selected in the sample were interviewed by a schedule consisting of a series of questions related to the respondents' social and economic backgrounds and to their general ways of viewing the social world—whether traditional or non-traditional. Of particular concern for our study were those questions asked about their migrant histories and which prefectural areas they tended to identify with. The latter was initially determined by asking the respondents which prefectures they presently considered themselves to be natives of, even though they might be residing in another area or even though that prefecture was not necessarily the one in which they were born.

Table 1. Number of respondents in each prefecture

Prefecture	Number of respondents
Tokyo	796
Osaka	610
Kagoshima	864
Iwate	825

Combining the migrant status of the respondents with the place where they identified led to the formation of four categories:

N_1 =natives of the prefecture who identified with the prefecture.

N_2 =natives of the prefecture who did not identify with the prefecture.

M_1 =migrants to the prefecture who identified with that prefecture.

M_2 =migrants to the prefecture who did not identify with that prefecture.

Respondents were classified into one of these categories; their responses to other questions were then cross-tabulated against these, with tabulations for each prefecture made separately.

The findings

Table 2 presents the percentage of migrants in each prefecture. As the data show, migration was very heavily concentrated to the large urban prefectures of Tokyo and Osaka. Thus, 59% of the Tokyo sample were migrants and 52% of the Osaka sample. In striking contrast,

in Iwate and Kagoshima—the more rural prefectures—migrants composed only 8.4% and 8.2% of the population, respectively. Such a finding substantiates and dramatizes what has been commonly known and understood: migration in Japan has been heavily directed toward the first two areas.

Table 2. Percentage in each migrant and native category by prefecture

Prefecture	Percent migrant ($M_1 + M_2$)	Migrant and native categories					
		N_1	N_2	M_1	M_2	Total	N
Tokyo	59.5	31.5	9.0	12.0	47.5	100	796
Osaka	51.7	34.3	14.1	11.5	40.2	100	610
Kagoshima	8.2	84.4	7.4	5.3	2.9	100	864
Iwate	8.4	84.2	7.4	3.2	5.2	100	825

Of greater importance to us is that among these migrants, only a small percentage (20% for Tokyo and 22% for Osaka) actually identified with their respective areas of destination (Table 3). Almost four out of five migrants to these areas do not identify with these areas. Yet, of those who do not identify, a large proportion of them identify with some other area, probably that prefecture where they originated. This means that these migrants are not completely alienated or cast adrift with no identification. They do have feelings of identity, but not with the area where they are currently residing. The percentage with no prefectural identity is no larger than the percentage of natives who have no such identification.

Table 3. Percentage of migrants who identify with prefecture of residence

Prefecture	Identified with prefecture	Identified with other prefecture	No identification	N
Tokyo	20.9	63.8	15.2	473
Osaka	22.2	53.7	24.1	315
Kagoshima	64.8	25.1	9.8	71
Iwate	37.7	47.8	14.4	69

The implications are further spelled out in Table 4, where almost one-half of the Tokyo and 40% of the Osaka sample are migrants who do identify with other prefectures or have no identification at all. In short, these two prefectures (the two largest cities in Japan) have a substantial population of "strangers." In striking contrast, the impact of migration is not profound in the Iwate and Kagoshima prefectures. As we have seen, the percentage of migrants to these areas is very small, and a large proportion of them (especially in Kagoshima) identify with their areas of destination. Altogether, the percentage of migrants

with no identification with the prefecture is so small as to be inconsequential. No doubt, the very quality of these areas—its more rural atmosphere, smaller population, slower rates of population growth, and lower rates of in-migration—make it easier for those few who do migrate here to identify with those areas and to become integrated into the social and economic life. This is also indicated by the fact that in Table 5 the percentage of natives who do not identify with these areas is much lower than those in Tokyo and Osaka.

Table 4. Percent of prefecture who are migrants with no identification or have identification elsewhere

Prefecture	Elsewhere percent	N
Tokyo	47.5	796
Osaka	40.2	610
Kagoshima	2.9	864
Iwate	5.2	825

Table 5. Percentage of natives in each prefecture with no identification with prefecture

Prefecture	Percent	N
Tokyo	16.7	323
Osaka	24.4	295
Kagoshima	7.6	793
Iwate	6.2	756

One may question whether stating that one is a native of a certain prefecture may be a sufficient index of identification. We may need to pursue further the implications of such a finding. One way is to note the degree to which each group of natives and migrants are proud of their prefecture of identification.

Table 6 shows the percentage of each migrant and native category who are proud of their prefectures (the cases with no prefectural identification were not included here). The data for Tokyo and Osaka show that among migrants who identify with these areas (M_1), the percentage who are proud is lower than those of the natives who identify with the area (N_1). Such a finding would be anticipated in light of their migrant status and relative newness. However, the more interesting finding is the percentage of migrants who do not identify with their destination areas (M_2) but yet are proud of the non-destination areas with which they do have identification. In fact, in Tokyo and Osaka, the percentage is highest for this group—at least 50% of them are proud of their prefectures. The percentage in this latter group is also

high in Iwate and Kagoshima but they are obscured by the fact that the natives also have exceedingly high rates of being proud. Thus, for Tokyo and Osaka, it is not only a large proportion of migrants who make up its population, but (1) these migrants do not identify with these areas but elsewhere; and (2) these identifications with other areas appear to be strong.

Table 6. Percentage of migrants who are proud of their prefecture
(Includes only those who have identification)

Prefecture	Proud	Somewhat proud	Not proud	D.K.	Total	N
Tokyo						
N_1	49.8	42.6	3.6	4.0	100	251
N_2	44.4	38.9	16.7	0.0	100	18
M_1	34.3	52.5	12.1	1.0	100	99
M_2	50.0	44.4	23.1	3.0	100	302
Osaka						
N_1	52.2	44.0	2.4	1.4	100	209
N_2	28.6	57.2	0.0	14.2	100	14
M_1	45.7	47.1	4.3	2.9	100	70
M_2	56.7	38.6	2.3	2.3	100	171
Kagoshima						
N_1	62.6	31.0	1.8	4.7	100	729
N_2	*	*	*	*	*	4
M_1	50.0	43.5	2.2	4.3	100	46
M_2	55.6	44.4	0.0	0.0	100	18
Iwate						
N_1	64.3	30.1	1.7	3.9	100	692
N_2	42.9	42.9	7.1	7.1	100	14
M_1	61.5	30.8	7.7	0.0	100	26
M_2	51.6	42.4	3.0	3.0	100	33

Tables 7 and 8 show further implications of this process. In Table 7 are presented the responses to the question whether the respondents would be proud if the local high-school baseball team won the championship. Baseball is a very popular sport in Japan and like so many athletic activities can be the source and focus of community pride and identification. Strong identification with the triumphs of the local baseball team may be indicative of a strong community identification. It is interesting to see in Table 7 that Tokyo has generally the lowest percentage of those with pride in their team. It is the highest—as would be expected—in the Iwate and Kagoshima areas. Moreover, in Tokyo the highest percentage occurs among the migrants who are thinking in terms of their home prefectural teams (M_1). The percentage for these migrants is also relatively high in the Osaka area. One should

note here that a large percentage of respondents—irrespective of migrant status, identification, or prefecture—maintain pride in their local baseball teams. At least 70% of all respondents do so, but it is over 90% in Iwate and Kagoshima.

Table 7.

Q: "Aside from whether you like baseball or not, if the high school baseball team from your prefecture won the championship, would you be proud?"

Prefecture and migrant category	Proud	Indifferent	Others	D.K.	Total	N
Tokyo						
N_1	78.9	19.1	0.4	1.6	100	251
N_2	70.8	26.4	0.0	2.8	100	72
M_1	79.8	20.2	0.0	0.0	100	99
M_2	89.8	8.8	0.0	0.0	100	374
Osaka						
N_1	86.6	11.0	1.9	0.5	100	209
N_2	90.7	9.3	0.0	0.0	100	86
M_1	84.3	14.3	1.4	0.0	100	70
M_2	87.3	11.8	0.0	0.8	100	245
Kagoshima						
N_1	94.5	3.4	0.1	1.9	100	729
N_2	96.9	0.0	1.6	1.6	100	64
M_1	97.8	2.2	0.0	0.0	100	46
M_2	92.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	100	25
Iwate						
N_1	97.7	1.3	0.1	0.9	100	695
N_2	90.3	4.9	0.0	4.9	100	61
M_1	92.3	7.7	0.0	0.0	100	26
M_2	90.7	7.0	0.0	2.3	100	43

A related question was asked, whether the respondents would be ashamed if a criminal apprehended in Tokyo happened to come from the prefecture in which the respondents were currently residing. It is important to note that the question did not state that the criminal was from the prefecture one identified with, but from the prefecture where the respondent was currently residing. The pattern of responses to this question is presented in Table 8. Since the question is phrased in the above manner, it would be expected that those who identified the least with their present area of residence would show the least concern. The pattern of responses seems to bear this out—those migrants and natives who do not identify with the prefecture show the lowest percentage of shame. The least concerned, as might be expected, occur among those in the Tokyo area; concern is highest, and strikingly so,

among those in the Iwate and Kagoshima prefectures. Thus, the impact of both size and identification with community affects how one views the behavior of others from the same area.

Table 8.

Q: "If a criminal were caught in Tokyo who happens to be from the prefecture in which you are currently residing, would you feel ashamed?"

Prefecture and migrant category	Ashamed	Not ashamed	Others	D.K.	Total	N
Tokyo						
N_1	35.5	61.8	1.2	1.6	100	251
N_2	25.0	73.8	0.0	1.4	100	72
M_1	34.3	63.6	1.0	1.0	100	99
M_2	29.1	67.1	1.9	1.9	100	374
Osaka						
N_1	58.4	40.2	1.0	0.5	100	209
N_2	48.8	47.7	1.2	2.3	100	86
M_1	61.4	38.6	0.0	0.0	100	70
M_2	46.9	53.1	0.5	0.0	100	245
Kagoshima						
N_1	90.1	8.1	0.0	1.2	100	729
N_2	89.1	10.9	0.0	0.0	100	64
M_1	87.0	13.0	0.0	0.0	100	46
M_2	76.0	24.0	0.0	0.0	100	25
Iwate						
N_1	93.1	5.3	0.4	1.2	100	695
N_2	90.2	4.9	0.0	4.9	100	61
M_1	96.2	3.8	0.0	0.0	100	26
M_2	90.7	9.3	0.0	0.0	100	43

Urban-rural backgrounds of the migrants

One important variable related to migration is the urban and rural background of the migrants involved. Past studies have shown that there are significant differences between those who come from urban and rural places, for they represent contrasting social environments which may aid or hinder the migrants' adjustment to their new settings. The data in our study show there is some relationship between whether the migrant comes from an urban or rural background and identification with the area. Migrants with urban backgrounds tend to identify more with their present prefectures than migrants from rural areas (see Table 9). Although these differences are small, they are consistent in all prefectures. Another way of stating this is that rural migrants tend to identify more with their home prefectures than do urban migrants. Presumably the previous rural setting may create

more enduring attachments and ties, which the migrants retain. But just as important, rural migrants may have more difficulties adapting to a new setting, particularly if it is highly urban. It is interesting to note here that the rate of identification with the present area is higher in Iwate and Kagoshima—the more rural prefectures.

Table 9. Percentage of urban and rural migrants who identify (M_1) or do not identify (M_2) with prefecture of current residence

Prefecture— urban and rural category	Identifies (M_1)	Does not identify (M_2)	Total	N
Tokyo				
Rural	16.1	83.9	100	161
Urban	23.4	76.6	100	312
Osaka				
Rural	19.8	80.2	100	106
Urban	23.4	76.6	100	209
Kagoshima				
Rural	54.2	45.8	100	24
Urban	70.2	29.8	100	47
Iwate				
Rural	33.3	66.7	100	18
Urban	35.3	64.7	100	51

Length of residence in the community

There is no doubt that as migrants remain in a community longer, they become more adapted, develop more meaningful ties, and feel more intimately linked to the community. Previous studies of migrants have all shown this process to occur.

In our study, we were not able to cross-tabulate length of residence with other responses for the Iwate and Kagoshima prefectures, due to

Table 10. Mean length of residence (by years) of the residents of Tokyo and Osaka

	Mean number of years	N
Tokyo		
N_1	39	251
N_2	33.8	72
M_1	24.9	99
M_2	20.2	374
Osaka		
N_1	38.4	209
N_2	31.9	86
M_1	26.1	70
M_2	20.1	245

the small number of migrants in these areas; but analysis by length of residence was done for migrants to Osaka and Tokyo. The results are summarized in Table 10, where the mean length of residence (by years) was computed for each of the migrant and native categories.

It is very clear in looking at this table that migrants who identify with Tokyo and Osaka have, on the average, resided longer in the community. The differences between these groups are around five years and more. Yet it is important to note that even after the migrants have lived in Tokyo or Osaka a considerable period of time, many of them still do not identify with these areas.

Studies in other countries, such as the United States, have shown that when migrants have resided in the community for a long period of time, they do not differ at all from the natives. In Japan, such differences still persist. This may be indicative of the differences in culture, with different social emphasis put on family place and home—a point we will discuss later. It is also important to remember that it is much easier in Japan to maintain ties with the home area after migrating simply because Japan is such a small country geographically.

There is further evidence that it is not only how long one has resided in the community which is related to identification with the community, but also at what age one migrated to it. The data in Table 11 show that migrants who identified with Tokyo and Osaka tended to have migrated to these areas at a younger age than those who did not. The mean age for the former group is at least three years less than the latter. Such a finding may be expected if we consider that younger people tend to be more open and less set in their ways and therefore more willing to become a part of their new setting. In any case, if after even twenty years of residence in a community, migrants in large numbers still identify elsewhere, this finding should have very important implications.

Table 11. Mean age at time of migration
to Tokyo or Osaka

	Mean age	N
Tokyo		
N_1	1.6	251
N_2	5.6	72
M_1	16.3	99
M_2	21.8	374
Osaka		
N_1	2.2	209
N_2	4.5	86
M_1	19.6	70
M_2	22.7	245

Socio-economic status, traditional and non-traditional values

Previous studies have also emphasized the importance of socio-economic status on migrant behavior. The ability of migrants to integrate themselves into a community is partly a function of where they stand socio-economically. Thus, it could be that the differences we noted between various migrant groups may be due more to differences in socio-economic status. Certain groups may be more selective of migrants with certain socio-economic characteristics.

Using the occupation of the respondents, along with their level of schooling, as indices of socio-economic status, our investigation revealed no consistent pattern of differences. No destination area or migrant groups tended to be selective of certain occupational or educational levels which, in turn, could have accounted for some of the patterns of differences we noted. For example, migrants of high educational or occupational levels were not heavily concentrated in any one of the migrant groups nor did they tend to migrate to certain prefectures over others. Rather, they were scattered throughout all migrant groups and all prefectures.

Also, one of the major objectives of the original survey was to ascertain to what degree various values, particularly with respect to being traditional or non-traditional, persisted in the population or among major segments of the population. Thus, questions which probed such values were asked of each respondent. These questions were developed over a period of twenty years by the Institute in their studies on national character. The responses to these questions were therefore available to be cross-tabulated against our categories of migrant and native status.

However, the results of this analysis revealed no significant patterns of differences. No migrant or native groups showed any tendency to be more or less traditional in their ways of thinking. The differences were erratic and varied by prefectures, questions, and migrant categories. In sum then, the influence of socio-economic status and traditional and non-traditional views did not seem to be significant. Migrants or different migrant groups in each prefecture did not seem to differ in any consistent manner with respect to these characteristics.

Summary and conclusions

The results of our study show that the consequences of migration have created a situation where large urban communities like Tokyo and Osaka consist of populations with large segments of migrants who do not identify with these areas but with others—probably those areas where they originated. Moreover, the evidence indicates that this iden-

tification is more than just a superficial feeling that one is a native of a certain prefecture—it involves a sense of pride, attachment to that area, perhaps mediated through one's attachments to home and kin. The evidence also suggests that such feelings are not related to people of any given socio-economic status or whether the migrants' views are traditional or non-traditional. Moreover, these feelings persist even after a considerable period of time in the area.

Although no exact comparable data on identity were available for Western societies, such a proportion of migrants with identification elsewhere seems unusually large. Perhaps this phenomenon is more peculiarly Japanese—an outcome or continuation of certain social practices associated with its migration. As we have previously noted, rural-urban migration in Japan was conducted within a traditional rural social context. Urbanward Japanese migrants never completely severed their ties with their rural past. Thus, they tended to move to those areas where others from their own area were living and could assist them, and, also help them carry on some of their past traditional practices. There was also a common practice of migrants returning to their home areas to find marriage partners, and of women migrants returning to the family homestead for the birth of their children. It was also common for rural workers to come to the urban areas for temporary work and then return to settle down in rural areas. Indeed the Japanese pattern seemed circulatory in the sense that more back-and-forth movements occurred (Vogel [13]). In the West, there appears to be a greater severance of ties with the rural past, although patterns similar to the Japanese have been noted in some Western migrant groups (Brown et al. [2]).

One can begin to explore what the implications are when a large urban metropolis is composed of such large numbers of outsiders. Is community integration hindered by this lack of identification? Perhaps certain areas of the community activity are able to function without the necessity of any strong ties of identification by its members. On the other hand, it would also seem that certain important community problems are not apt to be solved without the collective and sustained action of members who are sufficiently motivated by feelings that their own welfare is intimately tied to that of the community—a strong identification. Certainly, more research on these issues is needed.

Notes

1. There is a vast amount of literature on internal migration (migration within national borders) covering different aspects of this process. A recent bibliographical work is by Shaw [10]. There is also a good

up-to-date bibliography covering various aspects of internal migration in Peterson's [9] population textbook. For a recent review of migration trends in Japan, see Okazaki [7]. Also, for a review of recent migration trends and their implications in Japan, see Ueda et al. [12]. White [14] contains an excellent bibliography on recent Japanese studies (in English and Japanese) on migration and especially migrant behavior.

2. There are a variety of ways in which people use the term *community*. For example, we hear about a *rural community* or an *ethnic community* or even about a *community of nations*. Social scientists have also defined a community in a number of ways but most definitions revolve around certain key features: sustenance, organization, and geographical locale. The well known American sociologist Talcott Parsons ([8], p. 91) defines a community as a collectivity the members of which share a common territorial area as their base of operations for daily activities. Such daily activities are those like working, schooling, shopping, attending church or other religious activities. In short, the community is that area in which one is intimately involved on a regular basis in order to get by from day to day.

This definition applies to a large variety of communal types ranging in size and complexity. One type of community could be a small rural village composed of a few families, another could be a large metropolitan center involving millions. Both constitute an organized area around which people live out their daily lives. It is within this setting that the most significant social experiences occur to people. In the case of the large urban metropolis however, the communal ties are much more complex and indirect—people of a metropolis are organized into an interlocking web of relationships where one is unable to interact directly with all others. Because of improvements in transportation and communication, the areas in which modern urbanites live and work is extremely vast subsuming places which were previously independent communities. Indeed, a large modern metropolitan center such as Tokyo today, is actually composed of hundreds if not thousands of neighborhoods, towns, and suburbs. Yet, together it comprises a community for its millions of residents—it is a mass complex organization spread over a wide area which is the locale in which the residents are dependent upon each other for their daily needs.

This phenomenon has lead some sociologists and others to argue that such a large urban metropolis lacks a *sense of community* or what the German sociologist Tonnies termed *Gemeinschaft* where communal ties are more intimate and where one has a strong sense of belonging and identity. It is the approach of this paper that while a sense of community may or may not exist in a large metropolis, it is nevertheless true that people of necessity are involved in an elaborate communal

network to meet their daily needs. Indeed, it is one of the major concerns of this paper that strong feelings of communal ties and identification are partly an outcome of the resident's migrant status—whether they were born and raised there or recent migrants.

INSTITUTE OF STATISTICAL MATHEMATICS
SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY

REFERENCES

- [1] Beijer, G. (1963). *Rural Migrants in Urban Settings*, Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague, Netherlands.
- [2] Brown, J. S., Schwarzweller, H. K. and Mangalam, J. J. (1963). Kentucky mountain migration and the stem-family: An American variation on a theme by Le Play, *Rural Sociology*, 28, 48 ff.
- [3] Jansen, C. J. (ed.) (1970). *Readings in the Sociology of Migration*, Pergamon Press, New York.
- [4] Koyano, S. et al. (eds.) (1975). *Japanese Community*, Kawashima-shoten, Tokyo.
- [5] Koyano, S., Suzuki, T. et al. (1974). *Forecasting and Assessing the Quality of Urban Life—A Survey Report—*, Chuo-chosa-sha, Tokyo.
- [6] Kuroda, T. (1973). *Japan's Changing Population Structure*, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tokyo.
- [7] Okazaki, Y. (1975). Recent change of internal migration in Japan, *The Journal of Population Problems (Jinko Mondai Kenkyu)*, No. 136, 15-28.
- [8] Parsons, T. (1951). *The Social System*, The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois.
- [9] Peterson, W. (1975). *Population* (third edition), Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., New York.
- [10] Shaw, P. R. (1975). *Migration Theory and Fact: A Review and Bibliography of Current Literature, Bibliography Series*, No. 5, Regional Science Institute, Philadelphia.
- [11] Taeuber, I. B. (1958). *The Population of Japan*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J.
- [12] Ueda, M. et al. (1974). Trends of Migration and Their Implications in Japan (a special issue), *The Journal of Population Problems (Jinko Mondai Kenkyu)*, No. 129.
- [13] Vogel, E. F. (1967). Kinship Structure, Migration to the City, and Modernization, in *Aspects of Social Change in Modern Japan*, R. P. Dore (ed.), Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J.
- [14] White, J. W. (1973). Political implications of cityward migration: Japan as an exploratory test case, *Sage Professional Papers in Comparative Politics*, 4 (Series Number: 01-038).
- [15] Wilkinson, T. O. (1965). *The Urbanization of Japanese Labor, 1868-1955*, The University of Massachusetts Press, Amherst, Mass.