Formation of Ethnic Identity :
A Case of South Korean Youth in Japan

Myung - Soo Kim

INTRODUCTION

The study of ethnicity used to be a small part of racial discrimination study. But in the last decade many professional scholars have begun to study this subject, raising and analyzing various issues. This has happened because of the realization that there needs to be fundamental change in the basic theory of social science in order to address ethnic phenomena which can't be explained by conventional sociological theories. It is not only a motive for the study of ethnicity, but also a basic concern to explain ethnic revival, which requires perceptions beyond those provided by Marxism or functionalism.

However, it is questionable whether prior theories of ethnicity, especially theories of ethnic identities, could be analyzed adequately by empirical interpretations. Suppose the fundamental concern of ethnicity means reactions to the real ethnic phenomena, this could be a big contradiction. It seems more obvious that there are problems in Japan than in the U.S.

For example, in the U.S. the studies on social stratification accept ethnicity in the empirical study but in the history of the social stratification studies in Japan, ethnicity has never been mentioned. Also, in *Japanese Sociological Review* 176 [1994] [1], a special feature about ethnicity were assembled for the first time, but there weren't any theses which were based on social research. Furthermore, there were none that analyzed Japanese ethnic groups such as Koreans in Japan, Ainu and Okinawan. It can also be said that this fact has characterized most

recent studies of ethnicity published in Japan. These conditions concerning the study of ethnicity in Japan might give rise to a question asking why there is a need to study ethnicity in Japan.

The main purpose of this paper is to suggest an answer to how ethnic identity forms from the empirical point of view, taking these problems into consideration and using information from a survey of Koreans in Japan. The reason why Koreans in Japan are objects of research is not only that they represent a subjective application of the term ethnicity in Japan, but also that they form a prototype of an ethnic minority, so they are easier to identify when talking about formation of ethnic identity than multi-ethnic situations like U.S.

In this paper, (1) first, I will review some measurement approaches of ethnic identity, (2) specify the structure of ethnic identity from my own analysis, and (3) explore the formation process of ethnic identity.

THEORETICAL FOCUS

The theory of assimilation and reaction

The theory of assimilation and reaction is related to two major theoretical schools. One is the Chicago school, which proposed an " assimilation theory" based on a theoretical history [Park & Burgess 1921; Park 1950; Gordon 1964; Greeley 1971]. The other is called " ethnic reaction theory," examples being the internal colonialism theory [Hechter 1974, 1978] , the theory of divided labor market [Bonacich 1981] and the emigrant small business theory [Bonacich 1973; Bonacich & Modell 1980; Kim 1981].

A common point of these theories is to identify relations between ethnic identity and discrimination or inequality. These theories suggest that structural assimilation decreases the importance of ethnic identity and vice versa. Structural assimilation means the decrease in isolation of regions, or segregation, of ethnic classes, and the increase of marriage outside ethnic groups.

Discrimination or prejudice are believed to be the main cause preventing assimilation. If I derive the propositions from this theory, they are as follows.

Proposition 1 : An ethnic minority whose social status is low is more likely to get strong ethnic identity.

Proposition 2 : An ethnic minority whose educational attainment is low is more likely to get strong ethnic identity.

Proposition 3 : An ethnic minority that lives in an ethnic community is more likely to get strong ethnic identity.

Proposition 4 : An ethnic minority who experiences discrimination is likely to get strong ethnic identity.

The primordial theory

Some scholars, proceeding the second school in the theory of assimilation and reaction, eagerly discussed "The primordial theory" [Geerts 1963; Isaacs 1975].

According to this theory, by naturally socializing in ethnic compatriot groups, you develop a total attachment to your ethnic group. That attachment is at the root of the ethnos. Therefore, a key phrase for the theory of primitive specificity is "primitive contact with compatriots". In this research it is represented by the number of compatriots in the place of upbringing and ethnic education within families.

Proposition 3 : An ethnic minority who lives in an ethnic community is more likely to get strong ethnic identity.

Proposition 5 : An ethnic minority who was raised with ethnic tradition in a family is more likely to get strong ethnic identity.

Theory of ethnic competition

The opposite of the theory of assimilation and reaction and the primordial theory, is the "theory of ethnic competition" [Hannan 1979; Nielsen 1980, 1985; Nagel & Olzak 1982; Olzak 1982, 1992]. To summarize this theory, the higher education, and the more knowledge and higher skills ethnic minorities acquire, the more competition they provide to control a society and social resources, and this competitiveness contributes to a stronger ethnic identity.

The theory of ethnic competition suggests that competition created after some structural assimilation leads to a rise in significance of ethnic identity; however, the theory of assimilation and reaction says that oppressive situations are required to unify ethnics. The theory of primitive specificity takes the innate side of ethnicity seriously, while the theory of ethnic competition emphasizes an acquirable side of views such as contact with ethnic associations [Olzak 1992].

Therefore, this research combines these theories and employs indices such as number of compatriots in place of upbringing, social status, education, experience of being discriminated against, and participation in ethnic associations.

Proposition 6: *An ethnic minority whose social status is high is more likely to get strong ethnic identity.*

Proposition 7: *An ethnic minority whose educational attainment is high is more likely to get strong ethnic identity.*

Proposition 8: *An ethnic minority who lives in a heterogeneous community is more likely to get strong ethnic identity.*

Proposition 9: *An ethnic minority who has experiences of participation in ethnic associations and experience of contact with compatriots is more likely to get strong ethnic identity.*

RESEARCH DESIGN

Data and Method

The data used in this thesis are from the "Survey on Consciousness among Korean Youth in Japan, 1993" [2] (henceforth referred to as "this survey") operated by "*Zainichi Kankoku Seinen-Kai*" or the Korean Youth Association in Japan, which is an affiliated association of "*Mindan*" or the Korean Residents Union in Japan [3]. This survey was given to people born in Japan, of South Korean nationality, aged from 18 to 30, in the three months from June 21 to September 21 1993, by interview method.

We used a list that the Korean Youth Association in Japan keeps, as representative of this population. The list comprises a group aged 18 to 30 from the Register of South Korean Nation that Mindan keeps.

Using systematic sampling from this list, about two thousand people were chosen for this survey. After excluding people who could not be found due to mistakes on the list, who were older or younger than the survey age limit, who had lost South Korean nationality by naturalization, or who had already died, our sample size was 1,723. Of these, 800 responses were obtained (a response rate of 46.4 %) [4].

Independent Variables

The variables and indices used to analyze ethnic identity are as follows.

Age and Sex

Used as control variables

Ethnic tradition inside families (ETF)

This measure consists of four indices such as "number of *Jeoi-sa*[5] per year", "experience of going to traditional weddings", "number of ethnic ceremonies",

and "extent of ethnic identities of parents". "Experience of going to traditional weddings of relatives" consists of a five point scale ranging from none to many times. For "number of ethnic ceremonies", the answer code includes experiences of "ceremony for 100 days after birth (*Baig il*)", "ceremony for a year after birth (*Dol jian chi*)", "ethnic funeral" and "ethnic purification (*Gus*)". To measure how deeply parents think of ethnic identities, it has four levels from "very little" to "very strongly". The result of principal component analysis is shown in Appendix 1.

Number of compatriots in place of upbringing (NCP)

This variable asks how many compatriots lived around you when you were 12 years old. There were seven choices from "I don't know" or "none" to "the area where a lot of compatriots lived". The answers "I don't know" and "none" were combined since they represent similar experiences, so in actuality six responses are possible.

Experience of being discriminated against (DIS)

This variable uses a five-point scale ranging from "none" to "frequent".

Father's occupational status (FOS)

The occupational prestige score from the SSM survey is used [Naoi and Suzuki 1978]

Educational attainment (GEDU)

Length of schooling

Ethnic education (EEDU)

Besides "Education" as a social status, "Ethnic education" has been adopted to

determine how ethnic values were handed down. It is a five-point scale ranging from "none" to "a lot".

Participation in ethnic associations and experience of contact with compatriots (PA)

Asked how often the subject has taken part in activities or meetings of ethnic associations. It has four levels from "none" to " a lot".

The definition and measurement of ethnic identity

If you take a look at metric studies, you'll find only three ways of measuring ethnic identity, and even then there is no discussion of what ethnicity is and minimal explanation of how it should indeed be measured [Smith 1980]. They are the "nativity approach", the "subjective approach" and the "behavioral approach".

The "nativity approach" is to identify your ethnic group by inquiring places where you, your parents, or your grandparents were born. This approach has been used widely in the U.S. since the 1970s. The main advantage is that you can get correct and detailed information that is easy to analyze. On the other hand you'll get lots of missing cases since the grand children and the later descendants of immigrants are not identifiable.

The "subjective approach" is designed to address the weak points of the nativity approach. To give a specific example, you might be asked to think about your identity or images of your ancestors. It is very useful because you'll get a variety of effective responses from different ethnic groups as well as white ethnic groups, but results are unstable since you might receive a different answer each time you use this approach.

The "behavioral approach" is to analyze ethnic orientation from various points of view by measuring multiple aspects of ethnic attitudes, thoughts and behaviors,

for example language and marriage within the same ethnic group. It has great potential for research for a wide range of groups, but it is difficult to ask the same questions to different types of ethnics, and it's getting more difficult to analyze ethnic behavior itself after immigration and cultural changes.

In most cases, the nativity approach or the subjective approach have been adopted to study ethnicity. For instance, Smith himself, who classified those three approaches, has hardly ever used the behavioral approach. Even Waters, who quoted Smith's thesis, pointed out the limits of both approaches. According to Waters, it is totally unclear why people choose a particular ethnic identity from possible alternatives, and so she considers how often individuals use an ethnic identity in their daily life or how they hand their ethnic identity down from generation to generation. However she never mentioned the behavioral approach and she changed her approach from the questionnaire method to the in-depth interview [Waters op cit.].

As I have suggested, it is a point of discussion why people adopted the nativity approach or the subjective approach, not the behavioral approach, but I would like to suggest problems inherent in both approaches here.

First of all, an essential problem with studying ethnicity is when you use the nativity approach or subjective approach, whether you like it or not, you consider only nativity and identity as standard factors of ethnicity. According to Hutnik, who studies the ethnic identity of Indian British students, however, no significant relationship has been found between ethnic identity and ethnic behavior. His study suggests that you can't understand everything about ethnic orientation from objective nativity and subjective identity. Furthermore, van den Berghe commented that subjective factors are too much exaggerated in the composition of ethnicity, therefore, the subjective approach has serious drawbacks [Van den Berghe 1976].

As Waters suggested, with these two approaches you can't determine the extent

to which ethnic identification has been developed. According to Cohen, ethnicity is a "variable", and it is supposed to vary in daily life, so you have to choose the behavioral approach to analyze comprehensively ethnic orientations. In other words, you are unable to cover ethnic cohesion until you analyze ethnic attitudes and behavior in such a way as to note its intensity or its frequency. Then you can comprehensively put objective and subjective factors together in the composition of ethnic identity.

As mentioned above, the behavioral approach can't cover certain kinds of ethnic groups, but in the case of the South Korean youth in Japanese, which is a prototype of an ethnic minority, there are relatively few problems with the behavioral approach. Consequently, I'd like to adopt the behavioral approach to analyze this ethnic identity. That means the definition of ethnic identity here stands for comprehensive ethnic orientations of attitude, consciousness, and behavior that come from ethnic cohesion.

Appropriate indices have been adopted for South Korean youth in Japan like Table 2 to analyze ethnic identity, referring to preceding studies [Constatinou 1985; Hutnik op cit.; Kim 1994]. "Ethnic knowledge" includes 25 headings about Korean ethnicity. The remaining indices are four or six point scales.

ANALYSIS

Measurement of ethnic identity

First of all, to check the validity of each index and relations among them, explanatory factor analysis was performed (Table 3). Each communality shows a stable and high score which is around 0.6 % except frequency of use of real names and concerns of unification of Korea which show relatively low scores. Also two factors explain 57.9 % of the total dispersion of the 11 indices. That means all indices represent ethnic identity of South Korean youth in Japan.

There are five variables in Factor 1, which are "Frequency of using ethnic

related books", "Ethnic knowledge", "Language ability (reading)", "Language ability (speaking)" and "Frequency of using real names". Most of South Korean youth in Japan have no chance to get a systematic ethnic education and have lost their ethnic language abilities. And most of them use Japanese names to make life easier. Considering such situations, to get or to do things mentioned in those five variables, requires intentional efforts.

In that case, it is suitable for keywords of those variables such as "subjective", "instrumental", "institutional", "political", and "cognitive" and you can point out a certain collective image. In short, a common factor that connects these five variables would be something like "instrumental orientation to recognize ethnic problems and try to solve them". So I would like to call Factor 1 "instrumental-oriented ethnic identity (IOE)".

On the other hand, concerning Factor 2, there are five variables which are "will to inherit *Jeoi-sa*", "will to make friends with compatriots", "attachment to compatriot society", and "will to keep own nationality". The common image of those five would be "expressive", "attachment", "relationship" and "connection" with compatriot society or ethnic cultures. So Factor 2 shows something like "expressive orientation to demand ethnic ties emotionally". In the light of those facts, Factor 2 will be called "expressive-oriented ethnic identity (EOE)".

To consider both factors as they are above, it is understandable that "concerns of unification of Korea" is considered at the same level from both sides. "Unification of the nation" does not favor one of these factors over the other. It is a topic that attracts emotional concerns as an earnest wish of Korean ethnicity as well as a topic that stimulates an awareness of the issues as a political matter.

In consideration of those matters, you can clearly see two facts related to the measurement. (1) Each measurement variable equally represents ethnic identity among South Korean youth in Japan, (2) it is statistically possible to

divide ethnic identity into two orientations such as instrumental orientation and expressive orientation.

The next section discusses how these two orientations which divide ethnic identity have been formed.

Formation process of ethnic identity

These data have been applied to a Structural Equation Model as well as a simple structure recognized by the explanatory factor analysis. Table 4 and 5 present the results [6]. Table 4 indicates correlation coefficients between ethnic identity and other variables. It also shows that all variables except sex have some significant relation with ethnicity among South Korean youth in Japan.

However, if you look at the beta coefficient on Table 5, you can see a huge difference between the expressive orientation and the instrumental orientation. The most effective influence on formation of the expressive orientation is "Ethnic traditions within families". Its beta coefficient is 0.582 and it can be said that it has a strong influence compared to the other factors. In other words, whether you have a strong expressive orientation or not depends on how much you learn about ethnic traditions inside your family. This is also called a process of inheriting ethnic identity because you directly hand traditions down within families.

The second biggest influence on the expressive orientation is "Participation in ethnic associations and experience of contact with compatriots" (0.259). That means that participating in ethnic organizations and having some contact with compatriots creates the expressive orientation. This suggests a process of acquiring ethnic identity in the sense of getting ethnic orientation from outside families. There aren't any other effective factors that influence the expressive orientation. To sum up, the expressive orientation is inherited mainly within families and acquired partly by participating in ethnic activities. In this sense,

expressive-oriented ethnic identity basically means "inheritable ethnic identity" .

On the other hand, the most effective factor to construct the instrumental orientation is "extent of ethnic education" (0.443). The construction of a instrumental orientation remarkably depends on how much ethnic education you receive. It can be said that one process for acquiring ethnic identity involves secondary sources, by education provided outside of families.

"Participation in ethnic associations and experience of contact with compatriots" (0.262) is the second most effective factor. It is understandable that participation in ethnic activities leads to the construction of a "instrumental orientation of recognizing ethnic issues and solving them". As I have suggested, this is a process of acquiring ethnic identity.

"Education" has a clear effect and it's also a process of acquiring ethnic identity.

Effective factors on the instrumental orientation are "extent of ethnic education" and "school education", which are less important to the expressive orientation, and "participation in ethnic associations and experience of contact with compatriots" . The most effective factor on the expressive orientation, "ethnic traditions within families" has a relatively smaller influence (0.165) on the instrumental orientation, which suggests the instrumental orientation doesn't have a strong inherited component.

Eventually the instrumental orientation is acquired through education inside and outside families as well as participating in ethnic organizations, and it is difficult to get the instrumental orientation only by a direct inheritance inside families. Such being the case, the instrumental-oriented ethnic identity is identified as "acquirable ethnic identity".

DISCUSSION

The essence of ethnic identity — its polysemy

In the 1980s some scholars emphasized the concept of ethnicity only by particular views such as emotional or institutional points, but that doesn't always mean that there are enough explanations of relations among various viewpoints. The results of this research indicate that there is a strong correlation (correlative variable 0.65) between an emotional side of ethnic identity (expressive orientation) and an institutional side of ethnic identity (instrumental orientation). That is, both sides of ethnic identity could be compatible.

In this study the behavioral approach as a measurement of ethnic identity made these empirical discussions possible. It is still difficult to simply apply data of South Korean youth in Japan to other ethnic groups in western countries, but I hope its polysemy in ethnic identity will stimulate future discussions on this topic.

Formation of ethnic identity — its autogenicity

In this research, the variables that represents the "structural assimilation" are number of compatriots in place of upbringing, social status, education, and experience of being discriminated against. Those variables had little, if any, impact on the formation of ethnic identity in South Korean youth in Japan, however. That suggests that the theory of assimilation and reaction has hardly any relevance in explaining the formation of ethnic identity in South Korean youth in Japan. The only significant factor, education, shows a totally opposite direction from what is theoretically expected. What does this mean?

First of all, since the number of compatriots in place of upbringing has a very strong relation to the expressive orientation as well as the instrumental orientation at zero order correlative level (Table 4), it seems to have something to do with construction of ethnic identity, but it doesn't have a direct influence on formation of ethnic identity and has only apparent relations by other factors.

Father's occupational status has been adopted to indicate social inequitable structure and it plays a very important role in the theory of assimilation and reaction, but it doesn't have an effect on either the expressive orientation or the instrumental orientation. It is surprising that there isn't any influence by social stratification from the point of view of intellectual sociology or industrial sociology. Ethnic identity of South Korean youth in Japan represents values in an area of private life and it may be created without occupational status, whose importance is excessively exaggerated in an industrial society.

The experience of being discriminated against also doesn't have much impact on the expressive orientation or the instrumental orientation 7 . It can be said that the assertion that discrimination is the main effective factor to form ethnic identity, which is broadly supported in Japan, is a very narrow perspective.

Finally, ethnic identity of South Korean youth in Japan is not passively defined by discrimination or inequality in Japanese society, but is formed through a unique and autogenous reproductive process.

Formation of ethnic identity 2 — its inheritance and acquirement

How can the autogenous reproductive process be defined?

Variables based on the primordial theory and the theory of competition, which are suitable for the data of South Korean youth in Japan, are ethnic traditions inside families, education and participation in ethnic groups and contacts with compatriots. From this result it is difficult to say, "the primordial theory and the theory of competition are appropriate for South Korean youth in Japan".

Because it is hard to say that only the number of compatriots in place of upbringing represents the "primitive contact with compatriots", which is a keyword in the theory of primitive specificity, and considering that father's occupational status doesn't have an effect on construction of ethnic identity, it is impossible to suggest that education attainment represents acquired status in the

theory of competition.

After all, a theory is framed by a set of several propositions, and the compatibility of each proposition to data doesn't necessarily mean efficiency of its theory. So consulting efficiency of "ethnic education" which isn't mentioned in any theories as previously stated, former theoretical premises, which had been created mainly in the U.S., hardly have any meaning for analyzing the construction of ethnic identity in South Korean youth in Japan.

What we need now is to break up each theory into propositions and to study critically the efficiency of each proposition. Then we need to reconstruct properly groups of propositions. To try a specific theorization will be the next step, but as a matter of fact, this has already been started in the previous section.

Again, ethnic identity of South Korean youth in Japan is divided into the expressive orientation and the instrumental orientation. To examine each process, the construction of the expressive orientation deeply depends on the inheriting process which is formed basically through ethnic traditions within families; meanwhile, the instrumental orientation is constructed by the acquirable process which includes ethnic education, participation in ethnic association, and school education. Consequently what has been found as keywords in order to explain the construction of ethnic identity in South Korean youth in Japan is two reproductive processes, "inheritance" and "acquirement".

References

Bonacich, Edna. 1973. "A Theory of Middleman Minorities." American Sociological Review 38.

————. 1976. "Advanced Capitalism and Black/White Relations in the United States: A Split Labor Market Interpretation." *American Sociological*

Review 41.

Bonacich, Edna and John Modell. 1980. The Economic Basis of Ethnic Solidarity: Small Business in the Japanese American Community. University of California Press.

Cohen, Abner. 1974. "Introduction: The Lesson of Ethnicity." in Cohen, Abner ed. *Urban Ethnicity*. Tavistock.

Constatinou, Stavros and Milton E. Harvey. 1985. "Dimensional Structure and Intergenerational Differences in Ethnicity: The Greek Americans." *Sociology and Social Research* 69.

Geerts, Clifford. 1963. The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays. Basic Books.

Gordon, Milton M. 1964. Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins. Oxford University Press.

Greeley, Andrew M. 1971. *Why Can't They Be Like Us?* E. P. Dutton.

Hannan, Michael T. 1979. "The Dynamics of Ethnic Boundaries in Modern States." in Meyer, J. W. and M. T. Hannan eds. *National Development and the World System: Educational, Economic, and Political Change, 1950 - 1970*. University of Chicago Press.

Hechter, Michael. 1974. "The Political Economy of Ethnic Change." *American Journal of Sociology* 79.

————. 1978. "Group Formation and the Cultural Division of Labor." *American Journal of Sociology* 84.

Fukuoka, Yasunori, Myung - Soo Kim and Zainichi Kankoku Seinenkai Chuohonbu. 1994. *Daisanji Zainichi Kankokujin Seinen Ishikichosa Chukan Hokokusho*. Zainichi Kankoku Seinenkai.

Fukuoka, Yasunori, Myung - Soo Kim. 1997. *Zainichi Kankokujin Seinen no Seikatsu to Ishiki*. Tokyo University Press.

Hutnik, Nimmi. 1986. "Patterns of Ethnic Minority Identification and Modes of

Social Adaptation." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 9 .

Isaacs, H. R. 1975. "Basic Group Identity." in Glazer, N. and D. P. Moynihan eds. *Ethnicity*. Harvard University Press.

Kim, IllSoo. 1981. New Urban Immigrants, The Korean Community in New York. Princeton University Press.

Kim, Myung-Soo. 1994. "Minzokuteki Kyuusinryoku no Keiseiron: LISREL wo mochiita Ingakozo Bunseki." *Nenpo Ningen Kagaku* 15. Osaka Daigaku Ningen Kagakubu.

Kim, Myung-Soo. 1995. "Zainichikankokujin no Gakureki to Shokugyo." *Nenpo Ningen Kagaku* 16. Osaka Daigaku Ningen Kagakubu.

Nagel, Joanne and Susan Olzak. 1982, "Ethnic Mobilization in New and Old States: An Extension of Competition Model." *Social Problems* 30.

Naoi, Atsushi and Suzuki Tatsuzo. 1978. "Shokugyou no Shakaiteki Hyoka no Bunseki: Shokugyoishin Sukoa no Kento." *Shakaikaiso to Shakaiido 1975 SSM Zenkoku Chosa Hokoku*. 1975 SSM Chosa Iinkai.

Nielsen, Francois. 1980. "The Flemish Movement in Belgium after World War II: A Dynamic Analysis." *American Sociological Review* 45.

————. 1985. "Toward a Theory of Ethnic Solidarity in Modern Societies." *American Sociological Review* 50.

Okamura, Jonathan. 1981. "Situational Ethnicity." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 4 .

Olzak, Susan. 1982. "Ethnic Mobilization in Quebec." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 5 .

————. 1992. *The Dynamics of Ethnic Competition*. Stanford University Press.

Park, Robert Ezra and Ernst W. Burgess. 1921. *Introduction to the Sociology*. University of Chicago Press.

Park, Robert Ezra. 1950. *Race and Culture*, The Free Press.

Portes, Alejandro. 1984. "The Rise of Ethnicity: Determinants of Ethnic

Perceptions among Cuban Exiles in Miami." *American Sociological Review* 49.

Smith, Tom. W. 1980. "Ethnic Measurement and Identification." *Ethnicity* 7 .

Van den Berghe, Pierre L. 1976. "Ethnic Pluralism in Industrial Societies." *Ethnicity* 3 .

Waters, Mary C. 1990. *Ethnic Option: Choosing Identities in America.* University of California Press.

---

[1] The study of ethnicity in Japan began with the import of the concept of ethnicity in the 1980s, and therefore most of the early articles of this field focused on the review of foreign publications. However this special edition was made up at least a decade ago after the concept of ethnicity was brought to Japan.

[2] The author participated in this research with Fukuoka Yasunori (Saitama University). More details referred to the research report [Fukuoka, Kim and others 1994]

[3] It is a nation wide ethnic organization that supports Republic of Korea. Since it has a public role such as management of registration in South Korea or receipt of applying a passport, most South Koreans in Japan register their names there.

[4] People who lost nationality of Republic of Korea by naturalization or who have nationality of Democratic People's Republic of Korea are not objects to this research. Strictly speaking, it doesn't cover all Korean youth in Japan. However it is obvious that its list covers most of them among obtainable lists so far because it is impossible to use the Alien Registration forms for a research.

[5] It is a religious ceremony, similar to a Buddhist service, but it has a role of maintaining relationships among relatives.

[6] Factor loadings are shown in Appendix B.

[7] The latent relationship between discrimination and ethnicity was discussed in another paper [Kim 1997].

Appendix 1   Principal component analysis on Ethnic tradition inside families

Variables	Loadings	Factor	Eigenvalue	Cum Pct
Number of *Jeoi-sa* per year	.588	1	1.842	46.1
Experience of traditional weddings	.717	2	.824	66.7
Number of ethnic ceremonies	.730	3	.738	85.2
Extent of ethnic identities of parents	.671	4	.596	100.0

Appendix 2   Factor loadings

Variables	ETF	EOE	IOE
Number of *Jeoi-sa* per year	.370*	.0	.0
Experience of traditional weddings	.625*	.0	.0
Number of ethnic ceremonies	.460*	.0	.0
Extent of ethnic identities of parents	.608*	.0	.0
will to inherit *Jeoi-sa*	.0	.677*	.0
friends with compatriots	.0	.672*	.0
marriage with compatriot	.0	.704*	.0
attachment for compatriot society	.0	.672*	.0
will to keep own nationality	.0	.704*	.0
concerns of unification of Korea	.0	.250*	.311*
ethnic related books	.0	.0	.756*
Ethnic knowledge	.0	.0	.854*
Language ability (reading)	.0	.0	.688*
Language ability (speaking)	.0	.0	.765*
Frequency of using real names	.0	.0	.463*

See also the note of table 5

Table 1　Independent variables with basic statistics

Variables	Average	St.Dev	Min.	Max.
Number of compatriots in place of upbringing	1.77	1.88	1.00	6.00
Father's occupational status	47.26	12.79	26.70	82.70
number of *Jeoi-sa* per year	3.21	2.18	0.00	9.00
experience of going to traditional weddings	1.60	1.43	1.00	5.00
number of ethnic ceremonies	1.32	1.36	0.00	5.00
extent of ethnic identities of parents	1.75	.87	1.00	4.00
Age	22.81	3.05	18.00	30.00
Sex	1.55	0.50	1.00	2.00
Educational attainment	13.46	1.74	9.00	16.00
Ethnic education	1.18	1.14	1.00	5.00
Experience of being discriminated against	1.21	1.01	1.00	5.00
Participation in ethnic associations	1.04	1.11	1.00	4.00

Table 2　Indices of Ethnic Cohesion with basic statistics

Variables	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.
will to inherit *Jeoi-sa*	1.48	.912	1.00	4.00
ethnic related books	1.57	1.218	1.00	5.00
friends with compatriots	2.00	.924	1.00	4.00
will to marriage with compatriot	1.24	1.046	1.00	4.00
attachment for compatriot society	2.49	1.116	1.00	5.00
Ethnic knowledge	13.33	6.559	1.00	25.00
Language ability (reading)	0.81	1.473	1.00	6.00
Language ability (speaking)	1.12	1.259	1.00	6.00
Frequency of using real names	2.59	1.817	1.00	7.00
will to keep own nationality	1.62	1.325	1.00	5.00
concerns of unification of Korea	3.25	1.229	1.00	5.00

$N=544$

Table 3　explanatory factor analysis on ethnic identity

Variables	Communality	Factor 1	Factor 2
will to inherit *Jeoi-sa*	.592	.010	.763
ethnic related books	.618	.731	.289
friends with compatriots	.554	.245	.703
will to marriage with compatriot	.610	.160	.764
attachment to compatriot society	.541	.300	.671
Ethnic knowledge	.720	.794	.300
Language ability (reading)	.726	.844	.117
Language ability (speaking)	.780	.867	.168
Frequency of using real names	.349	.555	.202
will to keep own nationality	.556	.250	.702
concerns of unification of Korea	.325	.408	.399
Eigenvalue		4.908	1.462
Cum Pct		44.6	57.9

Table 4　Correlation Coefficiencies among the Latent Variables

	NCP	FOS	ETE	AGE	SEX	GEDU	EEDU	DIS	PO	EOE	IOE
NCP	1.000										
FOS	−0.197*	1.000									
ETF	0.371*	0.041	1.000								
AGE	0.116*	0.012	0.283*	1.000							
SEX	0.015	−0.010	−0.004	−0.079	1.000						
GEDU	−0.088	0.214*	−0.009	0.022	−0.082	1.000					
EEDU	0.276*	0.020	0.550*	0.153*	0.046	0.041	1.000				
DIS	0.113*	0.003	0.200*	0.222*	0.006	0.060	0.203*	1.000			
PO	0.253*	0.014	0.437*	0.091*	0.019	0.018	0.513*	0.207*	1.000		
EOE	0.278*	0.115*	0.711*	0.131*	0.005	0.076	0.496*	0.214*	0.541*	1.000	
IOE	0.250*	0.095*	0.567*	0.256*	0.022	0.262*	0.711*	0.289*	0.592*	0.653*	1.000

see also the note of table 5

Table 5   Beta Coefficiencies on Ethnic Identities

	EOE	IOE
NCP	.010	.006
FOS	.077	.026
ETF	.582*	.165*
AGE	$-.077$	.096*
SEX	.000	.024
GEDU	.058	.231*
EEDU	.038	.443*
DIS	.048	.076*
PO	.259*	.262*

NOTE : N $=544$ *p $<.05$
χ^2/d. f.$=429.69/181=2.37$
GFI $=.937$ AGFI$=.904$ RMR$=.040$
R^2 of EOE$=.589$ R^2 of IOE$=.675$