

Shareholding and Lending Activity of Financial Institutions in Japan

TOSHIAKI TACHIBANAKI and ATSUHIRO TAKI

This paper investigates the share ownership and lending activity of financial institutions with emphasis on the relationship between the two. We obtained the following results. The mobility of lending order was somewhat higher than that of shareholding order. The correlation between lending order and shareholding order was not so high. We found the different outcomes of the stability of main banks between main banks defined traditionally as the largest lenders and "main banks" defined by as being both largest lenders and top shareholders. It should be pointed out, however, that the above results were greatly modified when we analyzed banks, trust banks, and life insurance companies separately.

I. Introduction

Intercorporate share ownership (or the crossholding of shares) and bank lending (or the main bank system) have been investigated separately in Japan, except for a few studies. The purpose of this paper is to examine statistically the relationship between financial institutions' share ownership and their lending to non-financial corporations. Although economic rationality (or irrationality) and interpretations of the relationship between intercorporate share ownership and lending are discussed, the principal concern is to examine two large data sets of individual non-financial firms and individual financial institutions and to explain the empirical findings derived.

The present work was conducted while Tachibanaki and Taki were, respectively, Visiting Scholar and Visiting Student at the Institute for Monetary and Economic Studies, the Bank of Japan. The authors benefited much from advices and comments given by the staff members of the Institute, including Kumiharu Shigehara (the Director), Yoshio Suzuki and Junichi Miyake (former directors), Mitsuhiro Fukao, Junichi Iwabuchi, Ryoko Oba, Mitsuaki Okabe, Kunio Okina, Setsuya Sato, Yoshiaki Shikano, Tomoo Yoshida, Katsufumi Yoshino, and others. The content of this paper was revised substantially by comments given at various seminars at the Japan Development Bank, Osaka University, Nagoya University, Kobe University, and the Japan Monetary Economics Association Congress at Hiroshima. Notably, comments by Hidekazu Eguchi, Yūsaku Futatsugi, Masakichi Ito, Keimei Kaizuka, Yoshitaka Kurosawa, Junichi Senda, Takayoshi Shimamura, Setsuo Uchibori, and Hirofumi Uzawa were useful. The authors are responsible for any remaining errors and opinions in this paper. The data used in this paper was purchased by Kyoto University through research funds allocated by of the Ministry of Education to study "Rational Resource Allocation in Post-Industrial Societies."

Two features of corporate finance in Japan, however, prompted our present undertaking. The first is the stability of the main bank system as studied by Miwa (1985), Suto and Takahashi (1986), Horiuchi and Fukuda (1987), and Hirota (1989) which were concerned with stability of the main bank system. The degree to which non-financial firms change their main banks was the principal interest, and there was a fairly solid consensus that the degree of stability was not as high (around 60~70%) as previously thought. Since all past studies were interested in the transition between main bank status and non-main bank status (i.e. the transition between one bank and the rest), we thought it would be interesting to inquire into the transition of all banks in terms of lending activity. Since the term "quasi" or "semi" main banks, which take second, third, or fourth position after main bank in terms of lending amount, is frequently used, not only main banks but also all other banks should be considered carefully. At the same time, we considered that it would be instructive to inquire into changes in shareholding order because it has not been closely scrutinized. The paper pays equal attention to changes in shareholding.

The second is intercorporate share ownership. Very few studies have paid attention to the role of share ownership in investigating bank lending activities or the main bank system, although several studies suggested the possibility of a relationship between them. Exceptions are Obata (1983) and Hirota (1989). The former is a thorough and comprehensive study of bank shareholdings but is not very systematic, and the latter is an examination of the relationship between only main banks and top shareholders. These two studies prompted us to investigate the relationship more quantitatively and systematically by utilizing large data sets. Specifically, the correlation between lending order and shareholding order is estimated, and implications discussed. When intercorporate share ownership, in particular financial institutions' ownership of other firms' shares, is the central subject, trust banks and insurance companies cannot be ignored. As will be shown later, trust banks and insurance companies (particularly the latter) are major holders of other firms' shares and, in some cases, hold more stock in several industries than do city banks. The paper gives equal weight to trust banks and insurance companies as well as to city banks and long-term credit banks.

The organization of the paper is as follows. Section II briefly examines various issues pertaining to corporate finance in Japan, and suggests some interpretations. Section III describes the data sources, and the empirical results of mobility tables (i.e. transition matrices) of both the lending and shareholding orders of various categories of financial institutions. Then, the relationship between lending and shareholding is examined by applying several elementary statistical techniques. Section IV focuses on firms which are the target of the largest lenders and the top shareholders, and gives several economic interpretations. Various definitions of a main bank are examined and discussed. Finally, in Section V, concluding remarks.

II. Main Banks and Intercompany Share Ownership in Japan

Japan's main bank system has received considerable attention. A main bank is the biggest lender to any particular firm (called the largest lender for simplicity) among a large number of banks lending funds, although some sceptical opinions regarding this definition have been presented by Schoenholtz and Takeda (1985), Miwa (1985), and Suto and Takahashi (1986). Some economists maintain that a main bank handles foreign exchange transactions exclusively, holds the largest amount on current account, or acts as a financial intermediary for shareholding. These are surely simply the effects of being a main bank, while the single most important element is being the largest lender. Very few authors, however, have rigorously defined a main bank. Our definition of a main bank in the strict sense is one which is the largest lender to a firm and at the same time the top shareholder of that firm, as will be shown in Section IV. However, we do not proclaim that this is necessarily the most appropriate definition. Perhaps the "largest lender and top shareholder simultaneously" may be preferable. Some economists believe that shareholdings should be secondary or only complementary, and that the amount of lending is the most crucial factor in defining a main bank. We will examine various definitions of a main bank in Section IV. As for the rationality of the main bank system, various ideas were presented. For example, Nakatani (1984) and Ikeo (1985) suggested the concept of insurance against default risk of a borrower, while Aoki (1988) and Horiuchi (1990) stress the relationship with the long-term employment system in Japan.

Table 1 presents changes in the composition of share ownership. As is frequently mentioned, the proportion of institutional shareholders has increased constantly while

Table 1
Distribution of Share Ownership (%)

	1950	1960	1970	1979	1984	1988
Central and Local Governments	3.1	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.9	0.4
Financial Institutions	12.6	20.4	32.3	38.8	41.5	44.1
a. Long-term Credit Banks, City and Regional Banks			(15.4)	(19.5)	(14.9)	(15.7)
b. Trust Banks					(7.3)	(9.8)
c. Life Insurance Cos.			(11.1)	(12.3)	(12.8)	(12.6)
d. Casualty Insurance Cos.			(4.0)	(4.9)	(4.0)	(4.1)
e. Others			(1.8)	(2.1)	(2.5)	(2.0)
Non-financial Firms	11.0	21.3	23.1	26.1	30.1	29.0
Securities Houses	11.9	3.5	1.2	2.0	2.1	2.3
Individuals	61.3	46.7	39.9	30.4	20.1	19.9
Foreigners	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.0	5.3	4.3

Source: Zenkoku Shoken Torihikisho Kyogikai, Share Distribution Survey, various years.

that of individual shareholders has declined constantly. In 1988 over 75 percent of shares in Japan were held by institutions (equivalently, non-individuals). Among institutional shareholders the portion held by trust banks and insurance companies was large, 27.2 percent of all shares outstanding. This number is larger than the 16.3 percent held by city, long-term credit, and regional banks. Therefore, it is quite important to investigate the role of trust banks and insurance companies as well as city, long-term credit, and regional banks in examining intercorporate shareholding and lending activities. Each category of financial institution behaves differently with respect to reasons for holding shares and in determining lending, and hence we provide empirical findings for each category as well as the aggregate of financial institutions.

Institutional share ownership is not only seen in Japan but is a world trend. Significant differences, however, between Japan and other industrialized countries must be recognized:

First, the motives for holding shares of other corporations are considerably different, even for financial institutions. Financial institutions in Japan hold shares of other corporations for other purposes than just income and capital gains.

Several such purposes have been suggested by various authors such as Aoki (1984), Tanigawa (1986), Horiuchi, Packer, and Fukuda (1988), Ariga (1989), Horiuchi (1990), Ito, Misumi, and Ichimura (1990), and others. For example, it is an essential precondition for long-term business relationship and for maintaining managers' independence from shareholders, as suggested by Horiuchi and others. It also serves as a barrier to the threat of merger and acquisition. Intercorporate share ownership enables firms to reduce corporate tax, as suggested by Aoki and Tanigawa. According to Horiuchi and Ariga, banks hold shares of other firms in order to ensure smooth monitoring, which could be one of the important causes of economies of scope between lending activity and other activities (including securities business) as suggested by Tachibanaki, Mitsui, and Kitagawa (1981). It may be useful to suggest one naive hypothesis, namely, that a financial institution which holds a substantial bloc of shares in a firm has the power to urge that firm to borrow large sums from it, and that a firm has to comply because it gains various benefit from the fact that the financial institution holds its shares.

Financial institutions in other countries regard shares as simply a normal financial asset which is expected to yield higher monetary returns. For Japan, the objectives of income and capital gains are usually less important. Share ownership by Japanese financial institutions is for other purposes as just described. Non-financial firms understand this. Therefore, Japanese financial institutions do not complain of low returns or yields. Institutional share ownership in other countries can perhaps be described as a principal-agency relationship since institutional shareholders are, to a large extent, really only agents for households. Institutional shareholders such as pension funds, trust funds, and other similar funds are more knowledgeable and skillful in asset management than individual shareholders. Needless to say, the above distinction between Japan and other

countries is somewhat oversimplified. For example, trust banks and life insurance companies in Japan which manage occupational (or enterprise) pensions seek higher monetary returns from share ownership than do other financial institutions such as banks.

Second, regulatory frameworks significantly affect and determine financial institutions' shareholding in other corporations. For example, the U.S. Banking Law of 1933 prohibits banks from holding shares and Japan imposes a maximum holding rate, 5 percent for banks and 10 percent for insurance companies according to Article 11 of the Anti-Trust Law, while the U.K. and West Germany (before unification) impose no concrete regulations. An interesting observation with respect to the U.K. and West Germany is that U.K. banks do not wish to hold shares in other corporations despite there being no regulation, while German banks actually hold very large blocs in other corporations, which suggests that regulations alone do not determine financial institutions' share ownership but that other factors such as economic rationality and historical background are also important. Such factors are certainly important in the case of Japan.

III. Share Ownership and Lending Activity

A. Data source

The *Kogin Zaimu Data File* gives the financial statements of nearly all financial firms in Japan. Despite the large number of items given in this data set, we have utilized only three: (1) financial institutions' names, (2) borrowers' names, and (3) the amount of lending, enabling us to rank the main lenders for each firm. In other words, it is possible to count the number of borrowers belonging to a particular order ranked by lending amount. Utilizing the number of borrowers for two different years, we can construct a transition matrix from one year to the other for each financial institution. However, since it is too cumbersome to evaluate all such matrices, aggregation is attempted. It should be noted that lending amounts are the sum of both short- and long-term lendings.

The second data source is the *Ookabunushi File* (principal shareholders' file), which gives the largest 20 (sometimes 30) shareholders and number of shares held respectively. Data is based on financial statements. Since financial institutions as well as corporated firms are principal shareholders in Japan as noted previously, it is possible to construct transition matrices for shareholdings which are similar to those for lendings. It is necessary, however, to eliminate non-financial corporate firms from the list because we are mainly interested in the relationship between financial institutions' lending activity and share ownership.

We used data for 1982 and 1986 to construct transition matrices for lending and shareholding. While it would be interesting to inquire into the situation during the period of rapid economic growth, crossholding data is not readily available and hence it is impossible to investigate rigorously. Nevertheless, some comments are included referring to casual observations and past studies.

The following categories of financial institutions were aggregated separately: (1) all financial institutions excluding governmental financial institutions and securities houses (since securities houses normally do not engage in lending, they are eliminated from the list); (2) private banks; (3) trust banks; and (4) insurance companies, in particular life insurance companies (casualty insurance companies were excluded because their lending is only very minor). Subsequent analyses are largely based on the above categories, drawing attention to the differences according to category.

B. Mobility tables for lending order and shareholding order

Table 2 comprises two transition tables for all financial institutions, one for lending (Table 2A), and the other for shareholding (Table 2B). The 21st rank represents all firms appearing below the 20th place either in 1982 or in 1986. We also prepared transition matrices which eliminated the 21st rank, but since there were no significant differences, we do not compare them here. Several useful findings can be derived from Table 2. Lending is discussed first. The top figure in each cell is the number of non-financial firms, and the lower one the percent share of the row total. The diagonal elements show no change in order of bank lending to non-financial firms. In particular, the (1×1) element signifies stability of the main bank system defined traditionally because it indicates the number of firms which received the largest loan amount in both years. Off-diagonal elements show some changes in lending order.

Table 2A provides us with the following observations. First, diagonal elements are normally much larger than off-diagonal ones. This is particularly true for the top left quadrant of the matrix. The ranking of lending by financial institutions is fairly constant and stable. This is especially true for financial institutions which maintain higher positions in the hierarchy of lending.

Second, values close to the diagonal elements are much smaller than actual diagonal values. However, values decline considerably as the order (i.e. distance from 1982 to 1986) widens. Let us take an example. We look at the second row, i.e. the second rank in 1982. The largest share is the diagonal element, namely 845 non-financial firms (57.72 percent) in 1986 out of 1464 non-financial firms in 1982. This signifies that 57.72 percent of firms retained second position in the borrowing hierarchy from particular financial institutions in both 1982 and 1986. In other words, 57.72 percent retained second position in financial institutions' lending hierarchy in 1986 among all financial institutions which ranked second in 1982. Adjacent elements to the diagonal one, namely 11.34 percent (2×1) and 12.98 percent (2×3) are much smaller than the diagonal element, namely 57.72 percent. Moving right, the share declines almost constantly. This implies that big changes in ranking rarely occur. It should be noted, however, that columns such as 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17 are not zero. Similar symmetry is observed at the extreme bottom left of the matrix. There are several cases in which the order changed dramatically.

Third, one of the most controversial subjects is discussed, namely, stability of the

Table 2A
Transition Matrix of Lending Order for All Financial Institutions from 1982 to 1986

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	99	TOTAL
1	1148 77.57	180 12.16	45 3.04	39 2.64	16 1.08	11 0.74	9 0.61	6 0.41	2 0.14	4 0.27	4 0.27	1 0.07	5 0.34	1 0.07	1 0.07	1 0.07	0 0.00	1 0.07	2 0.14	1 0.07	3 0.20	1480
2	166 11.34	845 57.72	190 12.98	82 5.60	54 3.69	39 2.66	31 2.12	15 1.02	7 0.48	9 0.61	8 0.55	6 0.41	3 0.20	1 0.07	0 0.00	1 0.07	2 0.14	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	5 0.34	1464
3	49 3.42	210 14.64	682 47.56	204 14.23	88 6.14	53 3.70	47 3.28	30 2.09	19 1.32	11 0.77	10 0.70	6 0.42	7 0.49	3 0.21	6 0.42	1 0.07	2 0.14	0 0.00	2 0.14	0 0.00	4 0.28	1434
4	48 3.40	78 5.52	218 15.44	534 37.82	177 12.54	103 7.29	79 5.59	42 2.97	44 3.12	20 1.42	15 1.06	13 0.92	13 0.92	8 0.57	3 0.21	2 0.14	2 0.14	4 0.28	1 0.07	1 0.07	7 0.50	1412
5	11 0.80	49 3.58	98 7.16	212 15.50	462 33.77	190 13.89	107 7.82	77 5.63	52 3.80	24 1.75	23 1.68	22 1.61	7 0.51	6 0.44	4 0.29	4 0.29	3 0.22	2 0.15	4 0.29	5 0.37	6 0.44	1368
6	13 0.98	35 2.65	60 4.54	108 8.18	195 14.76	383 29.75	170 12.87	92 6.96	73 5.53	50 3.79	29 2.20	19 1.44	18 1.36	15 1.14	8 0.61	8 0.61	9 0.68	6 0.45	6 0.45	0 0.00	14 1.06	1321
7	6 0.47	15 1.18	31 2.43	75 5.89	126 9.89	181 14.21	343 26.92	157 12.32	104 8.16	60 4.71	50 3.92	34 2.67	31 2.43	9 0.71	11 0.86	8 0.63	3 0.24	6 0.47	6 0.47	1 0.08	17 1.33	1274
8	11 0.92	13 1.09	31 2.60	36 3.02	86 7.21	133 11.16	137 11.49	294 24.66	144 12.08	82 6.88	44 3.69	43 3.61	33 2.77	24 2.01	17 1.43	11 0.92	7 0.59	11 0.92	5 0.42	6 0.50	24 2.01	1192
9	7 0.62	7 0.62	13 1.15	35 3.10	54 4.79	67 5.94	124 10.99	140 12.41	245 21.72	135 11.97	91 8.07	54 4.79	28 2.48	29 2.57	16 1.42	16 1.42	14 1.24	15 1.33	6 0.53	3 0.27	29 2.57	1128
10	4 0.39	8 0.77	14 1.35	23 2.22	30 2.89	42 4.05	68 6.56	107 10.32	125 12.05	224 21.60	118 11.38	69 6.65	49 4.73	32 3.09	31 2.99	21 2.03	12 1.16	16 1.54	11 1.06	4 0.39	29 2.80	1037
11	6 0.62	4 0.41	9 0.92	14 1.44	22 2.26	19 1.95	49 5.04	63 6.47	86 8.84	109 11.20	205 21.07	95 9.76	67 6.89	60 6.17	40 4.11	26 2.67	18 1.85	12 1.23	10 1.03	14 1.44	45 4.62	973
12	4 0.45	6 0.67	7 0.78	13 1.45	9 1.01	21 2.35	25 2.79	43 4.80	55 6.15	78 8.72	102 11.40	177 19.78	100 11.17	53 5.92	41 4.58	40 4.47	25 2.79	16 1.79	19 2.12	12 1.34	49 5.47	895
13	1 0.12	2 0.24	6 0.72	5 0.60	14 1.68	16 1.92	21 2.52	21 2.52	43 5.17	55 6.61	76 9.13	103 12.38	159 19.11	78 9.38	45 5.41	41 4.93	30 3.61	25 3.00	15 1.80	15 1.80	61 7.33	832
14	1 0.13	1 0.13	2 0.26	9 1.18	10 1.31	14 1.83	21 2.75	23 3.01	33 4.32	36 4.71	46 6.02	60 7.85	91 11.91	132 17.28	69 9.03	52 6.81	30 3.93	22 2.88	24 3.14	13 1.70	75 9.82	764
15	0 0.00	2 0.28	7 1.00	5 0.71	5 0.71	10 1.42	14 1.99	15 2.14	24 3.42	32 4.56	31 4.42	49 6.98	47 6.70	86 12.25	127 18.09	63 8.97	44 6.27	26 3.70	18 2.56	15 2.14	82 11.68	702
16	1 0.16	1 0.16	1 0.16	2 0.31	2 0.31	10 1.56	5 0.78	15 2.34	13 2.02	27 4.21	25 3.89	32 4.98	27 4.21	52 8.10	81 12.62	96 14.95	63 9.81	41 6.39	20 3.12	21 3.27	107 16.67	642
17	0 0.00	1 0.17	3 0.52	2 0.34	4 0.69	3 0.52	5 0.86	12 2.07	10 1.72	11 1.90	22 3.79	20 3.45	34 5.86	40 6.90	44 7.59	74 12.76	94 16.21	46 7.93	30 5.17	21 3.62	104 17.93	580
18	0 0.00	1 0.19	4 0.76	0 0.00	1 0.19	2 0.38	2 0.38	9 1.70	9 1.70	15 2.84	18 3.41	18 3.41	24 4.55	32 6.06	37 7.01	43 8.14	49 9.28	74 14.02	47 8.90	23 4.36	120 22.73	528
19	1 0.21	1 0.21	1 0.21	4 0.86	4 0.86	1 0.21	3 0.64	5 1.07	10 2.14	6 1.28	7 1.50	14 3.00	23 4.93	12 2.57	19 4.07	30 6.42	34 7.28	40 8.57	67 14.35	39 8.35	146 31.26	467
20	0 0.00	0 0.00	2 0.50	3 0.74	0 0.00	1 0.25	0 0.00	4 0.99	2 0.50	7 1.73	8 1.98	16 3.96	9 2.23	22 5.45	13 3.22	19 4.70	26 6.44	31 7.67	32 7.92	67 16.58	142 35.15	404
99	3 0.17	5 0.28	10 0.56	7 0.39	9 0.51	12 0.67	14 0.79	22 1.24	28 1.57	42 2.36	41 2.31	44 2.47	57 3.21	69 3.88	89 5.01	85 4.78	114 6.41	137 7.71	151 8.49	162 9.11	677 38.08	1778
TOTAL	1480	1464	1434	1412	1368	1321	1274	1192	1128	1037	973	895	832	764	702	642	581	531	476	423	1746	21675

Notes: First column and row show rankings. Upper figures indicate number of firms, and lower ones percentage share of row total.

Table 2B
Transition Matrix of Shareholding Order for All Financial Institutions from 1982 to 1986

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	99	TOTAL
1	1013 60.01	165 9.77	62 3.67	11 0.65	8 0.47	1 0.06	1 0.06	1 0.06	0 0.00	1 0.06	0 0.00	2 0.12	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	423 25.06	1688
2	121 7.29	823 49.58	183 11.02	62 3.73	20 1.20	7 0.42	6 0.36	4 0.24	3 0.18	2 0.12	2 0.12	0 0.00	1 0.06	0 0.00	1 0.06	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	425 25.60	1660
3	45 2.77	119 7.32	682 41.94	234 14.39	56 3.44	26 1.60	11 0.68	6 0.37	5 0.31	3 0.18	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 0.06	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	438 26.94	1626
4	14 0.89	51 3.25	123 7.85	557 35.55	222 14.17	83 5.30	46 2.94	23 1.47	9 0.57	4 0.26	4 0.26	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	431 27.50	1567
5	15 1.00	22 1.47	41 2.75	124 8.31	455 30.48	197 13.19	99 6.63	40 2.68	16 1.07	10 0.67	4 0.27	5 0.33	2 0.13	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	463 31.01	1493
6	9 0.65	8 0.58	27 1.95	43 3.11	121 8.75	392 28.34	187 13.52	69 4.99	32 2.31	22 1.59	6 0.43	2 0.14	4 0.29	1 0.07	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	460 33.26	1383
7	6 0.49	10 0.81	13 1.05	22 1.78	46 3.73	101 8.19	281 22.79	191 15.49	76 6.16	42 3.41	10 0.81	9 0.73	5 0.41	0 0.00	1 0.08	1 0.08	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	419 33.98	1233
8	2 0.19	4 0.37	9 0.84	17 1.59	29 2.72	34 3.19	90 8.43	228 21.37	130 12.18	68 6.37	36 3.37	15 1.41	4 0.37	2 0.19	2 0.19	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	397 37.21	1067
9	0 0.00	2 0.23	8 0.92	7 0.81	15 1.73	20 2.31	29 3.35	52 6.01	178 20.58	99 11.45	55 6.36	35 4.05	16 1.85	8 0.92	4 0.46	1 0.12	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	336 38.84	865
10	1 0.14	2 0.29	4 0.57	3 0.43	3 0.43	10 1.44	21 3.02	31 4.45	40 5.75	126 18.10	82 11.78	41 5.89	18 2.59	13 1.87	1 0.14	0 0.00	1 0.14	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	299 42.96	696
11	1 0.18	1 0.18	1 0.18	3 0.55	3 0.55	2 0.36	10 1.82	14 2.55	20 3.64	43 7.83	89 16.21	54 9.84	36 6.56	17 3.10	14 2.55	3 0.55	0 0.00	1 0.18	0 0.00	0 0.00	237 43.17	549
12	1 0.25	1 0.25	0 0.00	1 0.25	3 0.75	3 0.75	3 0.75	4 1.00	12 2.99	12 2.99	37 9.20	59 14.68	42 10.45	23 5.72	14 3.48	8 1.99	3 0.75	0 0.00	1 0.25	0 0.00	175 43.53	402
13	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 0.37	1 0.37	2 0.74	1 0.37	3 1.11	1 0.37	3 1.11	6 2.21	10 3.69	27 9.96	40 14.76	26 9.59	12 4.43	12 4.43	2 0.74	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	124 45.76	271
14	0 0.00	1 0.55	0 0.00	1 0.55	0 0.00	0 0.00	4 2.19	3 1.64	3 1.64	1 0.55	4 2.19	7 3.83	11 6.01	28 15.30	17 9.29	5 2.73	8 4.37	3 1.64	0 0.00	0 0.00	87 47.54	183
15	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 0.85	1 0.85	0 0.00	1 0.85	0 0.00	2 1.69	5 4.24	9 7.63	9 7.63	21 17.80	10 8.47	6 5.08	0 0.00	1 0.85	0 0.00	52 44.07	118
16	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 1.75	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	5 8.77	4 7.02	8 14.04	3 5.26	1 1.75	1 1.75	1 1.75	33 57.89	57
17	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	2 8.33	4 16.67	3 12.50	0 0.00	1 4.17	1 4.17	13 54.17	24
18	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 16.67	0 0.00	1 16.67	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	4 66.67	6
19	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 50.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 50.00	2
20	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 100.00	1
99	202 5.44	207 5.57	240 6.46	263 7.08	319 8.59	348 9.37	335 9.02	338 9.10	334 8.99	291 7.83	250 6.73	199 5.36	149 4.01	106 2.85	54 1.45	40 1.08	23 0.62	11 0.30	4 0.11	2 0.05	0 0.00	3715
TOTAL	1430	1416	1394	1349	1302	1226	1128	1005	862	731	591	461	337	239	147	92	49	17	8	4	4818	18606

Notes: First column and row show rankings. Upper figures indicate number of firms, and lower ones percentage share of row total.

main bank system defined traditionally. This is represented by the (1×1) element of the matrix. If we define a main bank as a bank which has the largest share of lending, 77.57 percent retained their position as main banks. In other words, 22.43 percent lost main bank status during the period. Compared with other studies, we obtained the highest stability. According to the present study, the main bank system defined traditionally is surprisingly stable.

It is necessary to explain in detail why this study obtained a very high degree of stability, or a very low rate of change in main banks defined traditionally, and some possible caveats. First, the present study relies only on lending amount, while some other studies consider not only lending amount but also other conditions. The effect of shareholding will be explained shortly. Second, Table 2 includes not only banks but also trust banks and insurance companies. Moreover, banks in this study include nearly all types of private banks, including regional banks and *sogo* banks. The majority of past studies only consider large banks, in particular city banks, and one or two long-term credit banks. The sample number of financial institutions in this study is over 200, while in other studies it is very limited, say 15 at most. The difference in the number of financial institutions is significant, although we admit that the role of city banks and long-term credit banks is far more important judging from the amount of lending. Nevertheless, it is also important to investigate the relationship between smaller banks and smaller firms because no attention has been paid to them so far. This leads us to the following point. Third, in the majority of past studies, borrowers from financial institutions were limited to listed corporations or large firms. This study, in principle, includes a large number of non-financial firms as borrowers. Thus, it is possible that the picture of banks' lending order is different from the usual understanding. In sum, the data used in this study is more extensive. Thus, readers should not be surprised that this study results in some different findings.

Table 2B is the transition matrix of shareholding from 1982 to 1986. Comparisons with lending order are emphasized during our interpretation. First, nearly all diagonal elements are somewhat smaller than those in the case of the lending table. However, diagonal elements are still much larger than off-diagonal elements. These two results suggest that most financial institutions retained the same share ownership position, although the degree is somewhat less than in the case of lending.

Second, the (1×1) element is examined. This represents the top shareholders and shows that all financial institutions retained 1,013 firms in 1986 of 1,688 firms in 1982 as top shareholders, a 60.01 percent rate. While this is fairly high, it is slightly lower than that with respect to retaining largest lender status. Whether changes in top shareholding are accompanied by changes in largest lender status will be examined later.

Third, while rates close to diagonal elements are fairly large, they are much lower than diagonal element ones, which is very similar to the lending matrix. There is, however, an important difference – rates in the bottom left and top right, i.e. extreme off-diagonal elements, are nearly all zero except for the last row and column. This implies

that few firms see dramatic changes in their order of intercorporate share ownership, i.e. the distance between the two rankings is not so wide when the order of financial institutions' share ownership is changed.

The above discussion suggests the necessity of inquiring into a comparison between the lending matrix and shareholding matrix with respect to overall mobility. Two measures are utilized to obtain such mobility based on the transition matrices. The first is the Bartholomew measure (Bartholomew, 1973), and the second the Shorrocks measure (Shorrocks, 1976, 1978). A measurement of mobility based on transition matrices is not easy because it involves several technical difficulties. For example, the assumptions of no new entries and/or no withdrawals, a common rank (or class) of transition matrices, etc. Since the number of observations in this study is large, such difficulties are not serious. Therefore, we do not adjust for new entries or withdrawals, nor pay attention to the number of classes in the matrices. As for the number of classes it is important to compare two matrices on the basis of a common class, say (5×5) , (10×10) , or others. We give two different results of mobility measures. The first is estimated for the entire transition matrices, although various ranks are selected. The second is estimated for (2×2) matrices, where the entire transition matrices are aggregated into (2×2) . Various forms of distinctions about the order of ranking (i.e. classes) are adopted to make the (2×2) matrices.

Table 2C-I shows results based on entire matrices. Several observations can be made. First, both Bartholomew and Shorrocks measures show that the degree of mobility for the lending matrix is higher than that for the shareholding matrix. Financial institutions' lending order is more mobile. This may sound contradictory to the previous result where shareholding mobility as judged by diagonal elements was higher than that of the lending order. As noted previously, probability at the diagonal element for the shareholding matrix was lower than that for the lending matrix. The reason for obtaining a higher degree of mobility for the overall lending matrix is due to the inclusion of extreme off-diagonal elements. The values at such elements for the lending matrix were not zero, while those for the shareholding matrix were almost zero. At the same time, the contribution of elements which are close to the diagonal elements is not negligible. By combining these effects, we see that the lending order is more mobile than the share ownership order. It also suggests that it is somewhat misleading to evaluate the degree of mobility based only on diagonal elements. A judgement on mobility must be made based on all elements of a matrix, although a message from the diagonal elements, especially the (1×1) element, has a particular value and is intuitively appealing.

Second, as the number of classes of the matrix increases, the degree of mobility increases. Also, the difference between lending and shareholding widens with respect to degree of mobility as the number of classes increases. This is true for both the Bartholomew and the Shorrocks measures. It is not surprising to have an increasing degree of mobility accompanying more classes, because it gives increased possibility for new firms

Table 2C-I
Mobility in Lending Order and Shareholding Order for Financial Institutions

Rank of Matrix	Bartholomew		Shorrocks ($\alpha = 0.1, T = 4$)	
	Lending	Shareholding	Lending	Shareholding
2 × 2	0.149	0.134	0.00887	0.00778
3 × 3	0.266	0.250	0.0236	0.0197
4 × 4	0.408	0.350	0.0458	0.0362
5 × 5	0.527	0.441	0.0709	0.0556
6 × 6	0.656	0.522	0.101	0.0776
7 × 7	0.796	0.620	0.134	0.104
8 × 8	0.920	0.708	0.168	0.135
9 × 9	1.042	0.779	0.206	0.160
10 × 10	1.144	0.856	0.241	0.187
11 × 11	1.244	0.916	0.275	0.220
12 × 12	1.340	0.976	0.308	0.254
13 × 13	1.435	1.028	0.344	0.291
14 × 14	1.517	1.082	0.378	0.319
15 × 15	1.594	1.119	0.410	0.345
16 × 16	1.667	1.140	0.444	0.366
17 × 17	1.734	1.151	0.478	0.395
18 × 18	1.810	1.177	0.507	0.455
19 × 19	1.884	1.206	0.534	0.459
20 × 20	1.942	xxxx	0.557	xxxx
21 × 21	2.242	7.422	0.600	0.652

Notes: Bartholomew measure is given by $B = \sum_i P_i^* \sum_j P_{ij} |i-j|$ where P_i^* is the number of class i at equilibrium, and P_{ij} is the transition matrix. The Shorrocks measure is given by $S = 1 - |\det P|^{\frac{\alpha}{T}}$, where $\alpha > 0$ and T is the time period. The 21st rank contains all firms which are below the 20th rank either in 1982 or in 1986. The sign (xxxx) signifies that it was not possible to calculate degree of mobility for the (20 × 20) matrix because nearly all observations at the 20th rank were zero.

to enter. This obviously raises the degree of mobility. Therefore, a common number of classes must be applied in order to assure comparability with respect to degree of mobility.

Table 2C-II gives another measure which is estimated for the aggregated (2×2) matrices. The (2×2) matrix is made on the basis of the first part (i.e. up to the n th rank) and the second part (i.e. the rest of the ranks). We considered various values of n . This table is quite different from Table 2C-I. For example, shareholding order is more mobile than lending order if $n=1$, where the distinction between only the first rank and the rest is the target. We have already proposed this by focusing on the (1×1) element of the entire transition matrices. A similar situation is observed for all values of n . In other words, all aggregated (2×2) transition matrices show the fact that shareholding order is more

Table 2C-II
Mobility in Lending Order and Shareholding Order for All Financial Institutions
when Transition Matrices were Aggregated into (2 × 2)

	Bartholomew		Shorrocks ($\alpha = 0.1, T = 4$)	
	Lending	Shareholding	Lending	Shareholding
(1 × 1) and rest	0.0306	0.0464	0.00686	0.0137
(2 × 2) and rest	0.0558	0.0840	0.00677	0.0133
(3 × 3) and rest	0.0796	0.124	0.00707	0.0139
(4 × 4) and rest	0.0989	0.167	0.00725	0.0152
(5 × 5) and rest	0.117	0.217	0.00769	0.0175
(6 × 6) and rest	0.129	0.266	0.00784	0.0205
(7 × 7) and rest	0.134	0.313	0.00783	0.0246
(8 × 8) and rest	0.137	0.354	0.00794	0.0304
(9 × 9) and rest	0.136	0.394	0.00801	0.0403
(10 × 10) and rest	0.135	0.425	0.00830	0.0586
(11 × 11) and rest	0.135	0.450	0.00876	0.0961
(12 × 12) and rest	0.134	0.468	0.00940	0.0527
(13 × 13) and rest	0.130	0.478	0.00990	0.0405
(14 × 14) and rest	0.127	0.485	0.0108	0.0340
(15 × 15) and rest	0.122	0.487	0.0118	0.0309
(16 × 16) and rest	0.118	0.489	0.0132	0.0290
(17 × 17) and rest	0.113	0.489	0.0149	0.0283
(18 × 18) and rest	0.107	0.489	0.0172	0.0280
(19 × 19) and rest	0.104	0.489	0.0213	0.0279
(20 × 20) and rest	0.0989	0.489	0.0276	0.0278

Note: Aggregation made on the basis of the first n ranks ($n = 1, \dots, 20$) and the rest of the ranks.

mobile than lending order regardless of the value of n .

We believe that the result of Table 2C-I (i.e. without aggregating entire matrices into (2×2) matrices) is better for evaluating mobility because aggregation eliminates a substantial portion of information. Simply, an aggregation bias is possible. Therefore, we do not provide estimated results which correspond to Table 2C-II for various categories of financial institutions. Only the case for all financial institutions is presented for the purpose of revealing the difference. It should be noted, however, that some of the results such as $n=1$ have a particular value even in Table 2C-I.

Tables 3A and 3B are transition matrices for all banks, excluding trust banks. In other words, the samples are city banks, long-term credit banks, and regional banks. Also, the degree of mobility is presented. It is natural that there are some differences in numbers and shares between Table 2 (all financial institutions) and Table 3 (banks, excluding trust banks). Since overall results, however, are not so different, detailed

Table 3A
Transition Matrix of Lending Order for All Banks Excluding Trust Banks from 1982 to 1986

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	99	TOTAL
1	1057 80.32	145 11.02	41 3.12	29 2.20	13 0.99	9 0.68	5 0.38	2 0.15	5 0.38	3 0.23	1 0.08	0 0.00	2 0.15	0 0.00	1 0.08	0 0.00	1 0.08	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	2 0.15	1316
2	150 12.72	697 59.12	154 13.06	57 4.83	39 3.31	27 2.29	23 1.95	10 0.85	3 0.25	5 0.42	4 0.34	4 0.34	1 0.08	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 0.08	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	4 0.34	1179
3	44 3.80	187 16.15	583 50.35	144 12.44	75 6.48	48 4.15	24 2.07	17 1.47	6 0.52	7 0.60	1 0.09	8 0.69	5 0.43	2 0.17	2 0.17	1 0.09	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 0.09	0 0.00	3 0.26	1158
4	42 3.78	71 6.40	192 17.30	455 40.99	128 11.53	78 7.03	58 5.23	35 3.15	15 1.35	7 0.63	6 0.54	3 0.27	7 0.63	4 0.36	0 0.00	2 0.18	0 0.00	1 0.09	0 0.00	0 0.00	6 0.54	1110
5	7 0.64	43 3.93	94 8.60	191 17.47	400 36.60	155 14.18	71 6.50	51 4.67	26 2.38	10 0.91	13 1.19	8 0.73	3 0.27	5 0.46	4 0.37	3 0.27	3 0.27	0 0.00	3 0.27	0 0.00	3 0.27	1093
6	12 1.15	28 2.69	65 6.25	99 9.52	164 15.77	336 32.31	128 12.31	68 6.54	48 4.62	28 2.69	18 1.73	12 1.15	12 1.15	5 0.48	4 0.38	2 0.19	2 0.19	1 0.10	2 0.19	0 0.00	6 0.58	1040
7	4 0.40	13 1.31	27 2.71	62 6.23	110 11.06	158 15.88	297 29.85	114 11.46	64 6.43	34 3.42	30 3.02	21 2.11	10 1.01	11 1.11	13 1.31	1 0.10	3 0.30	4 0.40	3 0.30	1 0.10	15 1.51	995
8	9 0.96	13 1.39	28 2.99	22 2.35	63 6.72	102 10.89	136 14.51	277 29.56	100 10.67	57 6.08	39 4.16	20 2.13	16 1.71	16 1.71	7 0.75	5 0.53	4 0.43	3 0.32	5 0.53	3 0.32	12 1.28	937
9	6 0.70	4 0.47	8 0.93	34 3.95	46 5.35	52 6.05	95 11.05	121 14.07	229 26.63	95 11.05	53 6.16	36 4.19	17 1.98	24 2.79	10 1.16	7 0.81	3 0.35	4 0.47	1 0.12	1 0.12	14 1.63	860
10	3 0.39	2 0.26	7 0.90	16 2.05	18 2.31	36 4.62	49 6.29	82 10.53	108 13.86	199 25.55	82 10.53	48 6.16	46 5.91	18 2.31	15 1.93	10 1.28	9 1.16	4 0.51	6 0.77	4 0.51	17 2.18	779
11	3 0.41	3 0.41	6 0.83	9 1.24	21 2.90	18 2.49	37 5.12	45 6.22	68 9.41	99 13.69	149 20.61	80 11.07	47 6.50	41 5.67	22 3.04	16 2.21	9 1.24	9 1.24	2 0.28	4 0.55	35 4.84	723
12	4 0.61	3 0.46	6 0.92	11 1.68	5 0.76	16 2.45	24 3.67	39 5.96	37 5.66	59 9.02	110 16.82	134 20.49	71 10.86	38 5.81	21 3.21	18 2.75	14 2.14	9 1.38	5 0.76	5 0.76	25 3.82	654
13	1 0.17	1 0.17	6 1.03	3 0.51	6 1.03	5 0.85	17 2.91	16 2.74	30 5.13	52 8.89	58 9.91	86 14.70	119 20.34	61 10.43	31 5.30	16 2.74	14 2.39	11 1.88	5 0.85	7 1.20	40 6.84	585
14	0 0.00	1 0.19	4 0.77	5 0.97	9 1.74	15 2.90	8 1.55	15 2.90	23 4.45	23 4.45	37 7.16	54 10.44	64 12.38	98 18.96	54 10.44	23 4.45	17 3.29	11 2.13	10 1.93	4 0.77	42 8.12	517
15	0 0.00	2 0.47	3 0.70	2 0.47	1 0.23	6 1.40	7 1.64	7 1.64	15 3.50	14 3.27	18 4.21	24 5.61	33 7.71	57 13.32	93 21.73	43 10.05	18 4.21	8 1.87	12 2.80	3 0.70	62 14.49	428
16	0 0.00	1 0.27	1 0.27	0 0.00	2 0.53	4 1.06	6 1.60	7 1.86	10 2.66	16 4.26	16 4.26	18 4.79	14 3.72	33 8.78	40 10.64	76 20.21	39 10.37	30 7.98	10 2.66	7 1.86	46 12.23	376
17	0 0.00	1 0.31	0 0.00	1 0.31	0 0.00	0 0.00	3 0.93	10 3.11	8 2.48	3 0.93	9 2.80	20 6.21	16 4.97	18 5.59	24 7.45	44 13.66	61 18.94	30 9.32	13 4.04	8 2.48	53 16.46	322
18	1 0.38	0 0.00	2 0.76	2 0.76	2 0.76	1 0.38	2 0.76	4 1.53	4 1.53	3 1.15	12 4.58	5 1.91	14 5.34	13 4.96	11 4.20	27 10.31	29 11.07	40 15.27	21 8.02	11 4.20	58 22.14	262
19	1 0.51	0 0.00	1 0.51	1 0.51	1 0.51	2 1.02	0 0.00	1 0.51	3 1.52	5 2.54	1 0.51	9 4.57	10 5.08	7 3.55	15 7.61	10 5.08	14 7.11	23 11.68	25 12.69	22 11.17	46 23.35	197
20	0 0.00	1 0.71	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 0.71	1 0.71	1 0.71	1 0.71	1 0.71	2 1.42	2 1.42	2 1.42	5 3.55	5 3.55	11 7.80	7 4.96	9 6.38	15 10.64	16 11.35	12 8.51	49 34.75	141
99	1 0.10	4 0.40	5 0.50	4 0.40	8 0.80	9 0.89	15 1.49	21 2.09	24 2.39	35 3.48	47 4.67	49 4.87	48 4.77	65 6.46	76 7.55	76 7.55	86 8.55	82 8.15	82 8.15	82 8.15	187 18.59	1006
TOTAL	1345	1220	1233	1147	1112	1078	1006	943	827	756	706	641	560	521	454	387	336	285	222	174	725	15678

Notes: First column and row show rankings. Upper figures indicate number of firms, and lower ones percentage share of row total.

Table 3B
Transition Matrix of Shareholding Order for All Banks Excluding Trust Banks from 1982 to 1986

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	99	TOTAL
1	946 62.65	156 10.33	22 1.46	9 0.60	1 0.07	2 0.13	1 0.07	1 0.07	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 0.07	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	371 24.57	1510
2	61 5.27	587 50.69	141 12.18	36 3.11	14 1.21	8 0.69	3 0.26	3 0.26	2 0.17	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	303 26.17	1158
3	9 0.82	63 5.77	470 43.08	154 14.12	53 4.86	16 1.47	12 1.10	3 0.27	1 0.09	1 0.09	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	309 28.32	1091
4	5 0.56	17 1.89	71 7.90	324 36.04	131 14.57	39 4.34	18 2.00	8 0.89	4 0.44	2 0.22	1 0.11	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	279 31.03	899
5	0 0.00	4 0.60	18 2.70	42 6.30	195 29.24	97 14.54	36 5.40	18 2.70	9 1.35	2 0.30	1 0.15	0 0.00	1 0.15	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	244 36.58	667
6	0 0.00	2 0.40	6 1.21	16 3.23	32 6.45	141 28.43	67 13.51	20 4.03	7 1.41	8 1.61	3 0.60	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	194 39.11	496
7	0 0.00	0 0.00	4 1.32	4 1.32	16 5.28	22 7.26	76 25.08	35 11.55	17 5.61	4 1.32	3 0.99	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	122 40.26	303
8	0 0.00	1 0.51	1 0.51	0 0.00	2 1.02	6 3.05	20 10.15	50 25.38	19 9.64	4 2.03	5 2.54	1 0.51	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	88 44.67	197
9	0 0.00	1 1.19	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 1.19	1 1.19	10 11.90	19 22.62	8 9.52	2 2.38	3 3.57	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	39 46.43	84
10	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 2.22	0 0.00	1 2.22	1 2.22	1 2.22	9 20.00	4 8.89	7 15.56	3 6.67	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	18 40.00	45
11	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	4 33.33	3 25.00	0 0.00	2 16.67	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	3 25.00	12
12	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 33.33	2 66.67	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	3
13	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 100.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1
99	144 10.05	167 11.65	175 12.21	203 14.17	202 14.10	178 12.42	124 8.65	101 7.05	59 4.12	49 3.42	16 1.12	8 0.56	2 0.14	3 0.21	1 0.07	1 0.07	0 0.00	1433
TOTAL	1165	998	908	789	646	511	359	250	146	87	44	16	5	3	1	1	1970	7899

Notes: First column and row show rankings. Upper figures indicate number of firms, and lower ones percentage share of row total.

Table 3C
Mobility in Lending Order and Shareholding Order for Banks
(City Banks, Long-term Credit Banks, and Regional Banks)

Rank of Matrix	Bartholomew		Shorrocks ($\alpha = 0.1, T = 4$)	
	Lending	Shareholding	Lending	Shareholding
2 × 2	0.144	0.113	0.00880	0.00670
3 × 3	0.260	0.190	0.0237	0.0164
4 × 4	0.383	0.300	0.0447	0.0317
5 × 5	0.496	0.389	0.0690	0.0494
6 × 6	0.622	0.478	0.0990	0.0698
7 × 7	0.734	0.591	0.130	0.0939
8 × 8	0.832	0.648	0.160	0.118
9 × 9	0.911	0.694	0.191	0.142
10 × 10	0.980	0.772	0.223	0.240
11 × 11	1.049	0.810	0.256	0.190
12 × 12	1.120	0.859	0.295	0.241
13 × 13	1.189	0.908	0.331	0.233
14 × 14	1.253	0.908	0.365	0.343
15 × 15	1.305	—	0.394	—
16 × 16	1.345	—	0.420	—
17 × 17	1.386	—	0.449	—
18 × 18	1.421	—	0.481	—
19 × 19	1.461	—	0.518	—
20 × 20	1.486	—	0.565	—
21 × 21	1.770	—	0.616	—

explanation is not given for Table 3. More interesting results are obtained for trust banks and life insurance companies if they are estimated separately.

Tables 4A and 4B are mobility tables of lending and shareholding for trust banks. The most important observation is the very high rates for keeping the same position with respect to the hierarchy of trust banks' lending, because all diagonal elements are larger than 55 percent. In particular, the (1×1) element is over 90 percent. Trust banks occupying first position in lending order are very likely to keep that position. It does not necessarily imply, however, that all these trust banks are the largest lenders because this table is only for trust banks. Nevertheless, it is important to recognize that the mobility of trust banks' lending order is very low, which is consistent with a general observation such that *yokonarabi* (a horizontal line) is strong at trust banks.

The picture of trust banks' shareholding is considerably different. The highest rate is only 59.02 percent for diagonal elements, and the great majority of even diagonal elements are about 30 percent. This high degree of mobility for trust banks reflects the fact

Table 4A
Transition Matrix of Lending Order for Trust Banks from 1982 to 1986

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	99	TOTAL
1	1134 90.21	100 7.96	12 0.95	4 0.32	1 0.08	1 0.08	1 0.08	4 0.32	1257
2	87 10.01	664 76.41	83 9.55	19 2.19	4 0.46	0 0.00	0 0.00	12 1.38	869
3	24 4.49	73 13.67	370 69.29	38 7.12	9 1.69	2 0.37	0 0.00	18 3.37	534
4	3 1.00	18 6.02	41 13.71	183 61.20	16 5.35	6 2.01	1 0.33	31 10.37	299
5	1 0.66	5 3.31	5 3.31	16 10.60	92 60.93	6 3.97	0 0.00	26 17.22	151
6	0 0.00	2 3.08	3 4.62	6 9.23	7 10.77	37 56.92	1 1.54	9 13.85	65
7	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 14.29	6 85.71	0 0.00	7
99	10 11.76	13 15.29	20 23.53	19 22.35	11 12.94	11 12.94	1 1.18	0 0.00	85
TOTAL	1259	875	534	285	140	64	10	100	3267

Table 4B
Transition Matrix of Shareholding Order for Trust Banks from 1982 to 1986

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	99	TOTAL
1	700 59.02	92 7.76	23 1.94	8 0.67	4 0.34	1 0.08	0 0.00	358 30.19	1186
2	58 12.26	160 33.83	34 7.19	18 3.81	5 1.06	1 0.21	1 0.21	196 41.44	473
3	8 4.85	30 18.18	37 22.42	12 7.27	6 3.64	0 0.00	0 0.00	72 43.64	165
4	3 7.69	0 0.00	3 7.69	11 28.21	2 5.13	0 0.00	0 0.00	20 51.28	39
5	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 16.67	0 0.00	1 16.67	0 0.00	0 0.00	4 66.67	6
99	381 28.95	375 28.50	272 20.67	165 12.54	91 6.91	31 2.36	1 0.08	0 0.00	1316
TOTAL	1150	657	370	214	109	33	2	650	3185

Notes: First column and row show rankings. Upper figures indicate number of firms, and lower ones percentage share of row total.

Table 5A
Transition Matrix of Lending Order for Life Insurance Companies from 1982 to 1986

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	99	TOTAL
1	755 81.45	105 11.33	25 2.70	4 0.43	2 0.22	0 0.00	1 0.11	0 0.00	0 0.00	35 3.78	927
2	107 17.63	375 61.78	48 8.07	21 3.46	3 0.49	1 0.16	1 0.16	0 0.00	0 0.00	50 8.24	607
3	24 6.59	51 14.01	203 55.77	22 6.04	10 2.75	2 0.55	1 0.27	1 0.27	0 0.00	50 13.74	364
4	7 3.18	14 6.36	26 11.82	98 44.55	20 8.08	4 1.82	1 0.45	1 0.45	0 0.00	49 22.27	220
5	0 0.00	4 2.88	8 5.76	21 15.11	62 44.60	5 3.60	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 0.72	38 27.34	139
6	0 0.00	5 6.58	3 3.85	2 2.63	8 10.53	32 42.11	1 1.32	1 1.32	0 0.00	24 31.58	76
7	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 2.78	2 5.56	0 0.00	3 8.33	17 47.22	0 0.00	1 2.78	12 33.33	36
8	0 0.00	1 5.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 5.00	1 5.00	0 0.00	6 30.00	1 5.00	10 50.00	20
9	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 16.67	0 0.00	2 33.33	1 16.67	2 33.33	6
10	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 100.00	1
99	17 19.32	20 22.73	13 14.77	14 15.91	8 9.09	8 9.09	6 6.82	2 2.27	0 0.00	0 0.00	88
TOTAL	910	575	328	184	114	57	28	13	4	271	2484

Notes: First column and row show rankings. Upper figures indicate number of firms, and lower ones percentage share of row total.

Table 5B
Transition Matrix of Shareholding Order for Life Insurance Companies from 1982 to 1986

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	99	TOTAL
1	981 67.15	73 5.00	7 0.48	1 0.07	1 0.07	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	388 27.24	1461
2	55 5.41	585 57.52	70 6.88	4 0.38	1 0.10	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	302 28.70	1017
3	6 0.93	57 8.88	324 50.47	49 7.63	8 1.25	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	198 30.84	642
4	0 0.00	5 1.44	35 10.09	149 42.94	31 8.93	4 1.15	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	123 35.45	347
5	1 0.53	2 1.06	5 2.65	21 11.11	70 37.04	18 9.52	3 1.59	0 0.00	0 0.00	69 36.51	189
6	1 0.98	0 0.00	0 0.00	6 5.88	20 18.61	40 39.22	6 5.88	1 0.98	0 0.00	28 27.45	102
7	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	3 4.84	6 8.68	21 33.87	6 9.68	0 0.00	26 41.94	62
8	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 3.57	1 3.57	7 25.00	8 28.57	3 10.71	8 28.57	28
9	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 10.00	2 20.00	1 20.00	1 10.00	4 40.00	10
10	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	3 100.00	3
11	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 100.00	1
99	190 29.41	161 24.92	126 19.50	90 13.93	46 7.12	25 3.87	7 1.08	1 0.15	0 0.00	0 0.00	646
TOTAL	1234	883	567	320	181	95	46	18	4	1160	4508

Notes: First column and row show rankings. Upper figures indicate number of firms, and lower ones percentage share of row total.

that they are likely to buy and sell stocks much more frequently than banks. They are committed to voluminous transactions in stocks. One example are *tokkin* funds.

Next, Tables 5A and 5B for life insurance companies are examined. Their lending order is fairly similar to that of banks if we compare diagonal elements. In other words, the likelihood of retaining the same position during the period for life insurance companies is almost the same as for banks. It is, however, lower than for trust banks. As for shareholding order, diagonal elements are smaller than those for lending. This is similar to the case of trust banks. However, overall mobility is lower in the case of shareholding order than that in the case of lending order, as confirmed by Table 5.

The difference in the degree of mobility in shareholding order can be examined by the composition of transactions of stocks by various investors. Insurance companies accounted for only 1.2 percent in 1982 and 0.6 percent in 1986 of total stock transactions as buyers and sellers. The figures for banks are 2.8 percent and 11.8 percent, and for individual investors 31.7 percent and 26.5 percent, respectively. It is impressive that insurance companies effect so few stock transactions, which indirectly supports that shareholding mobility for these companies is very low. There are several reasons. First, their motives for holding shares are different from those of other financial institutions.

Tables 4C and 5C
Mobility in Lending Order and Shareholding Order for
Trust Banks and Life Insurance Companies

Rank of Matrix	Bartholomew		Shorrocks ($\alpha = 0.1, T = 4$)	
	Lending	Shareholding	Lending	Shareholding
4C (Trust Banks)				
2 × 2	0.0954	0.162	0.00547	0.0120
3 × 3	0.163	0.279	0.0147	0.0380
4 × 4	0.207	0.370	0.0250	0.0557
5 × 5	0.229	0.445	0.0337	0.0796
6 × 6	0.244	—	0.0454	—
7 × 7	0.248	—	0.0497	—
8 × 8	0.466	—	0.116	—
5C (Life Insurance Companies)				
2 × 2	0.158	0.0767	0.0105	0.00421
3 × 3	0.242	0.138	0.0221	0.0119
4 × 4	0.297	0.175	0.0353	0.0217
5 × 5	0.332	0.213	0.0513	0.0359
6 × 6	0.348	0.235	0.0643	0.0559
7 × 7	0.361	0.244	0.0722	0.0679
8 × 8	0.369	0.250	0.0823	0.0963
9 × 9	0.374	0.251	0.126	0.166

For example, strategy for enterprise pensions or collective life insurance, and *antei kabunushi* (silent shareholders), etc. Second, by law, capital gains from holding shares cannot be included in life insurers' funds for dividends.

C. Correlation between lending and shareholding

This part investigates the relationship between the lending activity of financial institutions and their shareholdings in client firms. We took a naive hypothesis such that when a bank (or a life insurance company) lends a large amount to a non-financial firm, it holds a large amount of stock in that non-financial firm for various reasons. This hypothesis is tested by data. Table 6 is presented to grasp easily the relationship between the lending and shareholding of financial institutions and shows estimated rank correlation coefficients (both Pearson and Spearman) between lending order indicated by "L" and shareholding order indicated by "S" for six combinations classified by (1) lending order and shareholding order, and (2) years, namely 1982 and 1986.

The two most interesting combinations in this table are L82 and S82, and L86 and S86, because they represent the relationship between lending order and shareholding order for the common years. Pearson coefficients for all financial institutions are considerably lower, namely 0.387 in 1982 and 0.357 in 1986, than those for L82 and L86, and

Table 6
Rank Correlation Coefficients between Lending Order and
Shareholding Order for All Industries

	L86	L82	S86		L86	S82	S86
	All Financial Institutions				Trust Banks		
L82	0.822 (0.844)	0.387 (0.479)	0.394 (0.476)	L82	0.881 (0.880)	0.635 (0.668)	0.627 (0.689)
L86		0.341 (0.448)	0.357 (0.454)	L86		0.594 (0.627)	0.601 (0.643)
S82			0.895 (0.902)	S82			0.608 (0.660)
	Banks				Life Insurance Companies		
L82	0.835 (0.856)	0.595 (0.686)	0.563 (0.661)	L32	0.847 (0.820)	0.723 (0.732)	0.722 (0.729)
L86		0.569 (0.673)	0.540 (0.652)	L86		0.706 (0.677)	0.723 (0.680)
S82			0.852 (0.870)	S82			0.937 (0.929)

Notes: L and S mean lending order and shareholding order, respectively. 82 and 86 signify years. Figures in tables are Pearson rank correlation coefficients, and those in parentheses Spearman rank correlation coefficients.

S86 and S86. Since there is no significant difference between the Pearson and Spearman coefficient with respect to relative magnitude, only the Pearson coefficient is used to discuss this table. Implications of the coefficients, such as for L82 and L86, and S82 and S86 have already been extensively discussed in utilizing the transition matrices and degrees of mobility. The considerably lower correlation coefficients between lending order and shareholding order in both 1982 and 1986 for all financial institutions do not support the naive hypothesis previously proposed, namely that a financial institution holds a large amount of stock in a non-financial firm when it lends a large amount to the same firm. Financial institutions' motive for holding shares is fairly independent of the amount of lending to them. It is, however, impossible to deny that there is no connection, because estimated coefficients for all financial institutions are not negligible, namely the Pearson coefficients of 0.387 in 1982 and 0.357 in 1986. It is perhaps preferable to conceive of only a modest connection between the determination of shareholding and that of lending.

This modest connection is stronger for banks, trust banks, and life insurance companies than for all financial institutions, if evaluated separately. Estimated rank correlation coefficients are 0.595 and 0.540 for banks, 0.635 and 0.601 for trust banks, and 0.723 and 0.723 for life insurance companies. This may imply that financial institutions which belong to the same category such as banks, trust banks, or life insurance companies, may watch others in the same category carefully when deciding lending amount and shareholding. This is frequently termed *yokonarabi* (a horizontal line) for financial institutions in Japan. The result suggests that *yokonarabi* is strongest at life insurance companies, followed by trust banks, and lowest at banks, judging from the coefficients. Finally, it should be noted that the correlation coefficients declined in most cases from 1982 to 1986, which may signify that the degree of connection between lending and shareholding has been on a declining trend. It is possible to surmise that the degree of connection was much stronger during the period of rapid economic growth because the role of financial institutions was more significant than now in terms of industrial development and capital formation.

A reservation needs to be made with respect to the higher correlation coefficients for banks, trust banks, and life insurance companies than for all financial institutions, namely that a much larger number of sample financial institutions and non-financial firms was used for all financial institutions than banks, trust banks, and life insurance companies in Table 6. It is possible that smaller sample observations result in a lower rank correlation coefficient. In other words, it would be preferable to make an identical number of sample observations in order to ensure a rigorous comparison, if rank correlation coefficients were used. To maintain an identical number is not an easy task because of the large data sets adopted for the present study. Moreover, even if an identical number of observations were made, a significantly different result would be unlikely. Therefore, we have to keep in mind that Table 6 may include minor adjustments (or errors). It should be emphasized, however, that the interpretations based on Table 6 are not affected by any adjustments.

D. Changes in lending order and shareholding order

Rank correlation coefficients between L82 and S82, and L86 and S86 given in Table 6 indicate changes in lending order and shareholding order to a limited extent. Table 7 presents the pattern of change, in particular direction in lending order and shareholding order from 1982 to 1986 more systematically. Concretely, changes both in lending order and in shareholding from 1982 to 1986 can be decomposed into three, namely (1) the rank

Table 7
Changes in Lending Order and Shareholding Order from 1982 to 1986

Lending/Shareholding	Down	Equal	Up	Total
All Financial Institutions				
Down	1,010 (3.2)	5,738 (18.4)	850 (2.8)	7,607 (24.4)
Equal	4,502 (14.5)	6,228 (20.1)	5,184 (16.7)	15,914 (51.1)
Up	1,131 (3.6)	5,541 (17.8)	937 (3.0)	7,607 (24.4)
Total	6,643 (21.3)	17,507 (56.2)	6,980 (22.4)	31,130 (100.0)
Banks				
Down	791 (3.5)	5,280 (23.2)	720 (3.2)	6,791 (29.8)
Equal	2,219 (9.7)	4,483 (19.7)	3,060 (13.4)	9,762 (42.9)
Up	779 (3.4)	4,755 (20.9)	676 (3.0)	6,210 (27.3)
Total	3,789 (16.6)	14,518 (63.8)	4,456 (19.6)	22,763 (100.0)
Life Insurance Companies				
Down	193 (3.6)	415 (7.8)	127 (2.4)	735 (13.9)
Equal	1,123 (21.2)	1,002 (18.9)	1,157 (21.9)	3,282 (62.0)
Up	314 (5.9)	726 (13.7)	237 (4.5)	1,277 (24.1)
Total	1,630 (30.8)	2,143 (40.5)	1,521 (28.7)	5,294 (100.0)

Notes: Down, Equal, and Up mean direction of change in order from 1982 to 1986. Figures in parentheses = share of total.

went down (called "Down"), (2) the rank was the same ("Equal"), or (3) the rank went up ("Up"). Since two dimensions, namely lending and shareholding are being considered, nine cells are prepared in Table 7.

All financial institutions are examined first. The largest share is given by the center cell, i.e. "Equal" for both lending order and shareholding order, 20.1 percent which is not impressively high but rather surprisingly low. There are not many cases which maintain the same rank in both lending order and shareholding order. This is in contrast to the previous result where diagonal elements in either the transition matrix of lending or the transition matrix of shareholding were considerably higher. In other words, the same ranks are retained to a large extent when we pay attention to either lending order or shareholding order.

The second highest shares, somewhat smaller than center cell shares, are located either in the "Equal" column/row, and are roughly equal, namely 14.5 percent, 18.4 percent, 17.8 percent, and 16.7 percent. This implies that the highest probability is associated with no change in either lending order or shareholding order, and that nearly the same probability of "Down," "Equal," and "Up" is observed on the shareholding side when no changes in order on the lending side are seen. The same story is true on the lending side when no changes in order on the shareholding side are observed.

Third, corner cell shares are very small and equally distributed, roughly speaking. It was anticipated that combinations of "Down" and "Down," and "Up" and "Up" would be higher than that of "Down" and "Up." The reason for this was that it was thought that ranks in both lending order and shareholding order would likely move in the same direction, but this turned out to be erroneous. It is false to assume that the rank of shareholding order will always be promoted (or demoted) when the rank in lending order is promoted (or demoted), or that shareholding will always increase (or decrease) when the amount of lending increases (or decreases). A similar assumption will work when the rank in shareholding is changed.

We have not paid any attention to the difference due to the category of financial institution with respect to changes in lending order and shareholding order. Similar tables as those for all financial institutions are presented for banks and life insurance companies separately. Some minor differences appear when considered separately. First, the largest rate is not given by the center cell (i.e. "Equal" and "Equal"), unlike the aggregated case. Second, "Equal" is largest on the shareholding side for banks, while it is largest on the lending side for life insurance companies, as figures in the total of each table suggest. Third, corner cells give the lowest rates in both cases, although the rates are very marginally different. An "Up" figure of 5.9 percent on the lending side and "Down" on the shareholding side is fairly high for life insurance companies in comparison with others, and indicates a modest inverse movement between lending order and shareholding order.

IV. Largest Lenders and Top Shareholders

This section is concerned with financial institutions which remain both largest lenders and top shareholders: these are our “main banks” in the strict sense. As described previously, the present study emphasizes two dimensions, namely lending and shareholding of financial institutions, to investigate the role of financial institutions in corporate finance in Japan. Therefore, we identify the biggest borrowers of banks whose largest shareholders are the same banks. It should be emphasized again that shareholding is ranked only among financial institutions.

Table 8 presents figures for “main banks.” Since their mobility is a subject of controversy in various studies, column (A) is presented to give those maintaining main bank status in both 1982 and 1986, column (B) those maintaining main bank status in the same years but only from the popular and traditional viewpoint of being the largest lenders, and column (C) those continuing to be the top shareholders but with no consideration given to lending. Column (D) is presented as a reference to show the number of firms for which each bank was the main bank defined traditionally. The data source for column (D), *Tokyo Shōkō Research*, covers a much larger number of borrowers because it includes firms with equity capital of 50 million yen and over. The number of firms is 36,737. The great majority are non-listed, and they are unlikely to issue shares. This source provides data only for city banks. The difference between column (D) and columns (A), (B), and (C) must be remembered in interpreting Table 8 because the former includes a great number of non-listed firms while the latter three include only large listed firms.

We interpret column (A) first. Banks continue to be the largest lenders to a significant number of firms for which they are the largest shareholders. The largest number, 40, is posted by Fuji Bank, and followed by Daiichi-Kangyo, 35. Figures in parentheses are the percentage shares of all firms (290) that maintain the same status. The Industrial Bank of Japan and Tokai Bank have considerably high shares, 10.69 and 9.31 percent, respectively. It is interesting to note that *ex-zaibatsu* banks, or those in the big three *keiretsu* groups of Mitsui, Mitsubishi, and Sumitomo, do not have such high shares. Banks lacking large assets naturally have smaller numbers in column (A). This is supported also by column (D). Very few trust banks maintain main bank status in terms of both lending and shareholding, and only one among life insurance companies.

What kind of firms belong to column (A)? The firms and their capital values for representative banks are listed in the Appendix. It is obvious that most are not gigantic nor those belonging to the “Presidents’ Club” (*Shacho-kai*) within the *keiretsu* group. Also, their capital value is generally not large on average. It was anticipated that firms which were likely to appear in column (A) would necessarily be extremely big ones and core members of the President’s Club. It is possible to surmise that all financial institutions which belong to a *keiretsu* may act as a “main bank” together. For example,

Table 8
Number of Firms for which the Financial Institution is
the Largest Lender and/or Top Shareholder

	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)		(A)	(B)	(C)
<u>Banks</u>					<u>Trust Banks</u>			
IBJ ^a	31 (10.69)	98	49		Mitsui	4	21	9
LTCB ^b	5 (1.72)	26	11		Mitsubishi	4	20	10
Daiichi-Kangyo	35 (12.07)	103	72	3,236	Yasuda	0	14	2
Mitsui	15 (5.17)	51	35	1,760	Sumitomo	8	21	12
Fuji	40 (13.79)	95	70	2,197	<u>Life Insurance</u>			
Mitsubishi	22 (7.59)	79	49	2,543	Nihon	0	0	95
Kyowa	10 (3.45)	26	15	848	Chiyoda	0	0	14
Sanwa	21 (7.26)	66	60	2,073	Daiichi	0	0	41
Sumitomo	18 (6.21)	80	42	2,155	Yasuda	0	0	20
Daiwa	0 (0.0)	19	0	894	Asahi	1	1	24
Tokai	27 (9.31)	55	51	1,640	Meiji	0	0	31
Hokkaido-Taku.	3 (1.03)	7	7	787	Mitsui	0	0	20
Taiyokobe	7 (2.41)	26	25	1,258	Sumitomo	0	0	35
Tokyo	1 (0.34)	7	2	126				
Saitama	8 (2.76)	17	15	529				

^a IBJ: Industrial Bank of Japan.

^b LTCB: Long-Term Credit Bank of Japan.

Notes: (A): The number of firms for which the financial institution was the main bank in terms of both lending and shareholding in both 1982 and 1986. Figures in parentheses are percentage shares of all firms (290) maintaining the same status.

(B): The number of firms for which the financial institution was the largest lender in both 1982 and 1986, but not the top shareholder.

(C): The number of firms for which the financial institution was the top shareholder in both 1982 and 1986, but not the largest lender.

(D): The number of firms for which the bank was the largest lender in 1990. Borrowers are firms with equity capital of 50 million yen or over. Data source: Tokyo Shoko Research.

Mitsubishi Bank, Mitsubishi Trust Bank, Meiji Life Insurance, and Tokyo Marine may form a "main bank" for non-financial firms in the Mitsubishi group. Since the purpose of this work is not to discuss *keiretsu* group, further comments are not given. Nevertheless, it is important to recognize that somewhat smaller firms than the extremely big ones are those having the greatest association with "main banks," when they are defined by both lending and shareholding. Also, the percentage of firms coming under the "main bank" category to total firms with which the bank has some business association either in terms of lending or shareholding, is very low. For example, they are 2.67 percent for the Industrial Bank of Japan, 2.75 percent for Daiichi-Kangyo, and 2.69 percent for Mitsubishi Bank. Therefore, it may be concluded that "main banks," according to our definition, play a relatively minor role in corporate finance in Japan. Some may say that a sound corporate financial system is possible in Japan because fewer firms are monitored or controlled by the "main banks." If a bank were both the largest lender and top shareholder for a particular firm for a long time, the management of that firm would find difficulty avoiding the influence of the bank. On the other hand, some economists who applaud the advice and monitoring provided by financial institutions may advocate that banks should be the largest lenders and top shareholders for more firms.

It is interesting to note that several firms in column (A) are firms which have experienced business difficulties or near bankruptcy. Banks were obliged to help them and thus they are the largest lenders and top shareholders. In such cases, the firm requested meaningful assistance from its main bank, and in return accepted significant monitoring and control. See Sheard (1989) who made relevant case studies.

It may be concluded on the basis of the current study that firms which are the target of the "main banks" in the strict sense are either medium-sized firms (*chukun kigyō*) in terms of size and equity capital (certainly not gigantic firms), or those which have had serious difficulties. These firms can enjoy the advantages of the "main bank" system epitomized as helpful monitoring and control, which is the whole story of the "main bank system." Other firms do not have continuous strong ties with financial institutions in terms of both lending and shareholding because they dislike monitoring and control, and wish to maintain their independence. Such firms are either certainly very big or post good business results.

If we ignore the dimension of shareholding, the number of firms for which a bank is the continuous largest lender increases. Figures in column (B) are double, triple, or even quadruple those in column (A). The Industrial Bank of Japan is the traditional main bank for 10.46 percent of firms it lends to; 10.68 percent is the figure for Daiichi-Kangyo, 8.37 percent for Mitsubishi Bank, and 9.69 for Sumitomo Bank. These rates are fairly high, and suggest that banks are the main banks of many firms if the amount of lending is the only criterion. It should be pointed out that several gigantic corporations, or firms which belong to one of the *keiretsu* groups, appear as traditional main banks which are defined only by the amount of lending unlike previous "main banks." It may not be easy for

financial firms to be “main banks” in the strict sense for gigantic corporations or *keiretsu* firms. Moreover, it may be neither necessary nor profitable to be “main banks” of such firms for various reasons. Finally, it is noted that trust banks are the largest lenders for a considerable number of firms, but not life insurance companies.

Column (C) gives us interesting figures. These are the numbers of firms for which financial institutions are continuous top shareholders. Although the figures are lower than those in column (B), they are considerably higher than those in column (A). City banks and long-term credit banks maintain the status of being top shareholders in many firms. It should be emphasized that shareholding order is only by financial institution in this table. Therefore, the number of top shareholders is much bigger than figures given in other studies which do not make any adjustment. There are many non-financial firms which rank high in shareholding, including being top shareholders. In other words, non-financial firms are also large shareholders in other non-financial firms. Therefore, whether non-financial firms are included or excluded changes the hierarchy of shareholding substantially. The present paper is concerned with the role of Japanese financial institutions in the relationship between lending and shareholding. Thus, it is natural to exclude the contribution of non-financial firms' shareholdings. The figures in column (C) are the outcome of this exercise, and suggest that many city banks and long-term credit banks maintain their position as top shareholders for a long time.

The role of life insurance companies is particularly impressive with respect to this point. There are many companies whose top shareholders are life insurance companies both in 1982 and 1986. The position of Nihon Life Insurance Company is extraordinary. Life insurance companies are also top shareholders for banks. For example, they are top shareholders in 11 of 13 city banks, 12 of 58 regional banks, and five of six trust banks. Moreover, they have maintained top status in the chemical, transportation, and electric power and gas industries. It would be an interesting subject to inquire into why life insurance companies are so important as shareholders not only for non-financial firms but also for financial firms, and how they are different from city banks and trust banks in evaluating the organization and working of Japan's financial market. Since such a work needs a separate study, no further comments are made here.

V. Concluding Remarks

This paper has investigated the share ownership and lending activity of financial institutions with emphasis on the relationship between the two. By using two large data sets, namely (i) the *Kogin Zaimu Data File*, and (ii) the *Toyokeizai Ookabunushi File*, various aspects with respect to lending order and shareholding order were examined statistically. We estimated, first, transition matrices for lending order and shareholding order, and calculated the degree of mobility. Several statistical methods were applied to analyze various aspects such as changes in lending order and shareholding order, the

correlations between the two, and the directions of the change. Attention was paid to the status of the largest lenders and top shareholders in view of the fact that main banks receive the highest attention in Japan. The paper examined not only city banks, long-term credit banks, and regional banks, but also trust banks and life insurance companies.

The paper obtained the following observations. First, the mobility of lending order was somewhat higher than that of shareholding order. Second, the stability of main banks, which are defined traditionally as only the largest lenders, was considerably higher in this study compared with other studies. Third, the correlation between lending order and shareholding order was not so high, contrary to expectations. This was also supported by examination of the direction of change in lending order and shareholding order. Fourth, there were not so many instances of "main banks" defined as being both largest lenders and top shareholders. Also, there were very few cases of such main bank status continuing over several years. This does not necessarily deny, however, that there are a considerable number of cases in which financial institutions are either the largest lenders or top shareholders continuously. Several economic interpretations of the above four observations were offered and discussed. Fifth, it should be pointed out that the above four conclusions would be greatly modified if we analyzed banks, trust banks, and life insurance companies separately. Each category of financial institution has its own specificity with respect to motives for shareholding in other corporations and also lending activity; such specificity was confirmed by this study and discussed.

Toshiaki Tachibanaki: Professor, Institute for Economics Research, Kyoto University

Atsuhiko Taki: Research Associate, Faculty of Economics, Nagoya University

Appendix

Firms for which the Financial Institutions are
the Largest Lender and/or Top Shareholder
(Nikkei code; capital in billion yen)

Code	Capital Value	Firm	Code	Capital Value	Firm
Industrial Bank of Japan (A)			1975	1640	Asahi Kogyosha
1515	3465	Nittetsu Mining	2202	28113	Meiji Seika
1832	3740	Okazaki Kogyo	2217	2081	Morozoff
2112	1750	Ensuiiko Sugar Refining	2264	13285	Morinaga Milk Industry
2218	911	Nichiryo Baking	2281	5323	Prima Meat Packers
3702	19145	Sanyo-Kokusaku Pulp	3512	1037	Nippon Felt
3867	5880	Kanzaki Paper Mfg.	3583	1220	Aubex
3945	733	Superbag	4002	3115	Nitto Chemical Industry
3946	2663	Tomoku	4065	1800	Kibun Food Chemifa
4041	4200	Nippon Soda	5458	1504	Takasago Tekko
4044	8772	Central Glass	5701	25363	Nippon Light Metal
4112	4132	Hodogaya Chemical	6013	3223	Takuma
4185	10696	Japan Synthetic Rubber	6213	1660	O-M
4219	600	Plas-Tech	6216	500	Kotobuki Industry
5007	27206	Cosmo Oil	6354	550	Hitachi Kiden Kogyo
5011	1320	Nichireki Chemical Industry	6376	2879	Nikkiso
5410	3408	Godo Steel	6453	3151	Silver Seiko
5454	2250	Daido Steel Sheet	6507	7134	Shinko Electric
5480	11583	Nippon Yakin Kogyo	6517	1421	Denyo
5657	1200	Suzuki Metal Industry	6751	5500	Japan Radio
5714	14094	Dowa Mining	6851	2327	Ohkura Electric
6102	2975	Ikegai	6857	14001	Advantest
6203	5799	Howa Machinery	6970	5382	Nipponcoinco
6462	4230	Riken	7142	4126	Nippon Air Brake
6711	2408	Takamisawa Electric	7407	3025	Japan Aircraft Mfg.
7021	1100	Nitchitsu Industries	8059	2093	Daiichi Jitsugyo
7263	3734	Aichi Machine Industry	8262	6805	Nagasakiya
7270	27254	Fuji Heavy Industries	8267	14391	Jusco
7756	3165	Copal	8269	11178	Nichii
9017	1400	Niigata Kotsu	Mitsui (A)		
9065	10120	Sankyu	1809	2105	Fujiko
9355	1200	Niigata Rinko Kairiku Unso	1891	2000	Daito Kogyo
Long-Term Credit Bank of Japan (A)			1971	880	Chuo Build Industry
1351	3000	Hoko Fishing	2875	5380	Toyo Suisan
4088	2855	Hoxan	3114	540	Doko Spinning
5976	2097	Neturen	3119	800	Daiichi Spinning
6648	1640	The Kawasaki Electric	4183	15835	Mitsui Petrochemical Ind.
9710	1549	The Dai-ichi Hotel	5803	19687	Fujikura
Daiichi-Kangyo (A)			5922	600	Nasu Denki-Tekko
1803	35700	Shimizu	6201	12415	Toyoda Automatic Loom Works
1816	3750	Ando Construction	6495	550	Miyairi Valve Mfg.
1818	4004	Nissan Construction	6761	3857	Aiwa
1884	4274	The Nippon Road	7913	1738	Tosho Printing
1898	2300	Seikitokyu Kogyo	8266	7863	Izumiya
1917	1056	Nisseki House Industry	9401	6737	Tokyo Broadcasting System

Code	Capital Value	Firm	Code	Capital Value	Firm
Mitsubishi (A)			7278	2002	Daikin Mfg.
1817	1100	Katsumura Construction	7305	2748	Araya Industrial
1827	2319	Nakanogumi	7977	5500	France Bed
1860	9704	Toda Construction	8017	1155	Hankyu Kyoei Bussan
2201	14118	Morinaga	8196	4350	Kasumi
2611	504	Settsu Oil Mill	8817	4143	Hankyu Realty
3591	12510	Wacoal	Fuji (A)		
4103	4300	Taiyo Sanso	1805	11146	Tobishima
5972	1000	Nihon Kentetsu	1810	1290	Matsui Construction
6365	810	DMW	1815	6953	Tekken Construction
6772	1277	Tokyo Cosmos Electric	1820	13772	Nishimatsu Construction
6809	1172	Toa Electric	1863	1214	Nippon Tetrapod
6850	2800	Chino	1885	8860	Toa
6936	950	Toyo Takasago Dry Battery	1893	15066	Penta-Ocean Construction
6951	3240	JEOL	1919	3486	Kobori Juken
7920	1051	Miura Printing	1922	2200	Taisei Prefab Construction
8018	3000	Sankyo Seiko	1943	1647	Daimei Telecom Engineering
8019	2530	Ichida	1950	2350	Nippon Densetsu Kogyo
8027	1129	N. Nomura	1954	3127	Nippon Koei
8042	1050	Nihon Matai	1979	1590	Taikisha
8084	1985	Ryoden Trading	2204	3016	Nakamura
8136	16166	Sanrio	2284	11227	Itoham Foods
9365	735	Dainichi Tsuun	2531	10558	Takara Shuzo
Kyowa (A)			2891	1916	Oriental Yeast
1819	3600	Taihei Kogyo	3010	500	Jomo Twisting Thread
1870	1320	Yahagi Construction	3403	3944	Toho Rayon
2211	6317	Fujiya	4271	1000	The Japan Carlit
5702	1893	Daiki Aluminium Industry	5204	1772	Ishizuka Glass
6377	500	Koyo Iron Works & Construction	5451	10292	Yodogawa Steel Works
6796	13013	Clarion	5691	1010	Tokyo Shering
7256	1210	Kasai Kogyo	5913	1215	Matsuo Bridge
7285	2976	Ikeda Bussan	5919	910	Japan Steel Tower
8182	2260	Inageya	6138	1131	Dijet Industrial
9360	660	3S Shinwa	6218	2391	Enshu
Sanwa (A)			6368	2087	Japan Organo
1890	8173	Toyo Construction	6710	2025	Taiko Electric Works
1920	7205	Shokusan Jutaku Sogo	6712	2112	Tamura Electric Works
1980	1540	ODD	6921	1320	Toko Electric
5486	17075	Hitachi Metals	7231	7957	Topy Industries
6210	525	Toyo Machinery & Metals	7281	1970	Kanto Seiki
6305	5687	Hitachi Construction Machinery	7729	1608	Tokyo Seimitsu
6329	770	Hitachizosen Engineer & Const.	8039	1000	Tsukiji Uoichiba
6332	1749	Tsukishima Kikai	8051	4090	Yamazen
6374	4268	Toyo Umpanki	8181	1117	Totenko
6585	2548	Japan Servo	8253	11774	Seibu Credit
6704	5618	Iwatsu Electric	8259	3025	Jujiya
6715	4909	Nakayo Telecommunications	9601	3049	Shochiku
6992	748	Kokusan Denki	Sumitomo (A)		
7014	1500	Namura Shipbuilding	1503	3309	Sumitomo Coal Mining
7104	1325	Fuji Car Mfg.	1833	12231	Okumura

Code	Capital Value	Firm	Code	Capital Value	Firm
1845	1050	Morimoto-Gumi	Taiyokobe (A)		
1861	34713	Kumagai Gumi	2898	716	Sonton Food Industry
1918	1110	Toyodo Housing	4362	1413	Nippon Fine Chemical
1921	1754	Tomoegumi Iron Works	6018	800	The Hanshin Diesel Works
4538	2193	Fuso Pharmaceutical Ind.	6776	660	Tensho Electric Industries
5453	5040	Toyo Kohan	7975	1004	Lihit Industrial
5738	13387	Sumitomo Light Metal Ind.	9083	1000	Shinki Bus
6350	1104	Shin Nippon Machinery	9364	11073	Kamigumi
6357	1086	Sansei Yusoki	Tokyo (A)		
6508	12530	Meidensha	5009	3990	Fuji Kosan
6708	5656	Toyo Communication Equipment	Saitama (A)		
8115	958	Moon Bat	3123	600	Saibo
8241	1455	The Hanshin Department Store	4224	1507	Lonseal
8818	2330	Keihanshin Real Estate	4903	501	Oriental Photo Ind.
8831	1528	Hanshin Real Estate	6369	4128	Toyo Kanetsu
9605	7140	Toei	6392	600	Yamada Yuki Seizo
Tokai (A)			6982	658	The Lead
1923	4400	Misawa Homes	7724	1575	Kimmon Mfg.
2209	1016	Imuraya Confectionery	8274	1335	Tobu Store
2806	250	Yutaka Shoyu	Mitsubishi Trust (A)		
2808	392	Sanbishi	1887	6254	JDC
3117	1500	Kowa Spinning	8032	5673	Japan Pulp & Paper
3585	848	The Shine Mills (Kyokuichi)	8056	3685	Nippon Univac
5461	1230	Chubu Steel Plate	9671	3566	Yomiuri Land
5462	1260	Toshiba Steel Tube	Yasuda Trust (A)		
5753	1305	Nippon Shindo	1859	660	Tatsumura Gumi
5993	411	Chita Kogyo	4090	1520	Toyo Sanso
5994	550	Tokyo Sintered Metal	5810	7231	Optec Daiichi Denko
6137	1561	Koike Sanso Kogyo	9069	4358	Senko
6397	606	Go Iron Works	Sumitomo Trust (A)		
6480	3979	Nippon Thompson	1888	5001	Wakachiku Construction
6623	2145	Aichi Electric	1949	1039	Sumitomo Densetsu
6955	3907	Fuji Electrochemical	5457	1265	Nippon Pipe Mfg.
7102	6313	Nippon Sharyo	5728	908	Tokyo Tungsten
7269	14864	Suzuki Motor	6126	761	Osaka Diamond Industrial
7903	200	Nagoya Lumber	6242	1620	Nihon Spindle Mfg.
7907	207	Dainihon Wood-Preserving	8192	1500	Nakagawa Musen
8076	880	Kanoh Steel	8194	2500	Life Stores
8130	1304	Sangetsu	Industrial Bank of Japan (B)		
8190	883	Yamanaka	3110	18092	Nitto Boseki
8193	1688	Suzutan	3129	504	Toyama Spinning
8235	9765	Matsuzakaya	3405	17686	Kuraray
8270	7688	Uny	3408	2800	Sakai Textile Mfg.
9357	1627	Meiko Trans.	3706	2750	Tokai Pulp
Hokkaido Takushoku (A)			3863	25041	Juho Paper
8085	1155	Narasaki Sangyo			
8177	1523	Sogo Denki			
9071	311	Sapporo Express			

Code	Capital Value	Firm	Code	Capital Value	Firm
6805	540	Yagi Antenna	5333	15018	NGK Insulators
6844	4221	Shindengen Electric Mfg.	5632	7200	Mitsubishi Steel Mfg.
6853	1309	Kyowa Electronic Instruments	5914	3000	Miyaji Iron Works
6972	1254	Elna	5916	506	Harumoto Iron Works
7012	66553	Kawasaki Heavy Industries	6135	5162	Makino Milling Machine
7202	40801	Isuzu Motors	6245	560	Hirano Kinzoku
7726	935	Kuroda Precision Industries	6339	2618	Sintokogio
7750	6064	Asahi Optical	6388	1350	Misawa Van
7762	17170	Citizen Watch	6443	1000	Toyo Engineering Works
7914	4510	Kyodo Printing	6491	840	Toa Valve
7951	13500	Yamaha	6503	139154	Mitsubishi Electric
7961	1500	Nissan Nohrin Kogyo	6644	1302	Osaki Electric
8046	1948	Marufuji Sheet Piling	6645	8589	Omron Tateisi Electronics
8050	4800	Hattori Seiko	6802	4252	Akai Electric
8101	2854	Gunze Sangyo	6973	2038	Kyoei Sangyo
8102	7795	Hitachi Sales	7267	57804	Honda Motor
8292	700	Tokyo Isuzu Motor	7274	1888	Showa Mfg.
9062	51517	Nippon Express	7731	28116	Nippon Kogaku
9304	3549	The Shibusawa Warehouse	7994	6158	Okamura
9470	5600	Gakken	8025	1375	Tsukamoto Shoji
9661	569	Kabukiza	8030	2050	Chuo Gyorui
9674	803	Kagetsuenkanko	8095	1500	Iwaki
9731	2410	Hakuyosha	8107	2727	Kimuratan
9765	660	Ohba	8234	11659	The Daimaru
Mitsubishi (B)			8237	4470	Matsuya
1702	1502	Kyoritsu Ceramic Materials	8238	10691	Isetan
1813	5520	Fudo Construction	8252	27297	Marui
1825	1088	Ishihara Construction	8802	76291	Mitsubishi Estate
1842	845	Shimato Construction	9301	7584	Mitsubishi Warehouse & Transport
1855	8295	Tokyu Construction	9310	2000	Yokkaichi Warehouse
1947	3025	The Nippon Telecommunications	Sumitomo (B)		
1958	882	Sanwa Daiei Elec. Construction	1812	43460	Kajima
1969	4964	Takasago Thermal Engineering	1822	2632	Daiho Construction
1974	500	Miyaji Construction & Engin.	1823	10715	Sumitomo Construction
2503	51202	Kirin Brewery	1852	3531	Asanuma Gumi
2801	8109	Kikkoman	1857	3000	Matsumura-Gumi
2802	57378	Ajinomoto	1864	714	Asakawagumi
2899	1757	Nagatanien-Honpo	1924	5643	National House Industrial
3104	5400	Fuji Spinning	1940	735	Kitanihon Tsushinkensetsu
3111	3030	Omikenshi	1982	947	Hibiya Engineering
3864	13510	Mitsubishi Paper Mills	2604	1100	Yoshihara Oil Mill
4010	61084	Mitsubishi Chemical Industries	2607	4019	Fuji Oil
4182	19311	Mitsubishi Gas Chemical	2809	5512	Q.P.
4184	17945	Mitsubishi Petrochemical	3009	4666	Kawashima Textile Manufacturer
4509	10125	Yoshitomi Pharmaceutical Ind.	3941	6504	Rengo
4514	1089	Teikoku Hormone Mfg.	4005	78680	Sumitomo Chemical
4516	2500	Nippon Shinyaku	4086	6248	Teisan
4914	4388	Takasago International	4502	41332	Takeda Chemical Industries
5004	15000	Mitsubishi Oil	4503	18151	Yamanouchi Pharmaceutical
5201	52497	Asahi Glass	4505	11287	Daiichi Seiyaku
5301	7611	Tokai Carbon	4519	13290	Chugai Pharmaceutical
5331	6146	Noritake	4615	1400	Shinto Paint

Code	Capital Value	Firm	Code	Capital Value	Firm
6431	633	Nippon Typewriter	5804	8411	Mitsubishi Cable Industries
6492	743	Okano Valve Mfg.	6140	3797	Asahi Diamond Industrial
6794	2136	Foster Electric	6331	3957	Mitsubishi Kakoki
8291	1705	Tokyo Nissan Auto Sales	6773	15778	Pioneer Electronic
9319	740	Chuo Warehouse	8064	1605	Kinsho-Mataichi
Sumitomo (B)			8070	800	Tokyo Sangyo
3878	1991	Tomoe-gawa Paper	8335	24186	Ashikaga Bank
3883	17325	Settsu	8344	7500	Yamagata Bank
4087	2551	Daido Sanso	8359	26100	Hachijuni Bank
5214	12967	Nippon Electric Glass	8367	11500	Nanto Bank
5351	3300	Shinagawa Refractories	8375	3685	Bank of Ikeda
5358	780	Isolite Insulating Products	8379	25000	Bank of Hiroshima
5633	2400	Kanto Special Steel Works	8391	5400	Shinwa Bank
5853	693	Kyoto Die-Casting	8405	8400	Nippon Trust Bank
5932	5938	Sankyo Aluminium Industry	8584	7024	Jaccs
6378	1030	Kimura Chemical Plants	8603	73079	Nikko Securities
6473	7014	Koyo Seiko	8751	68144	Tokio Marine and Fire Insurance
6478	500	Osaka Bearing	Sumitomo (C)		
8133	3448	C. Itoh Fuel	2116	4473	Nissin Sugar Mfg.
Industrial Bank of Japan (C)			3407	67452	Asahi Chemical Industry
1701	900	Showa Mining	4008	2500	Seitetsu Kagaku
3304	1523	Tosco	4514	1089	Teikoku Hormone Mfg.
5351	3300	Shinagawa Refractories	4535	15000	Taisho Pharmaceutical
5707	5000	Toho Zinc	5423	4513	Tokyo Steel Mfg.
5712	43073	Nippon Mining	5463	4477	Maruichi Steel Tube
5852	600	Fuso Light Alloys	6122	500	Wakayama Precision
6016	500	Kobe Diesel	6141	3778	Mori Seiki
6364	1001	Hokuetsu Industries	6351	2439	Tsurumi Mfg.
7124	500	Yusoki Kogyo	6587	8592	Matsushita Seiko
7201	116483	Nissan Motor	6714	1155	Kanda Tsushin Kogyo
7222	7387	Nissan Shatai	6752	89537	Matsushita Electric Industrial
7301	1320	Miyata Industry	7246	5730	Press Kogyo
8339	9000	Tokyo Tomin Bank	7984	6137	Kokuyo
8345	8190	Bank of Iwate	8024	2354	Naigai Clothes
8511	9700	Japan Securities Finance	8140	11195	Ryosan
8550	2265	Tochigi Sogo Bank	8371	6750	Bank of Osaka
9110	8100	Shinwa Kaiun	8532	11000	Hyogo Sogo Bank
9119	7800	Iino Kaiun	8545	3520	Kansai Sogo Bank
Mitsubishi (C)			8809	3204	Sankei Building
1959	2904	Kyushu Denkikoji	9470	5600	Gakken
2003	1991	Nitto Flour Milling	9665	1512	Yoshimoto Kogyo
2805	1586	S & B Shokuhin	9713	1866	Royal Hotel
2893	2100	Teishoku	Tokai (C)		
3305	500	Tokyo Ramie Spinning	1956	1650	Nippon Denwa Shisetsu
4527	2640	Rohto Pharmaceutical	2811	3483	Kagome
4531	770	Yuki Gosei Kogyo	2892	1600	Nihon Shokuhin Kako
4534	3969	Mochida Pharmaceutical	5992	3574	Chuo Spring
4540	10331	Tsumura Juntendo	6439	906	Nakanippon Casting
4619	836	Nihon Tokushu Toryo	6586	10106	Makita Electric Works
			6856	1955	Horiba

Code	Capital Value	Firm	Code	Capital Value	Firm
6995	2549	Tokai Rika	1934	1432	Tohoku Electrical Construction
7221	3830	Toyota Auto Body	1940	735	Kitanihon Tsushinkensetsu
7249	615	Owari Precise Products	1947	3025	The Nippon Telecommunications
7250	2323	Pacific Industrial	2053	1033	Chubu Shiryō
7283	1941	Aisan Industry	2286	4455	Hayashikane Sangyo
8003	31336	Toyo Menka	2871	15070	Nichirei
8035	8844	Tokyo Electron	3115	3250	Teikoku Sangyo
8245	1980	Maruei Department Store	3401	45635	Teijin
8293	1279	Aichi Toyota Motor	3405	17686	Kuraray
8408	11415	Chuo Trust and Banking	4043	11343	Tokuyama Soda
8513	200	Chubu Securities Financing	4099	2552	Shikoku Chemicals
8527	4300	Chuo Sogo Bank	4182	19311	Mitsubishi Gas Chemical
8588	7012	Central Finance	4202	17180	Daicel Chemical Industries
9402	1320	Chubu-Nippon Broadcasting	4215	2767	Takiron
9643	270	Nakanihon Theatrical	4217	8345	Hitachi Chemical
9664	450	Misonoza Theatrical	4222	1580	Kodama Chemical Industry
9762	7558	Daiwa Kosho Lease	4501	21315	Sankyo
Hokkaido Takushoku (C)			4502	41332	Takeda Chemical Industries
2108	8279	Nippon Beet Sugar Mfg.	4505	11287	Daiichi Seiyaku
8524	4500	Hokuyo Sogo Bank	4511	13183	Fujisawa Pharmaceutical
8531	2100	Hokkaido Sogo Bank	4613	10114	Kansai Paint
9085	1010	Hokkaido Chuo Bus	4914	4388	Takasago International
Mitsui Trust (C)			5205	1323	Nippon Muki
1834	1086	Odakyu Construction	5233	26741	Onoda Cement
4471	4866	Sanyo Chemical Industries	5660	1839	Shinko Wire
5814	500	Kyosan Electric Wire	5936	1781	Toyo Shutter
6770	19265	Alps Electric	5975	3689	Topre
9358	1455	Utoku Express	6103	8412	Okuma Machinery Works
Mitsubishi Trust (C)			6206	4111	Toyoda Machine Works
1825	1088	Ishihara Construction	6370	4628	Kurita Water Industries
1941	2363	Chugoku Elec. Construction	6373	2226	Daido Kogyo
4216	5000	Asahi Organic Chemicals Ind.	6395	3385	Tadano
4543	14100	Terumo	6473	7014	Koyo Seiko
5104	1920	Nitto Kako	6501	141228	Hitachi
6645	8589	Omron Tateisi Electronics	6583	7853	Matsushita Refrigeration
Sumitomo Trust (C)			6590	1265	Shibaura Engineering Works
2206	5947	Ezaki Glico	6753	51648	Sharp
5405	133499	Sumitomo Metal Industries	6805	540	Yagi Antenna
8601	81089	Daiwa Securities	6996	5155	Nichicon
9737	8870	CSK	6997	6164	Nippon Chemi-Con
Nihon Life Insurance (C)			7012	66553	Kawasaki Heavy Industries
1333	15000	Taiyo Fishery	7013	64925	Ishikawajima-Harima Heavy Ind.
1802	35980	Ohbayashi	7122	3000	Kinki Sharyo
1855	8295	Tokyu Construction	7205	15929	Hino Motors
1886	20266	Aoki	7210	9888	Nissan Diesel Motor
1892	829	Tokura Construction	7276	9264	Koito Mfg.
			7723	2340	Aichi Tokei Denki
			7735	12891	Dainippon Screen Mfg.
			7752	29212	Ricoh
			7936	11929	Asics
			8022	5546	Mizuno
			8128	726	F-One

Code	Capital Value	Firm	Code	Capital Value	Firm
8233	10591	Takashimaya	Meiji Life Insurance (C)		
8234	11659	The Daimaru	2503	51202	Kirin Brewery
8243	12376	Sogo	3404	31256	Mitsubishi Rayon
8261	2028	Meitetsu Department Store	4010	61084	Mitsubishi Chemical Industries
8320	131422	Sanwa Bank	4092	3750	Nippon Chemical Industrial
8324	17000	Daishi Bank	4516	2500	Nippon Shinyaku
8385	15800	Iyo Bank	4611	6055	Dai Nippon Toryo
8386	12000	Hyakujushi Bank	4617	2866	Chugoku Marine Paints
8538	3500	Niigata Sogo Bank	5238	20179	Mitsubishi Mining & Cement
8583	27513	Nippon Shinpan	5632	7200	Mitsubishi Steel Mfg.
8611	10338	Cosmo Securities	5771	2000	Mitsubishi Shindoh
8759	13500	Dowa Fire and Marine Insurance	5916	506	Harumoto Iron Works
9001	42836	Tobu Railway	6245	560	Hirano Kinzoku
9006	22207	Keihin Electric Express Rail	6503	139154	Mitsubishi Electric
9009	13584	Keisei Electric Railway	7105	1780	Nippon Yusoki
9014	1480	Shin-Keisei Electric Railway	7701	14521	Shimadzu
9019	3000	Izukyū	8081	1452	Kanagawa Electric
9041	71610	Kinki Nippon Railway	8246	1540	Iwataya Department Store
9042	37238	Hankyu	8302	103680	Industrial Bank of Japan
9043	12703	Hanshin Electric Railway	8312	39200	Hokkaido Takushoku Bank
9044	20771	Nankai Electric Railway	8313	106500	Bank of Tokyo
9045	20293	Keihan Electric Railway	8315	133261	Mitsubishi Bank
9048	32708	Nagoya Railroad	8341	16800	77 Bank
9049	1000	Keifuku Electric Railroad	8355	30000	Shizuoka Bank
9075	11388	Fukuyama Transporting	8360	8400	Yamanashi Chuo Bank
9404	7086	Nippon Television Network	8363	16500	Hokkoku Bank
9405	1800	Asahi Broadcasting	8392	4860	Oita Bank
9431	33931	Kokusai Denshin Denwa	8402	59934	Mitsubishi Trust and Banking
9503	466899	The Kansai Electric Power	9301	7584	Mitsubishi Warehouse & Transport
9504	176002	The Chugoku Electric Power	9310	2000	Yokkaichi Warehouse
9506	242400	Tohoku Electric Power	9502	361580	Chubu Electric Power
9507	110368	Shikoku Electric Power	9508	226464	Kyushu Electric Power
9509	101000	The Hokkaido Electric Power			
9532	111385	Osaka Gas			
9533	27176	Toho Gas			
9536	14500	Saibu Gas			
9642	500	Koma Stadium			
9724	1470	Hotel New Hankyu			

Notes: (A) signifies that the financial institution was the "main bank" for the firm in terms of both lending and shareholding both in 1982 and 1986.

(B) signifies that the financial institution was the largest lender for the firm in both 1982 and 1986, but not the top shareholder in either 1982 or 1986.

(C) signifies that the financial institution was the top shareholder for the firm in both 1982 and 1986, but not the largest lender either in 1982 or 1986.

References

- Aoki, M., "Shareholders' Non-unanimity on Investment Financing: Banks vs. Individual Investors," in M. Aoki, ed., *The Economic Analysis of the Japanese Firm*, North-Holland Publishing Company, 1984.
- , *Information, Incentives and Bargaining in the Japanese Economy*, Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Ariga, K., "Kigyō Kinyū to Jyōhō no Keizaigaku (in Japanese)," *Financial Review*, Japan, Ministry of Finance October 1989, pp. 69-103.
- Bartholomew, D.J., *Stochastic Models for Social Processes*, 2nd edition, John Wiley and Sons, 1973.
- Hirota, S., "Main Bank Seido no Antei (in Japanese)," *Keizai Ronso*, Doshisha University, Vol. 41, No. 2, 1989, pp. 39-63.
- Horiuchi, A., "Nihon no Kinyū System: Tokushoku to Henka (in Japanese)," in Y. Miwa and K. Nishimura, eds., *Nihon no Kabuka-Chika*, University of Tokyo Press, 1990.
- , and S. Fukuda, "Nihon no Main Bank wa donoyōna Yakuwari wo Hatashitaka? (in Japanese)," *Kinyu Kenkyu*, Vol. 6, No. 3, Institute for Monetary and Economic Studies, Bank of Japan, 1987, pp. 1-28.
- , F. Packer, and S. Fukuda, "What Role has the 'Main Bank' Played in Japan?," *Journal of the Japanese and International Economies*, Vol. 2, 1988, pp. 159-180.
- Ikeo, K., *Nihon no Kinyū Shijō to Soshiki* (in Japanese), Toyokeizai-Shinposha, 1985.
- Ito, K., T. Misumi, and T. Ichimura, "Kabushiki Mochiai no Rasengata Logics Shift (in Japanese)," *Business Review*, Hitotsubashi University, Vol. 37, No. 3, February 1990, pp. 15-36.
- Miwa, Y., "Main Bank to Sono Kinō (in Japanese)," in Y. Kosai and S. Nishikawa, eds., *Gendai Nihon no Keizai System*, University of Tokyo Press, 1985.
- Nakatani, I., "The Economic Role of Financial Corporate Grouping," in M. Aoki, ed., *The Economic Analysis of the Japanese Firm*, North-Holland Publishing Company, 1984.
- Obata, J., "Ginkō no Kabushiki Hoyū ni tsuite (in Japanese)," *Shoken Kenkyu*, Japan Securities Research Institute, Vol. 67, 1983, pp. 25-149.
- Schoenholtz, K., and M. Takeda, "Jōhō Katsudō to Main Bank-sei (in Japanese)," *Kinyu Kenkyu*, Vol. 4, No. 4, Institute for Monetary and Economic Studies, Bank of Japan, 1985, pp. 1-24.
- Sheard, P., "The Main Bank System and Corporate Monitoring and Control in Japan," *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, Vol. 11, 1989, pp. 399-422.
- Shorrocks, A.F., "Income Mobility and the Markov Assumption," *Economic Journal*, Vol. 86, September 1976, pp. 566-578.
- , "The Measurement of Mobility," *Econometrica*, Vol. 46, September 1978, pp. 1013-1024.
- Suto, M., and T. Takahashi, *Gendai no Kigyō Kinyū to Kinyū System* (in Japanese), Yuhikaku, 1986.
- Tachibanaki, T., K. Mitsui, and H. Kitagawa, "Economies of Scope and Intercorporate Share Ownership in Japanese Banking," *Journal of the Japanese and International Economies*, forthcoming, 1991.
- Tanigawa, Y., "On Mutual Shareholding by Corporations," *Economic Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 37, 1986, pp. 319-335.