

## Which does affect the natural landscape appreciation strongly, cultural or geological difference?

Hajime Matsushima<sup>1\*</sup>, PETROVA, Elena G.<sup>2</sup>, MIRONOV, Yury V.<sup>3</sup>, EBINE, Satoshi<sup>4</sup>, TAKAYAMA, Norimasa<sup>6</sup>, UEDA, Hirofumi<sup>7</sup>, PETROVA, Anastasia<sup>5</sup>, AOKI, Yoji<sup>11</sup>, NAKAJIMA, Toshihiro<sup>8</sup>, FURUYA, Katsunori<sup>8</sup>, HIRAOKA, Naoki<sup>9</sup>, FUKUI, Wataru<sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Hokkaido University, <sup>2</sup>Lomonosov Moscow State University, <sup>3</sup>Vernadsky State Geological Museum of the RAS, <sup>4</sup>Hokkaido University, <sup>5</sup>Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, <sup>6</sup>Forestry and Forest Products Research Institute, <sup>7</sup>Sapporo City University, <sup>8</sup>Chiba University, <sup>9</sup>Minami Kyushu University, <sup>10</sup>Kyoto Prefectural University, <sup>11</sup>None

Many cross-cultural researches pointed out the difference of landscape appreciation by countries. But the causes of these differences were not cleared still now.

Our research group conducted the cross-cultural research about landscape appreciation between Japan (Sapporo, Chiba, Kyoto and Miyazaki) and Russia (Moscow, Irkutsk and Kamchatka). This project was consisted by three main investigation, 1) comparison of natural landscape appreciation and their impression using photos, 2) comparison of environmental attitude, and 3) comparison of forest images by literal analysis and landscape image sketch analysis. The purpose of this paper is to discuss the cause of differences of landscape appreciation through the review of these results.

The photo based study showed that there were international differences about natural landscape appreciation between Russian and Japanese respondents, as well as national difference between groups of Russian respondents from different regions (Moscow, Irkutsk and Kamchatka). For the grouping of landscapes the most important feature appeared to be the presence/absence of water and type of water basin. Topography is also important for the Russians, while both visual and seasonal characteristics are significant for the Japanese.

The comparison of environmental attitude using the Thompson and Barton Scale Test (TBS) and New Environmental Paradigm (NEP) showed Russian respondents were highly orientated toward human and environmental symbiosis than Japanese. It was also interesting that there was no statistically significant difference in any indicator of environmental attitudes in the national comparison such as Moscow ? Irkutsk, or Hokkaido ? Chiba.

The analysis of landscape image sketches revealed differences between respondents in Japan and Russia. The typical landscape images of a forest were represented objectively, as aesthetic scenery in Russia and subjectively, as a practical place in Japan. The results suggested a fundamental difference in ways of seeing the landscape through individual perceptions rather than normative views on forests.

These three results indicated the differences of landscape appreciation between Japanese and Russian respondents. And such differences were also found between Russian respondents. Russia is one of the biggest countries in the world, so their landscapes were really diverse. Moscow region is flat and covered by forest. Irkutsk region is surrounding by mountainous landscapes, and close to Baikal lake. Kamchatka region is along with coast and has volcano. Because there were no difference about environmental attitude between Russian respondents, the natural settings of surrounding area would influent their landscape appreciation.

Keywords: natural landscape, landscape appreciation, Japan, Russia, cross-cultural research