

## **Host-Guest Attitudes toward Socio-Cultural Carrying Capacity of Urban Tourism in Chalus, Mazandaran**

***Seyyed Mohammad Mirtaghian Rudsari***

*Lecturer in Faculty of Cultural Heritage, Handicraft and Tourism,  
Mazandaran University, Mazandaran, Iran*

***Najmeh Gharibi***

*M.A. in Tourism Development Planning, Independent Researcher*

---

### ***Abstract***

*Cities have plentiful of tourism attraction and they always attract many tourists. Therefore, sustainable urban tourism development and its wise management require planning. In this research, the most important goal is to assess and enhance Chalus tourism carrying capacity toward sustainable development of urban tourism. This survey is a developing kind and its method is quantitative and analytical. In this survey, Chalus city has been selected not only because of having many attractions and its importance in national and international levels but also because of its multiple roles. The time domain has been 2016. The results show that caring capacity and tourism quality of the city is much more than what is now although, tourism facilities and infrastructure of the destination is still in the progress and negative socio - cultural effects of the destination is gradually perceived by the tourists and number of tourists is more than capacity. Totally, it can be concluded that Due to the volume of tourists being more than physical capacity of tourism in this destination, local community have felt negative sense of tourism impact on cultural and social dimensions. On the other hand, the quality of the tourism experience in Chalus is declining and only natural attractions of this city is attracting tourists to the destination and proper facilities tourism could not have played appropriate role in this regard.*

***Keywords: Urban Tourism, Assessment of Tourism Quality, Carrying Capacity, Tourism Attraction, Chalus.***

---

## **1- Introduction**

Tourism is the third biggest economy in the world (Lozano-Oyola *et al.*, 2012); it acts as an engine for development through the economic earnings and creation of direct and indirect employment (UNWTO & SNV, 2010). The process of tourism development evolved through time with modifications and the emergence of appropriate measures for statistical, legislative, and operational purposes (Zamani-Farahani, 2016).

Tourism is a multidimensional, multifaceted activity which touches many lives and many different economic activities (Cooper *et al.*, 2008). Tourism may create substantial economic benefits for host countries through contributions to government revenues and the generation of employment and business opportunities (Andereck *et al.*, 2005). However, tourism should be managed in a sustainable way to benefit present and future generations. There is evidence that residents of the countries that attract tourists hold diverse opinions about development in their regions. Understanding the level of satisfaction, the needs, and the expectations of the local community is an essential factor for the success of any form of tourism development (Jennings, 2001). Therefore, researchers should identify a set of guiding principles for a sustainable approach, which should be formulated in accordance with the way that indigenous people live in each area and the extent to which they are employed in tourism (Caneday & Zeiger, 1991).

Tourism operates within a specific spatial pattern. One of these spatial patterns is urban tourism (Papoli Yazdi & Saghaei, 2010). One of the most important places that are visited by tourists is urban areas. Most cities have places, which in a range of attractions and activities develop besides tourism (Hallyar *et al.*, 2008). For many years, urban environments have been among the most attractive areas for all the purposes of tourism around the world (Edwards *et al.*, 2008). City, with offering eligible and good services, provides an appropriate

context for economic, social and cultural activities of human and with providing services such as catering facilities and leisure activities, makes tourism develop and progress (Timothy, 2005). Tourism progress and development and take it as one of the major economic activities by developed and developing countries and competitiveness of tourism destinations for attracting tourists in recent decades, make planners attend two major categories to increase tourism activities revenues: first, increasing tourists satisfaction and promoting enjoyment and quality of the tourism experience. Second, trying to protect host community (Inskeep, 1991). It is not far-fetched to achieve these two important, although only way is to identify, evaluate, and improve the capacity of tourism destinations. Capacity is an important subject in the tourism literature (McCool and Lime, 2001; Sharpley and Telfer, 2008). Because development of tourism activities more than destination caring capacity, reduces quality of the tourism experience, declines levels of local community satisfaction and make local community dissatisfied about tourism development.

city of Chalus is one the destinations which has high tourism capacity in historical, cultural and natural heritage contexts and because of its importance in regional and national levels and its multiple role, determining its caring capacity leads to tourism development and promotion in the city. If the tourism development would not be sustainable and compromised with environmental and human capacity of Chalus, then sooner or later destination marketing will be declined and its tourism industry will be fall down. Hence, this study aims to calculate the quality and capacity of urban tourism in order to develop and promote it.

## **2- Theoretical Background & Concepts**

New researches, books publication and academic articles on urban tourism, shows the importance of this subject. Three types of deduction are common in the study of urban tourism: First, diversity of urban areas means that size, function and the date is effective on their being unique. Second, cities small or big are multirole areas that spontaneously provide various functions for different users and eventually, urban tourism functions consume or provide not only by tourists (Shaw & Williams, 1994). Cities are not only as a source for

sending tourists but also as a destination for accepting them. A very common type of tourism happens in cities (Inskeep, 1991).

Reutsche, (2006) analyzes the relation between tourism and urban areas; she makes a difference between the primary, secondary and additional elements of the urban tourism. The primary elements represent the main reasons that attract tourists to visit the cities. They consider: a) Places for deploying the activities: 1- cultural facilities: museums and art galleries; theatres and movie houses; business centers; other attractions; 2- sport facilities: covered or outdoor; 3- entertainment facilities: casinos and lotteries; organized events; festivals. b) Places for spending the leisure time: historical boulevards; buildings; old statues and monuments; parks and green areas; waters. Secondary elements (adaptation; catering facilities; shopping; markets) along with the additional ones (accessibility; transport and car parks; touring information (maps, indicators, guides)) are also very important for the success of the urban tourism, but do not represent the main attractions for visitors (Popescu, 2008). These elements have been developed in the cities for a multitude of reasons: attracting visitors encourage the urban economy, forming a positive image).

The first condition of success in urban tourism development, is urban infrastructure, wise and prudent management in the political, cultural and social activities and such as upon. The second condition for success in urban tourism development policy is formulation and spatial planning of urban attractions, and providing facilities and amenities that makes easy access to attractions (Dinari, 2006). Growth of short trips made these destinations become one of the main tourist centers, and this phenomenon has shown a significant decline in tourists around the world (cooper & other, 1998).

### **1-2- Urban Tourism**

One of the major destinations that have affected the world tourism trends in the past decade is urban centers. The growth of short-term trips has made this destination as one of the major tourist centers (Cooper *et al.* 1998). So that cities are not only as a source of tourist sender but also they are attracting tourists as a destination. Cities usually have large and diverse attractions, including museums, monuments, historic sites that attract many tourists by its own (Hall, 2001). Urban tourism in the first, largest and the most important forms

of tourism and one of the most complicated types in terms of managerial, but it's not a new form, it is just soaring again (Smith *et al.*, 2010). Urban Tourism is Tourism activities in urban environments. Urban tourism is one of the most important and complex human activities in urban population. According to experts, urban tourism provides a great cultural, social and economic opportunity. Urban tourism, if properly planned, developed, and managed, may have benefits for both urban communities and society in general (Iordache & Cebuc, 2009).

It is kinds of Tourism which in concerned citizens to various attractions like cultural, historical, religious and natural attractions while responsible excursion spend parts of their leisure time in these places (Higham & Lueck, 2002). Hallyar and Griffin call these areas "tourist areas" which usually have social, cultural and economic special identification (Hallyar & Griffin, 2008). Overly, urban tourism is mainly named by two main targets, in the fact they are very different and are as follows: Trade and Culture (Low, 1996). At the same time urban tourism tends to be accounted for as the product and creativity of an expanding tourist industry, a series of disparate activities with disparate histories and origins amalgamated and placed in taxonomy of tourism businesses (Franklin, 2003). The urban tourism is an essential aspect of the correlation of internal and external demands. This is because the tourists are not only visitors, they are equally, parents and friends visiting the locals and of course, there are the locals themselves (Popescu & Corbos, 2010). Significant numbers of tourists in urban areas are visiting for a primary purpose other than leisure, including business, conferences, shopping, and visiting friends and relatives (Edwards *et al.*, 2008; Ashworth & Page, 2010; Bramwell & Lane, 1993).

Urban visitors are increasingly looking for activities outside the traditional areas of tourism, which by means experience something special related to the city and its nature (Maitland, 2007). Nowadays, all the commentators increasingly write about urban, cultural or creative districts (Montgomery, 2004). These districts may also be related to the daily lives of residents. Many visitors are attracted to places where called ethnic neighborhood and they are gathering place of immigrants, including Chinatown, Greek town and... (Shaw, 2007).

In fact, urban tourism, is Tourist – Host cross-function, production of tourism space in relation to urban areas travel with different incentives and visiting attractions and using facilities and services related to tourism that leaves different effects on the environment and urban economics (Papoli yazdi & Saghaei, 2010).

Tourism can bring considerable benefits in urban areas,. These benefits includes creating new job opportunity; new prospects for local tourism companies, new investment opportunities, increasing income and improve living standards for the local; generating revenue from local taxes that can be used to rebuild infrastructure and improve community facilities(Stanciulescu, 2009).

### **2-2- Caring Capacity**

Studies on carrying capacity as an entrepreneurial approach in the area of recreation, was culminated in 1960s and 1970s and that's when recreational user growth in the United States increased concerns about the use of a variety of recreational activities in destinations (Stankey & Manning, 1968; Manning *et al.*, 2002). Tourism carrying capacity, have different types that are associated with each other. Social carrying capacity is one of the tourism carrying capacity (Lee & Graefe, 2003). Social carrying capacity of a tourist represents the maximum number of visitors and a variety of activities in one place that they will not experience unacceptable degradation (Coccosis & Mexa, 2004). Thus, quality management of visitors' experience, is one of the aspects of social carrying capacity. Also, the concept of caring capacity is number of people that a destination could accept in day, month or year. This capacity depends on the vastness and topography, type of soil, animal behavior, amount and quality of tourism facilities in the area (Zahedi, 2006). World Tourism Organization defines caring capacity: amount of visitors that can accumulate in an area (Buckley, 1999).

Despite these considerations, many authors agree that caring capacity is essentially an ecological aspect that expresses the relationship between population and natural environment (Abernethy, 2001). About this, Buckley defines tourism caring capacity: the number of visitors that does not produce any destruction or irreversible ecological change for an ecosystem within an area (Buckley, 1999).

Baud and Bovy state that caring capacity is number of people and time

that every Recreational site can provide without creating physical and environmental damage and without reducing tourist experimental quality each year (Baud-Bovy, 1977). Brotherton believes that caring capacity is maximum level of using a resort in the form of numbers and activities that can be tolerated by a region or an ecosystem before reducing unacceptable or irreversible ecological values (Papageorgio & Brotherton, 1999).

### **3-2- Host-Guest Attitudes**

Tourism process in tourism environment is a disputable point in the tourism space. Because the collision that comes between the host and the guest, is cultural diversity or multi-use of urban space and urban function and diversity of urban consumers (Orbasl, 2000). It is evident that residents' opinions about tourism are varied and determined by multiple factors and may differ from one country to another, in view of the enormous variety of populations. The number of researchers who have explored the effects of tourism in communities is still limited, mainly because of socio-cultural and political barriers (Zamani-Farahani, 2016). Residents' attitudes toward Carrying Socio-Cultural Capacity provide a significant input to identifying the strategic and managerial priorities of tourism. An understanding of the local population's perception of Carrying Socio-Cultural Capacity in urban tourism is essential, because it provides insight into the preferences and interests of the local people served. It may also suggest improvements and changes that should be adopted in future policies and plans in order to achieve successful development, marketing, and operation of existing and future programs and projects, tourism planning and policy (Haley *et al.*, 2005). Such understanding is essential for tourist development and its successful operation and sustainability (Zamani-Farahani, 2016). Consequently, in order to successfully develop the marketing and operation of existing and future programs and projects, tourism planning and policy must consider the attitudes of residents toward Carrying Socio-Cultural Capacity. Similarly, Tosun (2006) states that community members should play an important role in the strategy and action plan of tourism development.

### **3- The Geographical Scope of the Case Study**

City of Chalus is located on the north of the country, beside the sea.

Chalus's neighbor cities are Nowshahr in the east, Tonekabon in the west in Mazandaran province and Tehran province in the south. Chalus is the capital of Chalus Country in Mazandaran Province. It sits on the Chalus River near the Caspian coastline. In a very little distance, two types of sea and mountain climate can be observed that subsequently there are three visions of sea, forest and mountain. Although this city is small, the importance of urban tourism of this area can be better understood when we see that there is a fifteen minutes to an hour distance between this destination to the possibility of using and visiting all facilities of urban tourism.

#### **4- Methodology**

Data for the study is obtained by using a questionnaire, which is collected by domestic tourists who have visited Chalus individually. Questionnaires were collected in two ways: When tourists intended to exit the hotel and when they were visiting the attractions. Questionnaires were distributed and collected in the spring and summer of 2016. Number of sample was 334 people. Generally, because the international tourism in Iran generally does not follow a structure and discipline, we focused on domestic tourists who have visited the city of Chalus. In tourism development, given a strong domestic market can be less risky and more reliable base for gradual development of tourism. Questions of the survey were in Closed and open methods. The closed questions included nominal and ordinal, respectively questions. Nominal questions are identified as descriptive characteristics of the respondents in Table 1 for tourists. Ordinal questions have evaluated sample's attitudes and viewpoints by using Likert Scale. To assess caring capacity of tourism in Chalus From the perspective of the host community, it is needed to implement field survey including distribution of questionnaire. In order to Important to achieve this goal, a total of 386 questionnaires including Chalus residents, economic and central active persons within tourism was distributed and collected.

**Table (1) - Descriptive characteristics of Tourists**

Variable	Categories	Number	Percent	Variable	Categories	Number	Percent
Length of Stay	1 to 3 days	183	55	Number of visits	First time	59	18
	4 to 7 days	96	29		Second time	114	34
	8 days and more	55	16		3 times and more	161	48
Transportation	Car	196	59	Education	Under High	58	17



*Host-Guest Attitudes toward Socio-Cultural ... 39*

	Bus	92	27		school Diploma & Diploma		
	Plane	46	14		Bachelor	177	53
					Master, PHD and more	99	30
Accommodation	Hotel	106	32	Source of information	Brochures	53	16
	Private villa	72	21		Handbook	47	14
	Hotel Apartment	61	18		Internet	69	21
	Motels	42	13		Information centers	67	20
	Friends and Relatives' Home	53	16		Family & Friends	98	29
Sex	Men	181	54	What cause will make you stay overnight?	Proper Place of stay	60	18
	Women	153	46		Affordable accommodation	76	23
					Infrastructure	59	17
Do you plan to visit again?	Yes	302	90		Incentives	139	42
	No	32	10		Less than 10.600.000 Rials	55	16
Purpose of visit	Leisure and Recreation	232	69	Tourists' Income	10.600.000 to 20.000.000	116	35
	Visiting Family and Friends	54	16		20.000.000 to 30.000.000	131	39
	Business	33	10		30.000.000 to more	32	10
	Other goals	15	5				

## 5- Findings

### 1-5- The study of indicators affecting quality of tourists' experience

In order to assess quality of tourists' experience for traveling to the city of Chalus, a set of questions was designed. The results of this analysis that is shown in Table 2 states that tourists are generally satisfied with visiting Chalus and have emphasized on this With an average equal to (3) .The main reason for traveling to Chalus with an average of (3.1), was visiting historical attractions. Totally, tourists were satisfied with security situation in the city with scores of (2.7) and manage the service and social space of the city with the score of (2.8). In this trip, tourists have confirmed and satisfied with hygiene and environmental issues of the city, Condition of facilities and services for tourism development, quality of urban management, and catering quality of units with respectively Mean scores of (2.9), (2.8), (2.8) and (2.7). Results of this questionnaire show that there is compliance between tourists' perception and actual status of Chalus.

About the social climate of Chalus, Tourists believed that there are no conflicts with residents. About host communities dealing with tourists, it can be noted that with mean scores of (2.8) there has not been physical conflict between tourists and the host community. Results analysis shows that with the score of (2.6) local community have not shown a great interest in connection with adoption of Chalus tourists and active participation in attracting tourists and tourists also emphasized on these issues in the questionnaire. However, tourists were satisfied with Chalus local community's culture with total mean score of (3.3) and with mean score of (2.8) tourists stated that they tend to have a permanent home (villa) in the city of Chalus.

**Table (2) - Evaluation of Tourists' Experience Quality**

Questions	Mean	Total	Very Much	Much	Average	Low	Very Low
In general, are you satisfied with the trip to Chalus?	3	334	22 (16%)	93 (28%)	128 (38%)	68 (11%)	23 (7%)
The most important reason to travel to Chalus is natural attractions.	3.1	334	19 (6%)	104 (31%)	124 (37%)	69 (21%)	18 (5%)
Are you satisfied with services?	3	334	12 (4%)	74 (22%)	154 (46%)	76 (23%)	18 (5%)
Facilities and services are suitable for tourists	2.8	334	10 (3%)	72 (22%)	129 (39%)	96 (29%)	27 (8%)
Is quality of the catering department proper?	2.7	334	6 (2%)	40 (12%)	172 (51%)	84 (25%)	32 (10%)
How is the security situation of the city for tourists?	2.7	334	6 (2%)	47 (14%)	159 (48%)	85 (25%)	37 (11%)
How is quality of urban management towards tourists' needs and demands?	2.6	334	10 (3%)	58 (18%)	105 (31%)	108 (32%)	53 (16%)
If it is your first time visiting Chalus, is there compliance between your perception and actual status of city?	2.9	334	13 (4%)	80 (24%)	130 (39%)	85 (25%)	26 (8%)
In your opinion, how is the social space of the city for leisure?	2.9	334	14 (4%)	77 (23%)	137 (41%)	76 (23%)	30 (9%)
Are you interested in having a villa in the city?	2.8	334	27 (8%)	64 (19%)	130 (39%)	74 (22%)	39 (12%)
How much were you attracted to cultural life of the city?	2.8	334	10 (3%)	68 (20%)	137 (41%)	87 (26%)	32 (10%)
How is hygiene and cleanliness in the city?	2.9	334	16 (5%)	81 (24%)	117 (35%)	86 (26%)	34 (10%)
How satisfied are you with environmental situation of the city?	2.8	334	11 (3%)	69 (21%)	121 (36%)	104 (31%)	29 (9%)
Physical conflict with tourists	2.8	334	19 (6%)	57 (17%)	133 (40%)	88 (26%)	37 (11%)
Accepting and welcoming of tourists.	3	334	12 (21%)	55 (23%)	110 (33%)	105 (9%)	52 (11%)
Active participation in attracting tourists.	2.8	334	5 (2%)	58 (17%)	168 (50%)	81 (24%)	22 (7%)
How satisfied are you with culture of the residents?	3.3	334	81 (24%)	78 (23%)	116 (35%)	15 (5%)	44 (13%)

**2-5- Evaluating social- perceptual caring capacity of the city (Host community)**

In order to measure the impact of tourism on the host community, positive and negative social effects is divided into two categories that the following effects perceived by the host community is presented in positive dimensions (Table 3) and negative aspects (Table 4).

**Table (3) - Evaluating positive effects of tourism on socio - Cultural indicators on Perspectives of the host community**

Evaluating positive effects of tourism on socio-Cultural indicators on Perspectives of the host community	Host community	Very Low	Low	Average	Much	Very Much	Mean
improving living standards	Residents	14.9	28.7	41.5	14.9	0	2.82
	Economic active persons	0	28.1	50/9	21.1	0	
	Authorities	0	5.6	33.3	33.3	27.8	
improving accessibility, Streets, General Services	Residents	17.9	49.5	17.9	14.7	0	2.51
	Economic active persons	0	43.9	56.1	0	0	
	Authorities	5.6	16.7	22.2	27.8	27.8	
better recreational facilities for host community	Residents	10.5	54.7	34.7	0	0	2.31
	Economic active persons	14	50.9	35.1	0	0	
	Authorities	5.6	16.7	50	22.2	5.6	
increasing public awareness and knowledge	Residents	10.5	48.4	33.7	7.4	0	2.15
	Economic active persons	31.6	57.9	10.5	0	0	
	Authorities	22.5	47.1	24.5	5.9	0	
keeping local identity alive	Residents	10.5	20	30.5	28.4	10/5	2.97
	Economic active persons	3.5	36.8	45.6	14	0	
	Authorities	0	27.8	33.3	22.2	16.7	
the formation of valuable experience meeting others	Residents	17.9	26.3	40	15.8	0	2.94
	Economic active persons	0	5.3	40.4	42.1	12/3	
	Authorities	0	23.5	64.7	5.9	5.9	

The results of assessing positive effects of tourism on socio - cultural view of the host community show that none of the positive social - cultural effects is been approved by the host community and respondents in all three groups have been assessed these effects with an average of less than (3). The important point is the difference between view of host community and authorities that generally, these positive effects were further confirmed by the authorities and host community has less approved these effects. . According to the view of the host society, the positive effects of tourism on social indicators based on priority are: keeping local identity alive (2.97), the formation of valuable experience meeting others (2.94), improving living

standards with an average score of (2.82), improving accessibility (2.51), better recreational facilities (2.31) and increasing public awareness and knowledge (2.15), which in total were not confirmed by host community.

**Table (4) - Evaluating negative effects of tourism on socio - Cultural indicators on Perspectives of the host community**

Evaluating negative effects of tourism on socio - Cultural indicators on Perspectives of the host community	Host community	Very Low	Low	Average	Much	Very Much	Mean
Crowd	Residents	0	17.9	44.2	30.5	7.4	3.02
	Economic active persons	10.7	35.7	44.6	8.9	0	
	Authorities	0	22.2	33.3	33.3	11.1	
Crime Increase	Residents	11.6	25.3	46.3	9.5	7.4	2.59
	Economic active persons	12.3	45.6	29.8	12.3	0	
	Authorities	22.2	44.4	22.2	5.6	5.6	
Quality reduction of local community's life	Residents	7.4	33.7	44.2	14.7	0	2.74
	Economic active persons	14	26.3	38.6	21.1	0	
	Authorities	0	2.22	33.3	27.8	16.7	
Causing discomfort and lack of safety for the community because of tourists	Residents	0	38.3	46.8	14.9	0	2.63
	Economic active persons	21.1	42.1	28.1	8.8	0	
	Authorities	33.3	27.8	22.2	16.7	0	
Reducing access to recreational facilities and services for host community	Residents	7.4	33.7	36.8	22.1	0	2.99
	Economic active persons	7	19.3	19.3	40.4	14	
	Authorities	5.6	16.7	38.9	27.8	11.1	
Excessive use of resources and recreational attractions by tourists	Residents	7.4	29.5	47.4	15.8	0	3.05
	Economic active persons	7	12.3	15.8	35.1	29.8	
	Authorities	11.8	35.3	35.3	11.8	5.9	
Loss of family cohesion	Residents	0	54.7	29.5	15.8	0	2.57
	Economic active persons	14	42.1	28.1	15.8	0	
	Authorities	11.1	33.3	33.3	16.7	5.6	
increasing demand for services and infrastructures	Residents	0	22.1	42.2	30.5	4.2	3.35
	Economic active persons	0	17.5	24.6	36.8	21.1	
	Authorities	0	22.2	27.8	27.8	22.2	
Inappropriate cultural changes in residents' behavior in imitation of tourists	Residents	0	25.3	37.9	36.8	0	3.3
	Economic active persons	7	15.8	19.3	29.8	28.1	
	Authorities	0	22.2	27.8	33.3	16.7	
Making cultural problems for local community	Residents	0	23.2	40	28.4	8.4	3.12
	Economic active persons	8.8	26.3	33.3	31.6	0	
	Authorities	0	23.5	29.4	29.4	17.6	

On the other hand, negative effects of tourism in general has been confirmed by the host community and host community believe that tourism have caused negative effects on Chalus tourism. negative socio- cultural effects of tourism such as crowd, socio-cultural problems, cultural change, increasing demand for services and infrastructures, is been confirmed by host community with an average of (3) and the rest have got an average over (2).

#### **6- Discussion and Conclusion**

Today cities are one of the most important destinations that are considered by the tourism and different types of tourism including nature, cultural and special tourism is happening in these places and these destinations unlike other tourist destinations, includes human population and this makes carrying capacity of tourism and calculating research schemes and also outreach plans more important. But the point that should be mentioned here is that neglecting outreach projects and macro-projects such as comprehensive, detailed guide of these places depends on tourism outcomes and impacts of these points on environment and ways of increasing tourists' satisfaction, increasing tourism maximum efficiency in accordance with the wishes of the local people and local residents and attention spent on such initiatives and attention of these plans to physical development of cities. It should be noted that if in these places tourism does not move toward goals and development of tourism, a form of tourism will be happen that cause destruction of the natural and human environment of the cities and reduce the capacity of these points in throughput.

Chalus city, in terms of human and natural attractions, can be considered as a bride city of all cities in Iran. Due to the multi-functional and its tourism role of the city, thousand people visit it each year. It is highly desirable for tourism studies. According to the social and cultural dimensions of tourism impacts, we tried to analyze these impacts by using questionnaires and socio-cultural tourism caring capacity of Chalus is calculated. Chalus tourism quality experience on Perspectives of tourists was measured by questionnaire. The results of this study indicated that in assessing quality, satisfaction toward culture of the residents with a mean of (3.3) and Accepting and welcoming of tourists with a mean of (3) and quality of urban management towards tourists' needs and demands with an average of

(2.6) have the average of the highest and lowest. In evaluating positive effects of tourism on socio - Cultural indicators on Perspectives of the host community, keeping local identity alive with an average of (2.97) and increasing public awareness and knowledge with an average of (2.15) have respectively the highest and lowest average. In addition evaluate negative effects of tourism on socio-cultural indicators on Perspectives of the host community, increasing demand for services and infrastructures with an average of (3.35) and Loss of family cohesion with an average of (2.57) have respectively the highest and lowest average on host community's perspective.

Chalus as a tourism destination due to the influx of tourists is reached to maturity in a relatively incomplete cycle stage. However, tourism facilities and infrastructure of the destination is still in the development stage. This destination is placed at the stage cultural and social impact of that will be gradually perceived by the tourists. In general, it can be noted that negative socio-cultural aspects of tourism were confirmed by tourists and local community and research also confirmed that the volume of incoming tourists to the city of Chalus is over its capacity. In general, it can be concluded that due to the volume of incoming tourists being over its caring capacity, of this destination, host communities have felt negative impact of tourism in socio-cultural dimensions. On the other hand, quality of tourism experience is declining in Chalus, it is only natural attraction that has made tourists attract to the destination, and tourism facilities cannot play an appropriate role in this regard.

#### **References**

- Abernethy, V. d. (2001). Carrying capacity: the tradition and policy implications of limits, *Ethics in Science and Environmental Politics*, No. 23: 9-18.
- Andereck, K.L., Valentine, K.M., Knopf, R.C. & Vogt, C.A. (2005). Residents' perceptions of community tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(4): 1056-1076.
- Ashworth, G., & Page, S. J. (2010). Urban tourism research: Recent progress and current paradoxes, *Tourism Management*, doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2010.02.002.
- BaudBovy, L. & Lawson, F. (1998). *Tourism and recreation, Handbook of Planning and Design*. Architectural press.

- Bramwell, B., & Lane, B., (1993). Sustainable Tourism: an evolving global approach, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1(1): 1-5.
- Buckley R. (1999). An ecological perspective on carrying capacity, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(3): 705-708.
- Caneday, L., & Zeiger, J. (1991). The social, economic, and environmental costs of tourism to a gaming community as perceived by its residents. *Journal of Travel Research*, 30(2): 45- 49.
- Coccosis, H. and Mexa, A. (2004). Tourism carrying capacity: Methodological considerations. In H. Coccosis, & A. Mexa, *The challenge of tourism carrying capacity assessment: Theory and practice* (55-90) England: Ashgate.
- Cooper, C. P. (1981). Spatial and Temporal Patterns of Tourist Behavior, *Regional Studies*, No. 15: 359-371.
- Cooper, C. Fletcher, J. Gilbert, D. Wanhill, S. Shepherd, R. (1998). *Tourism: Principles and Practice*, 2nd ed, New York: Longman.
- Cooper, C., Fletcher, J., Fyall, A., Gilbert, D., & Wanhill, S. (2008). *Tourism principles and practice*. (4th ed), Harlow, England: Prentice Hall Financial Times.
- Dinari, A. (2006). *Urban tourism in Iran and the world*, Ferdosi university press.
- Edwards, D., Griffin, T. & Hayllar, B. (2008). Urban Tourism Research Developing an Agenda, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 35(4): 1032-1052.
- Franklin, A., (2003), *Tourism. An Introduction*. SAGE Publications, London.
- Hall, C. M. & Page, S. J. (2001). *Tourism and Recreation*. London: Routledge.
- Hallyar, B., Griffin, T. & Edwards, D. (2008). *City spaces- tourist places: urban tourism precincts*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Haley, A.J., Snaith, T., & Miller, G. (2005). The social impacts of tourism a case study of Bath (UK). *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(3): 647-668.
- Higham, J. & Lueck, M. (2002). Urban ecotourism: a contradiction in terms, *Journal of ecotourism*, No. 1: 36-51.
- Inskip, E. (1991). *Tourism Planning: An Integrated and Sustainable Development Approach*. New York, Van Nostrand Reinhold. Johnson.
- Iordache, C. & Cebuc, I. (2009). The influence of juridical regulations upon tourist town planning, *Theoretical and Empirical Researches in Urban Management*, 1(10): 86-92.
- Jennings, G. (2001). *Tourism research*. Australia: John Wiley & Son.
- Lee, H. and Graefe, A.R. (2003). Crowding at an arts festival: Extending crowding models, *Tourism Management*, No. 24: 1-11.

- Lozano-Oyola. M., Blancas. F.J., Gonzalez, M., Caballero, R., (2012), Sustainable Tourism Indicators as Planning Tools Cultural Destinations, *Ecological Indicators*, No. 18: 612- 675.
- Low Christopher M. (1996). *Urban Tourism Attraction Visitors to large Cities*. London: Mansell, Publishing Limited.
- Manning, R., Lawson, S., Newman, P., Laven, D. & Valliere, W. (2002). Methodological issues in measuring crowding-related norms in outdoor recreation, *Leisure Sciences*, No. 24:339–348.
- McCool, S. F. & Lime, D.W. (2001). Tourism carrying capacity: tempting fantasy or useful reality. *Journal of sustainable tourism*, No. 9: 372-388.
- Maitland, R. (2007). Culture city users and the creation of new tourism areas in cities, in M. K. Smith (ed.) *tourism, culture and Regeneration*. Wallingford: CABI.
- Montgomery, J. (2004). Cultural quarters as mechanisms for urban regeneration. part 2. A review of for cultural quarters in the UK, Ireland and Australia', *planning practice and research*, 19(1): 3-31.
- Orbasl, A. (2000). Is Tourism Governing Conservation in Historic Towns? *Journal of Architectural Conservation*, 6(3): 7-19.
- Papageorgio, K, & Brotherton, I. (1999): A Management planning framework based on ecological, perceptual and economic carrying capacity: the case study of Vicos-Aoos National Park. *Greece journal of Environmental Management*, No. 8: 271-284.
- Popescu, I. (2008). Promoting the urban touring destinations by implementing the total quality management, *Transylvanian Magazine of Administrative Sciences*, 21(1): 105-124.
- Popescu, R. I. & Corbos, R. A. (2010). The Role of Urban Tourism in the Strategical Development of Brasov Area, *Theoretical and Empirical Researches in Urban Management*, 7(16):69-85.
- Reutsche, J. (2006). *Urban Tourism: What Attracts Visitors to Cities?*, Let`s Talk Business.
- Sharpley, R. & Telfer, D. J. (2008). *Tourism and Development in the developing world*. Routledge.
- Shaw, G. & Williams A. M. (1994). *Critical issues in tourism: A geographical perspectives*, Blackwell: Oxford.
- Smith, M., Macleod, N. & Hart Robertson, M. (2010). *Key concepts in tourist studies*, SAGE Publications, London.
- Stanciulescu, G. C. (2009). The role of urban marketing in the local economic development, *Theoretical and Empirical Researches in Urban Management*, 1(10): 114-135.



- Stankey, G. H. & Manning, R. E. (1986). Carrying capacity of recreation settings, *The President's commission on Americans outdoors: A literature review*, Washington, D.C. U.S.: Government Printing Office.
- Timothy, D. & Allen J. (2005). *Aspects of tourism, shopping tourism, retailing and leisure*, Channel View Publications, Toronto.
- UNWTO & SNV (2010). *Manual on tourism and poverty alleviation practical steps for destinations*, Published by the World Tourism Organization and the Netherlands Development Organization, Madrid: United Nations World Tourism Organisation.
- Zahedi, S. A. (2006). *Principles of sustainable tourism and ecotourism*, Allameh Tabatabaei University Press.
- Zamani-Farahani, H. (2016). Host attitudes toward tourism: A study of Sareyn Municipality and local community partnerships in therapeutic tourism, *Journal of Tourismology*, 2(1): 16-34.