Factors affecting quality of social interaction park in Jakarta
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Abstract. The existence of social interactions park in Jakarta is an oasis in the middle of a concrete jungle. Parks is a response to the need for open space as a place of recreation and community interaction. Often the social interaction parks built by the government does not function as expected, but other functions such as a place to sell, trash, unsafe so be rarely visited by visitors. The purpose of this study was to analyze the factors that affect the quality of social interaction parks in Jakarta by conducting descriptive analysis and correlation analysis of the variables assessment. The results of the analysis can give an idea of social interactions parks based on community needs and propose the development of social interaction city park. The object of study are 25 social interaction parks in 5 municipalities of Jakarta. The method used is descriptive analysis method, correlation analysis using SPSS 19 and using crosstab, chi-square tests. The variables are 5 aspects of Design, Plants composition: Selection type of plant (D); the beauty and harmony (Ind); Maintenance and fertility (P); Cleanliness and Environmental Health (BS); Specificity (Drainage, Multi Function garden, Means, Concern/Mutual cooperation, in dense settlements) (K). The results of analysis show that beauty is the most significant correlation with the value of the park followed by specificity, cleanliness and maintenance. Design was not the most significant variable affecting the quality of the park. The results of this study can be used by the Department of Parks and Cemeteries as input in managing park existing or to be developed and to improve the quality of social interaction park in Jakarta.
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1. Introduction
The quality of social interaction park in Jakarta is causing for concern, so few visitors and its function is not as expected. On the one hand, people need their park for social interaction but unfortunately the park provided by the government are not used by the residents of the city. This study was conducted to analyze the factors most affecting visitors in assessing a social interaction park quality. The existence of neighborhood parks as green open space that is comfortable, safe, and unexploited as a heterogeneous city where citizens can interact absolutely necessary. Its presence gives a positive value on the lives of citizens and the quality of the urban environment.

A social interaction park or the neighborhood park became a favorite and frequented the public would have factors with certain environmental quality into its appeal. According [1] 8 critical factors that affect the environmental quality of the city of London are (1) Human scale and compactness, (2) Structure, legibility and identity, (3) Cleanliness and safety, (4) Urban management, (5) Visual richness, (6) Activity and mixed use, (7) Public spaces and special places, (8) Moving about and pedestrian friendliness.
While [2] suggests a community open space is a place to share and exchange ideas with communities that are typically located outdoors, located near the residence. The open space has value if its construction followed the rules and have good drainage can increase the natural growth in the region and greening. Researcher [3] stated that the park is developed as recreational facilities and other functions should show the character feasible physical footprint for both active and passive activities such as a multifaceted vegetation, topography, good drainage with attention to the security and safety of users. Thus a need to consider various aspects of the park from the standpoint of the environment and the quality of the facilities available to those aspects of the security and safety of users.

Results of the study is to provide an overview of social interaction parks as needed by the relevant agencies that can be used in the proposed development of the park in Jakarta.

2. Research Method

The object of study are 25 Social Interaction Parks in 5 municipalities of Jakarta: located in East Jakarta, North Jakarta, West Jakarta, South Jakarta and Central Jakarta. The survey was conducted in June 2016. Variables assessed and the percentage of valuation can be seen in the table below. Score ranged from 70 to 100.

| No | Aspect | Percentage | Score | Final Score |
|----|--------|------------|-------|-------------|
| 1. | Design, Plants composition, Selection Type of Plant (D) | 25 % | | |
| 2. | Beauty and harmony (Ind) | 10 % | | |
| 3. | Maintenance and fertility (P) | 20 % | | |
| 4. | Cleanliness and Environmental Health (BS) | 20 % | | |
| 5. | Specificity (Drainage, Multi Function garden, Means, Concern/Mutual cooperation, in dense settlements, etc.) (K) | 25 % | | |
| Total Score | | 100 % | | |

The method used is descriptive analysis method, the correlation analysis using SPSS 19 (Statistics Programme Social Science 19) and using crosstab, chi-square tests. Data were collected by survey and field observation and study of literature. Greater number obtained variables indicating the growing influence of the object of study assessment.

3. Results and Discussion

Quality of desire and satisfaction is a factor to consider. If visitors feel less satisfied in the city park, the desire of visitors to come to this park to be reduced. Factors that affect the sustainability of this park include Design, Plants composition, Selection Type of Plants, Beauty and harmony, cleanliness and others.
Figure 1. Cipinang Muara social interaction park, East Jakarta.

Figure 2. Taman Aries social interaction park – West Jakarta.

Table 2 below show the result of linkage analysis how big the influence of these factors on the quality of parks in Jakarta. While Table 3 show the correlations between each factors.

|    | Mean   | Std. Deviation | N  |
|----|--------|----------------|----|
| N  | 79.4520| 2.80255        | 25 |
| Dsn| 19.3260| 1.70093        | 25 |
| Ind| 8.0320 | .26571         | 25 |
| P  | 15.8240| .99217         | 25 |
| BS | 15.8000| .96954         | 25 |
| K  | 20.0900| .77015         | 25 |
From Table 3, the results of the correlation analysis above shows that there is a significant correlation at the 0.01 level (2-tailed) between Value garden with design (0.694 **). Significant correlation between Value garden with beauty (0.829 **). The correlation between the park with Special Values (Drainage, Multi Function garden, Means, Concern/Mutual cooperation, in dense settlements, etc.) (0.758 **). There is a significant correlation at 0.05 level (2-tailed) between Value garden maintenance (0.440 *). The correlation between the value of a garden with hygiene and environmental health (0.398 *). The highest correlation between the value of the park with all of the variables is the beauty of ratings (0.829 **). Significant correlation between beauty with specificity values (0.907 **). Correlation beauty with hygiene and environmental health (0.537 **). Correlation with the cleanliness and beauty of Maintenance (0.579 **).

Table 4 below show the model summary, while Table 5 is ANOVA result and Table 6 is correlations between models.

### Table 3. Correlations.

| N     | Dsn | Ind | P     | BS | K   |
|-------|-----|-----|-------|----|-----|
| Pearson Correlation | N   | 1.000 | .694 | .829 | .440 | .398 | .758 |
|       | Dsn | .694 | 1.000 | .229 | .027 | -.006 | .110 |
|       | Ind | .829 | .229 | 1.000 | .579 | .537 | .907 |
|       | P   | .440 | .027 | .579 | 1.000 | .970 | .540 |
|       | BS  | .398 | -.006 | .537 | .970 | 1.000 | .505 |
|       | K   | .758 | .110 | .907 | .540 | .505 | 1.000 |

| Sig. (1-tailed) | N | .   | .   | .   | .   | .   | 
| Dsn | .000 | .   | .135 | .449 | .488 | .300 |
| Ind | .000 | .135 | .   | .001 | .003 | .000 |
| P   | .014 | .449 | .001 | .   | .000 | .003 |
| BS  | .024 | .488 | .003 | .000 | .   | .005 |
| K   | .000 | .300 | .000 | .003 | .005 | .   |

### Table 4. Model summary.

| Model | R     | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------|----------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| 1     | .988a | .976     | .970              | .48818                    |

a. Predictors: (Constant), K, Dsn, BS, Ind, P

### Table 5. ANOVA b.

| Model          | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F     | Sig.    |
|----------------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|---------|
| Regression     | 183.974        | 5  | 36.795      | 154.394 | .000a   |
| Residual       | 4.528          | 19 | .238        |       |         |
| Total          | 188.502        | 24 |             |       |         |

a. Predictors: (Constant), K, Dsn, BS, Ind, P
b. Dependent Variable: N
Table 6. Correlations.

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | t     | Sig.  |
|-------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------|
|       | B                           | Std. Error                | Beta  |       |
| 1     | (Constant)                  | 3.065                     | 3.140 | .976  | .341  |
| Dsn   | .944                        | .063                      | .573  | 15.023| .000  |
| Ind   | 3.950                       | .974                      | .374  | 4.054 | .001  |
| P     | -.214                       | .433                      | -.076 | -.493 | .627  |
| BS    | .289                        | .430                      | .100  | .672  | .510  |
| K     | 1.256                       | .316                      | .345  | 3.977 | .001  |

4. Conclusion
The research concluded that the factors that influence the value and quality of interaction in a Jakarta park the most significant is the beauty Specialities (Drainage, Multi Function garden, Means, Concern/Mutual cooperation, in dense settlements, etc.) and maintenance. Aspects of the design was not held leadership positions in a quality park. Thus, people prefer the beauty of the city equipped with good drainage, clean and well maintained not design.
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