



Facilities and Visitor Interest at Cadika Park in Medan

Ervan Ariya Sembiring

Universitas Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia
sembiringdarknes@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study describes facilities at Cadika Park in Medan and examines their potential relevance to visitor interest. A descriptive qualitative approach combines non-participant observation with a review of documentary material and related literature. The facility inventory is organized into recreational and educational features, sports facilities, and supporting amenities. Recreational features include the artificial lake, bridge, deer enclosure, and wooded areas; sports facilities include walking and jogging routes and designated activity spaces; supporting amenities include toilets, a prayer room, parking, and food services. These categories provide a basis for discussing the different functions of the park, but their presence alone does not demonstrate visitor satisfaction or increased visitation. The reported percentage distribution lacks a documented denominator and calculation procedure and therefore cannot establish the relative influence of each category. Evidence from other urban parks suggests that maintenance, accessibility, perceptions of safety, and user preferences should be considered alongside facility availability. The study offers a preliminary framework for facility management and subsequent visitor research. Its conclusions remain descriptive because standardized condition ratings, visitor response data, and a reproducible observation schedule are unavailable. Future assessment should connect facility audits with direct measures of park use and visitor experience.

Keywords: urban parks; facility quality; visitor interest; Cadika Park; park management

Received: 10 April 2025

Revised: 10 May 2025

Published: 30 June 2025

INTRODUCTION

Urban parks provide settings for recreation and everyday social activity, but the availability of a park does not establish how well it serves its users. McCormack et al. (2010) identified safety, maintenance, amenities, and the social environment as recurring influences on park use in qualitative research. Corley et al. (2018) likewise conceptualized park quality through social and environmental dimensions. These perspectives support evaluating facilities in relation to access and use, rather than treating the number of attractions as a complete measure of quality.

Cadika Park in Medan Johor offers a local setting for examining these issues. The facility inventory includes spaces for recreation and education, areas for sports, and amenities that support a visit. Their different functions may appeal to different users. Research in other settings illustrates why such relationships require evidence: Kaczynski et al. (2008) associated specific park features with park-based activity, while Kaczynski et al. (2014) found that associations varied across demographic groups. A facility that is useful to one group may be less relevant or less accessible to another.

This study aims to describe the facilities reported at Cadika Park and discuss their potential relevance to visitor interest. It distinguishes the physical inventory from measured visitor responses. Interest in visiting, satisfaction with an actual visit, frequency of use, and intention to return are different outcomes. The present descriptive evidence can identify issues for management and subsequent research, but it cannot quantify the effect of facility quality on those outcomes.

METHODS

The study uses a descriptive qualitative approach at Cadika Park in Medan Johor, Medan, Indonesia. The reported data collection methods are non-participant observation of facilities and their use, together with documentation and a literature review. Observation concerns recreational spaces, sports areas, and public amenities. Documentary material is described as covering facility information, park revitalization, and management. The analysis is limited to a descriptive account because the observation dates, duration, sampling schedule, and underlying field records are not documented.

The facility descriptions are organized into three functional categories: recreation and education, sports, and supporting amenities. Related research is used to interpret possible links between these facilities and visitor experience. This comparison does not supply missing observations for Cadika Park. No standardized condition scale, visitor questionnaire, interview dataset, or statistical test is reported. Consequently, descriptions of cleanliness, comfort, or attractiveness cannot be treated as independently validated quality scores.

Table 1 retains the percentages reported for the three categories. Their denominator, data source, and calculation method are unspecified. They are presented without interpreting them as proportions of respondents, effect sizes, or contributions to visitor interest. No inference about statistical significance is made.

Established methods offer a basis for improving the reproducibility of subsequent assessment. The Community Park Audit Tool was developed with stakeholder input and field testing to assess park environments (Kaczynski et al., 2012). The System for Observing Play and Recreation in Communities provides a structured approach to observing activity and contextual conditions (McKenzie et al., 2006). These instruments were not applied in the present study; they are methodological options for a future facility audit and observation programme.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The inventory identifies three groups of facilities with different functions. Recreational and educational features include an artificial lake, a bridge, a spotted deer enclosure, and a mini forest or wooded area. Sports facilities include a jogging track, a soccer field, a skatepark,

an archery area, and kayaking facilities. Toilets, a prayer room, parking, and a canteen or café form the supporting category. Table 1 summarizes this inventory and preserves the accompanying percentages with their evidential limitation.

Table 1. Facilities at Cadika Park and percentages with an undocumented calculation basis

Facility category	Examples in the inventory	Reported percentage
Recreation and education	Artificial lake, bridge, spotted deer enclosure, wooded area	50%
Sports	Jogging track, soccer field, skatepark, archery area, kayaking facilities	35%
Supporting amenities	Toilets, prayer room, parking, canteen or café	15%

Note. Percentages are retained as reported. Their denominator and calculation procedure are undocumented; they are not verified estimates of influence or visitor preferences.

The percentages in Table 1 cannot establish comparative influence. Supporting amenities may be essential even when they are not the main reason for a visit. The 50% figure cannot be interpreted as half of visitors choosing the park for recreation or education without a defined question, sample, and denominator.

The lake, bridge, and wooded areas offer possible settings for sightseeing, photography, and informal learning. These are interpretations of facility functions, not measured visitor motivations. Felappi et al. (2024) examined how park characteristics relate to perceived restoration and support for wildlife, including possible synergies and trade-offs. Their findings suggest that natural features deserve attention alongside built amenities. However, the presence of a deer enclosure at Cadika Park does not by itself demonstrate wildlife conservation outcomes or educational effectiveness.

Sports facilities provide opportunities for different activities, but opportunity is distinct from observed participation. Veitch et al. (2015) documented variation in park use by visitor characteristics and observation periods. In a separate study, Veitch et al. (2016) found differences in how adolescents rated park features. These findings caution against assuming that all sports spaces attract the same users or that their availability establishes frequent use. For Cadika Park, systematic observation would be needed to determine which areas are used, when they are used, and whether facilities are operational.

Supporting amenities warrant assessment through usability and accessibility as well as presence. Błaszczuk et al. (2020) investigated park access from the perspectives of people with mobility difficulties and their carers. Their work supports considering barriers that a simple facility list can overlook. A toilet or route can exist without being usable by every visitor. Bahriny and Bell (2020), using site assessments and user observations in Tehran, also showed that good facilities can coexist with limited use where maintenance, accessibility, or other contextual conditions are problematic.

The relationship between facility conditions and satisfaction requires direct evidence from users. Liu and Xiao (2021) examined online comments about Shenzhen parks and identified the relevance of management and contextual attributes alongside physical features. Tang et al. (2024) investigated nonlinear associations between pocket park attributes and satisfaction in Chengdu. These studies indicate that a single facility count or an assumed

percentage allocation may conceal more complex relationships. Their estimates should not be transferred to Cadika Park, where comparable measurements are unavailable.

Visitor interest, satisfaction, and loyalty should also remain conceptually separate. Du and Zhao (2022) investigated satisfaction and loyalty using a structural equation model in Taihu Park. Xiao et al. (2024) examined relationships involving park characteristics, satisfaction, and social self-efficacy among older visitors in Guangzhou. These studies used visitor response data to examine relationships that cannot be established from a facility inventory alone. The present findings therefore do not confirm increased revisit intention, longer visits, or word-of-mouth promotion at Cadika Park.

For management, the inventory provides a starting point for identifying what should be inspected and discussed with users. Wang and Hu (2024) applied importance–performance analysis to satisfaction surveys in Shaping Park, illustrating how perceived importance can be compared with reported performance. A similar evaluation at Cadika Park would require locally collected responses. Managers could use such evidence to distinguish an attractive but adequately functioning feature from an essential facility that users experience as deficient.

Visitor feedback can complement direct inspection. Huang et al. (2022) explored online reviews as a source of information for park management in Chicago, while Liu et al. (2024) developed an assessment approach using social media comments about parks in Wuhan. These approaches demonstrate ways to identify concerns across facilities and services. For Cadika Park, any use of online feedback should acknowledge that reviewers are self-selected and may not represent visitors who do not use those platforms. Feedback is best considered alongside field observations and direct consultation.

Claims about the effects of improvement require observations over time. Veitch et al. (2012) studied park improvements through a natural experiment with an intervention and a comparison park. Thompson et al. (2025) evaluated changes in use and satisfaction around renovated parks using repeated surveys and comparison neighborhoods. These designs provide a stronger basis for examining change than a single descriptive inventory. The present study contains no comparable before-and-after evidence, so it cannot attribute visitor behavior to park revitalization.

A practical next step is to document facility conditions and accessibility, then collect visitor feedback on the same attributes. The observation schedule should include repeated visits where feasible. Responses should distinguish reasons for visiting from satisfaction and intention to return. These recommendations require new data; maintenance priorities remain provisional until the reported percentages and condition descriptions can be verified.

CONCLUSION

Cadika Park's facility inventory identifies opportunities for recreation, education, and sports, supported by basic visitor amenities. The descriptive evidence cannot establish how facility quality affects visitor interest, and the reported percentages lack a verifiable calculation basis. Management should combine facility inspection with accessibility assessment and direct visitor feedback. Documented observations and clearly defined measures of satisfaction and use are needed to evaluate visitation and any effects of revitalization.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bahriny, F., & Bell, S. (2020). Patterns of urban park use and their relationship to factors of quality: A case study of Tehran, Iran. *Sustainability*, 12(4), Article 1560. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12041560>
- Błaszczak, M., Suchocka, M., Wojnowska-Heciak, M., & Muszyńska, M. (2020). Quality of urban parks in the perception of city residents with mobility difficulties. *PeerJ*, 8, Article e10570. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.10570>
- Corley, E. A., Ahn, J. J., Kim, Y., Lucio, J., Rugland, E., & Molina, A. L., Jr. (2018). Conceptualizing lenses, dimensions, constructs, and indicators for urban park quality. *Environmental Justice*, 11(6), 208–221. <https://doi.org/10.1089/env.2018.0017>
- Du, Y., & Zhao, R. (2022). Research on the development of urban parks based on the perception of tourists: A case study of Taihu Park in Beijing. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(9), Article 5287. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19095287>
- Felappi, J. F., Sommer, J. H., Falkenberg, T., Terlau, W., & Kötter, T. (2024). Urban park qualities driving visitors mental well-being and wildlife conservation in a Neotropical megacity. *Scientific Reports*, 14(1), Article 4856. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-55357-2>
- Huang, Y., Li, Z., & Huang, Y. (2022). User perception of public parks: A pilot study integrating spatial social media data with park management in the city of Chicago. *Land*, 11(2), Article 211. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land11020211>
- Kaczynski, A. T., Besenyi, G. M., Wilhelm Stanis, S. A., Koohsari, M. J., Oestman, K. B., Bergstrom, R., Potwarka, L. R., & Reis, R. S. (2014). Are park proximity and park features related to park use and park-based physical activity among adults? Variations by multiple socio-demographic characteristics. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 11(1), Article 146. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12966-014-0146-4>
- Kaczynski, A. T., Potwarka, L. R., & Saelens, B. E. (2008). Association of park size, distance, and features with physical activity in neighborhood parks. *American Journal of Public Health*, 98(8), 1451–1456. <https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.2007.129064>
- Kaczynski, A. T., Wilhelm Stanis, S. A., & Besenyi, G. M. (2012). Development and testing of a community stakeholder park audit tool. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 42(3), 242–249. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2011.10.018>
- Liu, R., & Xiao, J. (2021). Factors affecting users' satisfaction with urban parks through online comments data: Evidence from Shenzhen, China. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(1), Article 253. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18010253>
- Liu, S., Tan, C., Deng, F., Zhang, W., & Wu, X. (2024). A new framework for assessment of park management in smart cities: a study based on social media data and deep learning. *Scientific Reports*, 14(1), Article 3630. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-53345-0>

- McCormack, G. R., Rock, M., Toohey, A. M., & Hignell, D. (2010). Characteristics of urban parks associated with park use and physical activity: A review of qualitative research. *Health & Place, 16*(4), 712–726.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2010.03.003>
- McKenzie, T. L., Cohen, D. A., Sehgal, A., Williamson, S., & Golinelli, D. (2006). System for observing play and recreation in communities (SOPARC): Reliability and feasibility measures. *Journal of Physical Activity and Health, 3*(s1), S208–S222.
<https://doi.org/10.1123/jpah.3.s1.s208>
- Tang, Q., Cao, J., Yin, C., & Cheng, J. (2024). Examining the nonlinear relationships between park attributes and satisfaction with pocket parks in Chengdu. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening, 101*, Article 128548.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ufug.2024.128548>
- Thompson, R. L., Wyka, K. E., Evenson, K. R., Thorpe, L. E., Johnson, G. D., Pavilonis, B. T., & Huang, T. T. K. (2025). Park use patterns and park satisfaction before and after citywide park renovations in low-income New York City neighborhoods. *Scientific Reports, 15*(1), Article 23036. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-07264-3>
- Veitch, J., Ball, K., Crawford, D., Abbott, G. R., & Salmon, J. (2012). Park improvements and park activity: A natural experiment. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 42*(6), 616–619. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2012.02.015>
- Veitch, J., Carver, A., Abbott, G., Giles-Corti, B., Timperio, A., & Salmon, J. (2015). How active are people in metropolitan parks? An observational study of park visitation in Australia. *BMC Public Health, 15*(1), Article 610.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-015-1960-6>
- Veitch, J., Salmon, J., Parker, K., Bangay, S., Deforche, B., & Timperio, A. (2016). Adolescents' ratings of features of parks that encourage park visitation and physical activity. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity, 13*(1), Article 73. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12966-016-0391-9>
- Wang, Y., & Hu, W. (2024). Satisfaction evaluation and renewal strategies for urban parks based on the importance–performance analysis: A case of Shaping Park in Chongqing, China. *Journal of Urban Planning and Development, 150*(2), Article 05024013. <https://doi.org/10.1061/jupddm.upeng-4546>
- Xiao, J. X., Liao, J., Zhao, B., Long, Y., Xu, X., Liang, X., & Xia, T. (2024). The influence of community park characteristics on satisfaction in Guangzhou: Moderating and mediating effects analysis. *Heliyon, 10*(10), Article e31043.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e31043>