Assyfa Journal of Islamic Studies

AJIS. Vol. 4 No. 1 (2026) Page 671-677

e-ISSN: 2988-7399 p-ISSN: 2988-7399

https://doi.org/10.61650/ajis.v4i1.1369

Community-Based Management of a Rural Community Reading Center in Way Kanan: A Qualitative Case Study

Akhmad Suprianto[1*], Muslih Qomarudin[1], Ismail Fahmi[1], Sujari Rahmanto[1], Moh. Solikul Hadi[1]

[1]Institut Agama Islam Al Hikmah Lampung, Indonesia

Correspondence: muslihqomarudin@gmail.com

Article History: 20 February 2026 • Revised: 25 March 2025 • Accepted: 15 April 2026 • Published: 30 April 2026 date pending

ABSTRACT

This qualitative single-case study examines community-based management at TBM Rumah Baca Lintas Literasi in Way Kanan Regency, Indonesia. The supplied manuscript describes semistructured interviews with five coded informants, one brief observation in August 2026, and document review. Thematic interpretation identifies shared planning, flexible volunteer roles, reading and creative services, local storytelling, and prospective institutional partnerships. Local narratives function as materials for discussion and writing; participant accounts indicate perceived relevance but do not establish measurable learning gains. Documentation concerning a draft regional literacy regulation establishes a policy context rather than enacted protection or funding. The first author's insider role and inconsistent source details regarding informant roles, observation duration, interview dates, and the local-story workshop require verification before submission. Findings explain management practices in one case and cannot establish program impact or wider prevalence.

Keywords: Community Reading Center; Community Participation; Local Wisdom; Volunteer Management

ABSTRAK

Studi kasus kualitatif ini mengkaji pengelolaan berbasis masyarakat di TBM Rumah Baca Lintas Literasi, Kabupaten Way Kanan. Naskah sumber melaporkan wawancara dengan lima informan berkode, satu observasi singkat pada Agustus 2026, dan kajian dokumen. Interpretasi tematik menunjukkan perencanaan bersama, pembagian tugas relawan, layanan membaca dan kegiatan kreatif, pemanfaatan cerita lokal, serta hubungan kelembagaan yang masih bersifat prospektif. Cerita lokal dipakai sebagai bahan diskusi dan menulis, tetapi penuturan peserta belum membuktikan peningkatan hasil belajar terukur. Dokumen mengenai rancangan peraturan literasi merupakan konteks kebijakan, bukan bukti perlindungan hukum atau pendanaan yang telah berlaku. Peran penulis pertama sebagai pengelola TBM dan pertentangan rincian informan, durasi observasi, tanggal wawancara, dan lokakarya perlu diverifikasi sebelum pengajuan. Temuan menjelaskan mekanisme pengelolaan satu kasus tanpa membuktikan dampak kausal atau keterwakilan pusat baca lainnya.

Kata kunci: Taman Bacaan Masyarakat; Partisipasi Masyarakat; Kearifan Lokal; Relawan

How to cite: Suprianto, A., Qomarudin, M., Fahmi, I., Rahmanto, S., & Hadi, M. S. (2026). Community-Based Management of a Rural Community Reading Center in Way Kanan: A Qualitative Case Study. *Assyfa Journal of Islamic Studies*, *4*(1), 671–677. Retrieved from https://journal.assyfa.com/index.php/ajis/article/view/1369

1. INTRODUCTION

Community Reading Centers (Taman Bacaan Masyarakat, TBMs) provide flexible access to books, learning activities, and community knowledge. Their continuity depends on more than collections: volunteers, locally relevant programming, resource management, and partnerships require deliberate coordination. Community participation can support those functions when residents take part in planning and delivery, rather than attend events only (Afrina et al., 2023; Wenger, 1998).

TBM Rumah Baca Lintas Literasi in Gunung Sangkaran Village, Blambangan Umpu, Way Kanan, offers a case for examining these relationships. The supplied manuscript describes reading services, volunteer activities, and the use of local stories in literacy programming. Its reference to a draft regional literacy regulation concerns a potential institutional context; no enacted regulation or resulting financial support is evidenced.

This study asks how participation informs management, how local knowledge enters programs, and how external relationships may affect continuity. A single-case qualitative design can describe mechanisms and meanings in this setting, although it cannot estimate program impact or establish whether similar mechanisms operate across all TBMs.

This article organizes the available case material around governance, volunteer work, services, local wisdom, and institutional relationships. It distinguishes interview accounts, brief observation, and documentary evidence. That distinction is necessary because the source gives conflicting dates and informant details, which are identified explicitly rather than silently reconciled.

© 2026 Suprianto & Qomarudin. Published by CV. Bimbingan Belajar Assyfa, Indonesia

2. RESEARCH METHODS

This qualitative single-case study concerns TBM Rumah Baca Lintas Literasi in Dusun 04 Way Kawat, Gunung Sangkaran Village, Way Kanan Regency, Lampung. The source describes purposive recruitment of people involved in management, volunteer activity, learning, and institutional support. It reports five coded informants (I1–I5), but its role enumeration accounts for only four individuals; the fifth role requires confirmation from the interview register.

The source reports semistructured interviews, one short participatory observation on 22 August 2026, and review of TBM activity and policy-related documents. It alternately states 10 and 15 minutes for the observation and assigns interview quotations to 23 August elsewhere; the verified field log should establish exact timing. Consequently, this revision describes a single brief observation without adopting a disputed duration or quoting unverified dates.

Interview prompts concerned program planning, volunteer responsibilities, collections, funding, local stories, partnerships, and perceived continuity. Thematic analysis followed data condensation, display, and interpretation (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Miles et al., 2014). The source presents a coding matrix connecting accounts of decisions, volunteer roles, local narratives, and institutional links to broader governance themes.

Source and technique triangulation involved comparing interviews with field observation and documents. The first author is identified in the manuscript as the TBM founder and manager; this insider role provides contextual familiarity but increases the possibility of selection and interpretation bias. The source describes review by the second author, though independent coding agreement and an auditable transcript archive are not reported.

The interpretation treats institutional documents as evidence of proposed collaboration, not proof of enacted policy or guaranteed support. The documented local-story workshop is distinct from the short observation session; its implementation date and whether participant statements precede or follow the event should be checked against original records. This design supports contextual explanation but no causal or population-wide claim.

3. RESULTS AND FINDINGS

The supplied case account identifies participatory planning as a central management practice. Managers, volunteers, and residents reportedly discuss local needs and program priorities. Flexible assignment of duties allows volunteers to help arrange activities, manage reading materials, and facilitate learning. These are described management arrangements rather than independently measured improvements in organizational capacity.

The TBM combines access to reading materials with discussion and creative activities. The source uses the existing service concepts widya pustaka, widya loka, and widya budaya to organize collection access, learning interaction, and cultural expression. These categories help interpret the case; they are not new themes validated as a universal TBM classification.

© 2026 Suprianto & Qomarudin. Published by CV. Bimbingan Belajar Assyfa, Indonesia

Local narratives and oral history appear as learning resources. Documentation describes a local-story short-story writing workshop intended to translate village stories into written work. Because the study observation occurred before the workshop date recorded in another part of the source, accounts of the workshop are treated as documentation and retrospective or prospective interview claims pending chronological verification.

Participants reportedly found local stories useful as writing prompts and as material for discussing cultural identity. Such perceptions illustrate program relevance but cannot demonstrate gains in writing skill, creativity, or confidence without direct assessment. The source contains neither pre- and post-activity measures nor a long-term participation series.

The external setting includes reported collaboration by the Way Kanan Regency Government and the University of Lampung concerning a draft literacy-movement regulation. This documents an institutional connection and a stated policy intention. The evidence does not establish enactment, TBM eligibility for funding, or a direct effect of the draft on services.

Across the accounts, continuity is linked analytically to sharing responsibility, retaining volunteers, meeting local needs, and securing resources. The interviews are predominantly supportive; the supplied manuscript provides no documented negative case. Combined with the author's insider position and brief observation, this limits claims about dissenting views or sustained outcomes.

4. DISCUSSION

The case suggests that participation becomes useful for governance when it shapes decisions and distributes work. Discussion of local needs informs planning, while volunteer roles connect those decisions with program delivery. This mechanism is plausible from the supplied accounts, although the short field period cannot show that participation remains stable over time.

Volunteer organization matters because a TBM may depend heavily on its founder. The case describes flexible roles and community recruitment, which could spread routine work across more people. Whether those arrangements provide succession capacity requires volunteer records and follow-up observation; the current interviews alone cannot demonstrate institutional resilience.

Local stories connect literacy activity with knowledge residents already possess. This offers a meaningful reason to read, discuss, and write within the community setting (Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Street, 1984). The documented workshop illustrates the type of activity undertaken or planned, while ambiguity in the workshop and interview chronology prevents precise claims about what participants experienced before data collection.

The three widya service concepts provide a helpful lens for interpreting the collection, learning space, and cultural activity. Their overlap is visible in the movement from a story or text to group discussion and creative writing. These functions describe program content; they do not establish that reading frequency or measurable writing ability improved.

External partnerships may offer technical advice, visibility, or resources, but intentions recorded in a draft policy are not equivalent to implemented support (Ansell & Gash, 2008). The regional

© 2026 Suprianto & Qomarudin. Published by CV. Bimbingan Belajar Assyfa, Indonesia

collaboration documented by the source should therefore be interpreted as an institutional opportunity. Budget decisions, final legal text, and TBM participation would need separate verification.

Methodological inconsistencies constrain confidence in the case record. The manuscript reports five interviewees while listing only four roles, gives two observation durations, and uses different interview and workshop dates. A corrected field log, informant table, document inventory, and dated activity record would allow readers to trace each finding to its source.

The insider role of the first author can aid access and understanding but may favor constructive accounts. The absence of a clearly reported negative case cannot be taken as broad agreement among community members. Interviews with former volunteers and nonparticipants, combined with repeated visits, could test whether the reported mechanisms extend beyond active supporters.

The contribution of this case is a focused account of how planning, volunteering, culturally relevant activities, and prospective partnerships may interact in one rural TBM. Future research can follow programs and finances longitudinally, compare several centers, and assess participant learning directly. These steps would clarify which management practices endure and which require outside support.

5. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

TBM Rumah Baca Lintas Literasi is described as organizing literacy activity through shared planning, volunteer work, local narratives, and external institutional relationships. The available interviews and documents provide contextual evidence of these mechanisms, while the brief observation and unresolved source chronology limit stronger conclusions.

Before journal submission, the authors should confirm the five informants' roles, observation and interview dates, workshop documentation, and final status of the regional policy. Continued volunteer records and repeated observations would strengthen claims about sustainability; the present case does not demonstrate causal effects or guaranteed policy benefits.

REFERENCES

Afrina, C., Wahyuni, S., Dito, R., & Utari, K. (2023). Padang Panjang community reading park toward UNESCO version of literacy city. *Jurnal Kajian Informasi & Perpustakaan, 11*(2), 193–210. https://doi.org/10.24198/jkip.v11i2.43745

Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 18*(4), 543–571. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032

Bangani, S. (2024). Academic libraries' support for quality education through community engagement. *Information Development*. https://doi.org/10.1177/02666669231152862

Barton, D., & Hamilton, M. (1998). *Local literacies: Reading and writing in one community*. Routledge.

© 2026 Suprianto & Qomarudin. Published by CV. Bimbingan Belajar Assyfa, Indonesia

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). Greenwood Press.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2022). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide*. SAGE Publications.

Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum.

Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (2007). *Ethnography: Principles in practice* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Kerr, P. (2024). Organisational practices and social inclusion: Inclusionary place-making in the library. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 34*(3), e2801. https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2801

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE Publications.

Liu, H., Rukspollmuang, C., & Viseshsiri, P. (2026). Innovative library management for lifelong learning. *IFLA Journal*. https://doi.org/10.1177/03400352251412912

Malterud, K., Siersma, V. D., & Guassora, A. D. (2016). Sample size in qualitative interview studies: Guided by information power. *Qualitative Health Research, 26*(13), 1753–1760. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732315617444

Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Munawar, A. (2024). Gerakan literasi berbasis inklusi sosial di Taman Bacaan Masyarakat Sehati Kabupaten Bandung. *Informatio: Journal of Library and Information Science, 4*(1), 17–32. https://doi.org/10.24198/inf.v4i1.44609

Oldenburg, R. (1989). *The great good place*: Cafés, coffee shops, bookstores, bars, hair salons, and other hangouts at the heart of a community. Paragon House.

Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge University Press.

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. Simon & Schuster.

Saldaña, J. (2021). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. SAGE Publications.

© 2026 Suprianto & Qomarudin. Published by CV. Bimbingan Belajar Assyfa, Indonesia

Street, B. V. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge University Press.

Vårheim, A. (2014). Trust and the role of the public library in the integration of refugees: The case of a northern Norwegian city. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science, 46*(1), 62–69. https://doi.org/10.1177/0961000614523636

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge University Press.

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

© 2026 Suprianto & Qomarudin. Published by CV. Bimbingan Belajar Assyfa, Indonesia