

MANAGING ACADEMIC RIGHTS, DUTIES AND ACCOUNTABILITY FROM TAWHIDIC PARADIGM

Suhaimi Mhd Sarif

Department of Business Administration, Kulliyah of Economics and Management Sciences
International Islamic University Malaysia, P. O. Box 10, Jalan Gombak, 53100, Selangor
Email: suhaimims@ium.edu.my

Yusof Ismail

Department of Business Administration, Kulliyah of Economics and Management Sciences
International Islamic University Malaysia, P. O. Box 10, Jalan Gombak, 53100, Selangor
Email: yusof@iiu.edu.my

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the critical importance of Tawhidic paradigm for academic rights, duties and accountability. In the recent years, academic rights, duties, and accountability (RDA) have been 'aligned' with the commercial objectives of tertiary education. Education has been transformed into a commodity. From Tawhidic paradigm, education is a Divine mechanism to mold and shape thinking, feeling and behaviour of people. The study provides conceptual aspects of the Tawhidic paradigm (Islamic monotheism) and links the spirit of Tawhid (monotheism) with academic rights, duties and accountability and then they are integrated with the ethos of Tawhid which balancing the gain in the worldly life and the pleasure in the Hereafter. The study obtained the views of 10 selected representatives of academic staff association that participated in various meetings at the Malaysian Academic Associations Council (MAAC) between 2010-2016 pertaining to academic rights, duties and accountability from the current practices and the way forward from their religious and spirituality perspectives. The results of the study showed that the academic rights, duties and accountability (RDA) are compromised by higher education providers for commercial gain, survival and sustainability. While commercial advantage is necessary for the higher education to be competitive, they should not compromise the need to nurture and educate people with religiosity and spirituality rituals and practices. The study has immediate implications for enhancing personal and professional values of academic movement to be sustainable. However, the results of the qualitative study have to be read within the context and they are not to be generalised. The future studies should use case study and personal interview with all the stakeholders of academic institutions in Malaysia.

Key words: *Tawhidic* paradigm, Academic rights, Malaysian academic associations council (MAAC), rights duties and accountability (RDA).

INTRODUCTION

In today's world, every organization aims for high performance outcomes whether for profit or not for profit organizations. The higher education sector is not spared from changing its operational model due to the dynamism of the industry. As such, the higher education operational model is shifting gradually sometimes drastically from the traditional mode to commercial mode (Levine, 1993; Plater, 1995; Gruber, Reppel and Voss, 2010). The primary motive is to be aligned with the expectations of key stakeholders that wanted the higher education sector to be part of the economic growth value chain (Srikanthan & Dalrymple, 2002, 2003, 2005; Vardi, 2011).

There have been proposals and initiatives from the policy makers, industrialists, practitioners and academicians to change the business and administration models of higher learning institutions. The traditional method of teaching and learning is no longer applicable to many sectors of the economy. The stakeholders wanted the higher education sector to be more pragmatic, practical and commercial. In the mean time, there were strong opposition views about the commercial drive.

The proponents for commercial driven higher education argued that higher education institutions as a component in the large market and industry should contribute significantly to supply professional and talented workers to the industry. The graduates should be readily available to work in the industry with the right attitude, soft skills and business acumen. The opponents are furious about the changes of the model for the main reason that higher education is not another component in the value chain process of the industry.

As a result of the changes in operational model, the rights, duties and accountability of academic staff at higher education sector are also changed proportionately. Academic staffs are expected to be more customer-centric in the teaching and learning deliveries similar to the executives of commercial entities. More significantly, the operational model does not provide adequate participation of the academic staff.

The critical point in this study is about the evaluation of Tawhidic paradigm on academic rights, duties and accountability (RDA). The RDA in academic movement is essential to sustain trust of stakeholders. When higher education providers emphasised greatly on commercial value, they gave less attention to the RDA aspects of higher education. In fact, the RDA has been forced to be aligned with the commercial objectives. From Tawhidic paradigm, the primary objective of education is to nurture, shape, and guide people to think, feel, and act according to the commandment of Allah, that is to fulfil the duties as servant and vicegerent of Allah.

The discussion in this study is divided into a few parts. Firstly, the section discusses the literature review on the academic rights, duties and accountability. The review on selected literature shows research gap. Secondly, it is about the discussion on methodology, findings, and the results.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This part provides discussion from conventional and Islamic perspectives on the academic rights, duties and accountability. The conventional perspectives outline the scope and depth of academic duties and accountability in the lights of existing model of higher education operations. As from the Islamic perspective, the scope and the depth of academic rights, duties and accountability is discussed from the *Tawhidic* paradigm.

Academic rights, duties and accountability from various organizations

The scope of academic staff duties and accountability is operational in nature. According to UK Prospect for Higher Education Career (2012), duties of higher education academic staff includes (a) developing and implementing new methods of teaching to reflect changes in research, (b) designing, preparing and developing teaching materials, (c) delivering lectures, seminars and tutorials, (d) assessing students' coursework, (e) setting and marking examinations, (f) supporting students through a pastoral/advisory role, (g) undertaking personal research projects and actively contributing to the institution's research profile, (h) writing up research and preparing it for publication, (i) supervising students' research activities, (j) undertaking continuous professional development (CPD) and participating in staff training activities, (k) undertaking administrative tasks related to the department, such as student admissions, induction programmes and involvement in committees and boards, (l) managing and supervising staff - at a senior level this may include the role of head of department, (m) representing the institution at professional conferences and seminars, and contributing to these as necessary, and (n) establishing collaborative links outside the university with industrial, commercial and public organisations.

At the global level, Education International (EI, 2012) provides central linkage with all representative organisations of teachers and other education employees across the globe. So far EI becomes the world largest federation of unions and represent the voices of more than 30 million people. Ultimately, Education International integrates and enhances the bond of relationships with all teachers and education employees. Thus, EI (2012) highlighted a few ideas have been agreed by various leaders, namely (1) to promote the principle that quality education, funded publicly, should be available to every student in every country ; (2) to promote and represent the interests of teachers and other education employees on the international level, (3) assists the development of independent democratic organisations to represent teachers and other education employees and builds solidarity and cooperation between them, (4) advocates for equity in society.

According to ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles, academicians have rights to freedom of expression without any disturbances. In order to uphold the fundamental principles and rights, academicians should be given to the right of freedom of association. Apart from this is to have the rights to bargain collective, free from discrimination and force labour.

Duties of academic staff of higher education

This part discusses on the duties of academic staff of higher education. Åkerlind & Jenkins (1998) argued that academic staffs of higher education are expected to coach and train students as expected by the stakeholders, primarily to meet the expectations of potential employers. These academic staffs play different roles, but they are executed directly to the primary operations of higher education (Åkerlind, 2003). The change of roles from traditional to contemporary approach has resulted in confusion of roles. SA (2003) contended that the lack of clarity can lead different performance outcomes.

According to Crosby (2000), the roles, duties and responsibilities of academic staff of higher education can be categorised into six areas, namely (1) as information providers in the lecture/clinical context; (2) demonstrator to the role model on-the-job in more formal teaching settings; (3) the facilitator as a mentor and learning facilitator; (4) the student assessor and curriculum evaluator; (5) the curriculum and course planner; and (6) the resource material creator, and study guide producer. Based on the specific roles of academic staffs mentioned by Crosby (2000), the primary role is operational in the classroom.

Since academicians involve in the class operations, fundamentally with the students, they should play active roles in ensuring the academic contents are delivered at the expectations and satisfaction of the students. Hence, academicians are expected to focus on the students learning outcomes (Crosby, 2000; O'Neill & McMahon, 2005; Taylor & Mifflin, 2008). O'Neill & McMahon (2005) argued that student-centred learning is expected to be delivered and the nature of the mode is very interactive. For instance, the problem-based learning is highly interactive with the faculty members as well as the students (Taylor & Mifflin, 2008). Lafferty & Fleming (2000) argued the commercial influence on higher education has changed the business model; universities are restructured to support the trade for higher education.

Winter (2009) argued higher education has changed the values from *congruent* (the 'academic manager') to *incongruent* (the 'managed academic') with the corporate managerialism. Billot (2010) contended due to the corporatisation, the real academic identity is blurred.

The changes in the directions of the higher education could attract more threats and challenges. According to Williams (2008) argued that more threats are expected for 21st century. However, Doherty, Steel, & Parrish (2012) contended that while there are challenges, there are also opportunities for real academic role. One of the opportunities is to be professional in conducting the class and academic activities.

According to Kolsaker (2008), professionalism of academics is essential for its survival and sustainability. But, where is the professionalism of academics? According to Rayner, Fuller, McEwen, & Roberts (2010), with the new expectations and changes of leadership are dynamic. However, academics are not aware of the changes, and left them into more confusion. A professional academician demonstrates the ability professional and helpful to the society and market (Whitchurch, 2010). As a result, the higher education sector becomes more attractive course (Coates, & Goedegebuure, 2012).

Malaysia's Higher Education

Malaysia's higher education sector is guided by the National Higher Education Strategic Plan (NHESP) with the aim to turn Malaysia's higher education from local higher education provides to the global higher education providers. This strategic plan is master plan for the direction of the higher education in Malaysia. However, MOHE (2012) contended that this blueprint for higher education applies the existing National Education Philosophy, which says:

“Education in Malaysia is an on-going effort towards further developing the potential of individuals in a holistic and integrated manner, so as to produce individuals who are intellectually, spiritually, emotionally and physically balanced and harmonic, based on a firm belief in and devotion to God. Such an effort is designed to produce Malaysian citizens who are knowledgeable and competent, who possess high moral standards and who are responsible and capable of achieving high level of personal well-being as well as being able to contribute to the harmony and betterment of the family, the society and the nation at large.”

MOHE (2012) argued that by transforming the higher education into global positioning, it will lay down an important milestone which is “the foundation towards attaining merit and sustainability for the higher education system beyond 2020.” MOHE (2012) outlines seven (7) result areas crucial for the NHESP, namely (1) widening of access to higher education with increasing participation (equity), (2) improving the quality of teaching and learning, (3) Enhancing Research and Innovation, (4) Empowering the Institutions of Higher Education (IHE), (5) Intensifying Internationalisation, (6) Enculturation Lifelong Learning, and (7) Reinforcing Delivery Systems of MOHE. Table 1 summarizes the key thrusts in Malaysia's higher education policy.

Table 1: Key Thrusts in National Higher Education Strategic Plan (NHESP/PSPTN)

Thrust	Agenda
Thrust 1 - Widening of Access and Increasing Equity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Democratization through diversified meritocracy (50% of the population with access to tertiary education; 33% of the workforce with tertiary qualification) • The higher education human capital development fund – prestigious scholarships (for outstanding students) and special scholarships (for specific groups)
Thrust 2 - Improving the Quality of Teaching and Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A national policy on industrial internship for students and industry attachment for lecturers • Periodical improvement of the curriculum, an interactive learning methodology and the widening usage of the English Language • Versatility and marketable graduates • 100,000 PhD holders or equivalent
Thrust 3 - Enhancing Research and Innovation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To develop a critical mass of researchers (100 researchers per 10,000 workforce) • 6 Research Universities • 20 world class Centres of Excellence (CoE) • Innovation culture among students

- 10% of research findings to be commercialised
- Thrust 4 - Empowering the Institutions of Higher Education (IHE)
 - One or two APEX Universities among existing IHEs
 - Three IHEs among the top 100 and one in the top 50 of world renowned universities
 - Autonomy based on Key Performance Indicator under (KPIs)
 - 75% of the lecturers with PhD qualifications
 - Rating of IHE based on KPIs
- Thrust 5 - Intensifying Internationalisation
 - Collaborative networking with foreign IHE
 - An average 10% of overall enrolment consists of international students, especially in private IHE
 - 5% international students in competitive courses
 - Sending students for post-doctoral studies in renowned international universities
 - 15% of the teaching staff to be from foreign countries for research Universities
 - Student mobility with credit transfer
 - Malaysia International Scholarship
- Thrust 6 - Enculturation Lifelong Learning
 - Recognition of lifelong learning through MQF
 - Recognition of Prior Learning Experience
 - Increase participation of lifelong learning by adults
 - Alternative pathways and programme mobility
- Thrust 7 - Reinforcing Delivery Systems of MOHE
 - The MOHE as a facilitator
 - Best delivery system
 - Effective implementation and monitoring
 - KPI performance-based
 - Prudent spending of government allocation
 - Appointment to top management of Public IHE based on merit

Source: MOHE (2012) PSPTN, <http://www.mohe.gov.my/portal/en/info/psptn.html>

The Ministry of Education Malaysia has revised the direction of higher education into Malaysia Education Blueprint (2015-2025) (Higher Education) in 2015. The main reason is due to the national policy that emphasised on people welfare and wellness. The new direction has been emphasised on the goal of higher education is to prepare people for the workforce that imbued with virtue and integrity. Prime Minister of Malaysia YAB Dato' Sri Mohd Najib in his remarks (Ministry of Education, 2015) said:

Education has been key to Malaysia's rapid development. It has provided our citizens with the knowledge, skills, and competencies that have propelled our growth and, with it, our prosperity. However, if we want to achieve our goal of becoming a developed nation by 2020, we must increase both access to and the quality of higher education in Malaysia.

Therefore, all higher education curriculum and co-curriculum are required to align with the 10 shifts:

1. Holistic, Entrepreneurial and Balanced Graduates
2. Talent Excellence
3. Nation of Lifelong Learners
4. Quality Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) Graduates
5. Financial Sustainability
6. Empowered Governance
7. Innovation Ecosystem
8. Global Prominence
9. Globalised Online Learning
10. Transformed Higher Education Delivery

Tawhidic paradigm

Tawhidic paradigm is about Islamic monotheism worldview that the dynamism is actually part of the process to attain ultimate victory in this worldly and the hereafter life. Mohd Kamal Hassan (2010, p.187) explains that Tawhidic paradigm is about Islamic monotheism thinking to serve as the true servant of Allah (*'ibād al-Rahmān*), vicegerents (*khulafā' fī al-ard*), true believers (*al-mu'minūn*) for the sake of betterment of mankind (*khayra ummatin ukhrijat lil-Nās*) (Qur'ān, 3:110) and 'balanced community' (*ummatah wasatan li-takūnū shuhadā' 'alā al-nās*) (Qur'ān, 2:143). Based on Mohd Kamal Hassan (2010) explanation, Tawhidic paradigm outlines the rights, duties and accountability, which is based on the dual roles as servant and vicegerent of Allah.

METHODOLOGY

This paper applies qualitative methodology in data collection. The use of qualitative method through personal interview allows the study to enrich its findings to be more meaningful although it is highly contextual. Essentially, the study is not aim to generalise the findings, particularly in the context of higher education.

This paper explores the critical importance of *Tawhidic* paradigm for academic rights, duties and accountability. The important components about Tawhidic paradigm are sense of duty, sense of responsibility, sense of accountability towards the universal commandment of Allah. In the recent years, academic rights, duties, and accountability (RDA) have been 'aligned' with the commercial objectives of tertiary education. The use of personal interview allows the study to understand the situation and experience on how RDA is being understood, perceived, practiced and projected for future.

The personal interview is reasonable and practical due to the nature of the research, which is to ask the informants to provide their views pertaining to academic rights, duties, and accountability. By doing the personal interview, it provides more 'engaging' mode (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2010), 'evolving' (King & Horrocks, 2010), and 'sensible' (Chambliss & Schutt, 2012).

FINDINGS

This section presents the views of 10 selected representatives of academic staff association that participated in various meetings at the Malaysian Academic Associations Council (MAAC) between 2010-2016 pertaining to academic rights, duties and accountability from the current practices and the way forward from their religious and spirituality perspectives.

Each interview was conducted within 20-30 minutes. Note taking, rather than audio tape recording, was used due to the request of the informants. Nevertheless, the transcribed notes were verified with the informants prior to analysis. Each informant was assigned a code for easy reference. Table 2 summarizes the profile of the informants.

Table 2: Summary of Responses from the Informants

Code	Institution
ARD1	An academic centre from a university of Northern Peninsular
ARD2	An industrial linkage unit from a university of East Coast Peninsular
ARD3	A student development centre of a university from Southern Peninsular
ARD4	A public university in Klang Valley
ARD5	A public university from Northern Peninsular
ARD6	A public university from East Coast Peninsular
ARD7	A public university from Southern Peninsular
ARD8	A public university in Klang Valley
ARD9	A public university in Klang Valley
ARD10	A public university in Klang Valley

ARD 1 argued that not many academicians are aware of their rights as stated in the Federal Constitutions of Malaysia. Even they do not the basic human rights. Since the academic duties and accountability were specified by the university authority, it becomes structured and one-stop-centre. ARD 1 said:

“Academic staff are not trained to know their rights. Their only concerned is to get the research, publication and consultancy done. At the end of the month, they can withdraw money from the ATM machine. When academic association approached them, they gave a lot of reasons for not joining the association. We persuaded them to join us. They argued that the Human Resource office of the university can take care of their welfare. However, when their contracts are not renewed, they know when to get help. Normally we will ask them whether they have our association membership. The association can only represent the members to the top management.”

ARD 1 has a great concern on the attitude of academic staff on their own well-being and welfare. The same concerned shared by ARD 2. As for ARD 2, the levels of awareness still low, especially when academicians just ignore it or too occupied with the routines. ARD 2 stated:

“Academic community has their own ego. They do not need association to champion their welfare. They said that they know how to position and defend themselves. They arrogantly said to us that we are just wasting our time in academic association. We should concentrate on our research, publication and consultancy. Even to attend a get-together event provided with refreshment, they just could not spend some time with colleagues from various faculties. This is our challenge as office bearers of academic staff association.”

The concern of ARD1 on the attitude of academic staff towards managing academic rights through association has been echoed by ARD 2. The same concern expressed by ARD 3. For ARD 3, it is more on the legal protection of academic staff. ARD3 argued that academic rights are similar in terms of human rights and the duties and accountability follow the foundation of human rights. ARD 3 emphasised:

“As a country that practiced democracy, the Federal Constitution has covered the academic rights. The Constitution is superior and supreme law in the country. The labour law is governed by the Constitution. If the labour law is inadequate, we can always seek justice from the Federal courts. What is the big deal to join academic staff union for the sake of protecting our rights? We are not like the supporting and general staff. They need protection from CUEPACS, MTUC, and so on. We can stand on our own.”

Unlike ARD 1, ARD 2, and ARD 3, ARD 4 placed a great interest in aligning the academic rights and the basic duties of academic staff. ARD 4 contended that the basic duties of academic staff are to assist them to make better planning for teaching and learning. ARD 4 said:

“Basic duties of academic staff comprised of teaching, supervision, research, publication, consultancy, and community service. The flexibility given to the academic staff allows them to plan the delivery of the basic duties effectively. Unlike administrative staff, they have to follow the Standard Operating Procedure, time in and out, and all the rigid process. The academic staff must appreciate this freedom.”

While the previous informants are concentrating on individual academic staff and their reaction towards academic staff association, ARD 5 has more interest in reacting towards the regulatory body of higher education. ARD 5 argued that universities have done their best to manage the rights and duties of academic staff. The government through Ministry of Higher Education supervises the delivery of higher education, both public and private higher learning institutions. ARD 5 said:

“Education is essential component of any nation. It is the engine to shape people with thinking, emotion and attitude that supports the national interest. As the country moving towards developed nation status, the education component must follow the megatrend too. The regulation on higher education is to ensure the education sector advanced together with the aspiration of the nation.”

ARD 6 contended that academic rights accompanied with the delivery of duties and responsible for the outcome of the delivery. Indeed, the novelty of academic service delivery lies in the outcome of the education. ARD 6 said:

“We should do our job diligently. Work hard, work smart and work in teamwork to achieve the results. All entities must work together. There should not be any adversarial among important stakeholders.”

ARD 7 has a different opinion about managing academic rights from Islamic perspective. For ARD 7, every aspect of life governed by Islam as the way of life guided by Quran and Ahadith.

“Management is an art. How to manage the academic staff is about managing educated and talented people. The main concern of academic staff is flexibility. Too rigid with documents, forms, and audit from internal and MQA made the academic staff equivalent to factory staff. Islam values educated people. There is a difference between the educated and non-educated. If both are treated similarly, then the institution makes an insult to the intelligence.”

ARD 8 argued that a harmony society emphasised on quality. The management of academic staff should emphasise on quality service to academic staff. ARD 8 said:

“The university, the ministry and the people must work together to determine the kind of people and graduates to be in the market and society. Educated, talented, and responsible people are essential for the nation.”

The concern of ARD 8 has been categorised by ARD 9 as shifting the blame game. ARD 9 stated:

“There should not be a blame game. Some people like to blame others for their dissatisfaction. The reality is complex. People could try their best level. The external environment has moderating role too.”

In a more cynical mode, ARD 10 focused on categorical imperative of duties. ARD 10 mentioned:

“Everyone must learn to respect others. Everyone must practice ethics and virtue. Ethics came from inside instead of outside. What is good inside our heart will be displayed as good also. When we manage our people with good value, our people will be good. The formulae is simple.”

ARD 8, ARD 9, and ARD 10 argued that the management of academic rights, duties and accountability is collective effort.

In short, all the informants argued the management of academic staff with more responsible, dynamic and ethical driven by Tawhidic paradigm in line with the aspiration of higher education. As an important component of the nation, higher education is part of the thrusts of national agenda and they insisted that a proper strategic planning should involve all key stakeholders.

DISCUSSION

The specific roles of academic staffs mentioned by Crosby (2000) are primarily operational in the classroom. Although they are aware of the nature of classroom, they are not aware of the academic rights. As for the duties and accountability, they are aware of them because these values are written in the work guidebook. Although in the recent years, academic rights, duties, and accountability (RDA) have been 'aligned' with the commercial objectives of tertiary education, the academic staffs argued that this approach makes them more presentable in the academic community.

The informants have mixed views about managing academic rights, duties and accountability. ARD 1 always argued on the lack of awareness among the academicians. ARD 2 related the lack of awareness due to the pressure from the higher education providers and regulatory bodies. Gradually, academic staff resorted to legal mechanism to restore their dignity as argued by ARD 4. Nevertheless, ARD 5 pointed that the regulatory bodies of higher education have the final say.

When ARD 6 contended that academic rights should be accompanied with the delivery of duties, ARD 7 provided Islamic solutions. There is strong basis for ARD 7's argument when the modern society is modelling the traditional method of Islamic education (Mokhtar, 2017). The traditional education emphasised on Tawhidic paradigm. Based on Mohd Kamal Hassan (2010) explanation, Tawhidic paradigm outlines the rights, duties and accountability, which is based on the dual roles as servant and vicegerent of Allah. This approach has universalism feature that is acceptable to people with various faiths (Tan & Ibrahim, 2017). Nevertheless, ARD 8, ARD 9, and ARD 10 argued that the management of academic rights, duties and accountability is collective effort.

In recent years, higher education is very much concern on ranking (Hazelkorn, 2015). This is evident in the statement made by ARD 1 and ARD 2 when the academic staff are busy meeting the ranking business. Since they are now into business sector, the higher education needs visibility and competitiveness. The sentiment has been argued by ARD 3, 4 and 5 when the academic community sought legal protection. The benevolent, kindness, and people orientation as emphasised in Islamic education (Mohd Kamal Hassan, 2010) has faded away.

The concern of higher education is how to survive and competitive in the higher education market. ARD 6 is very much concerned on the delivery of service to create, maintain and sustain competitive advantage. This is key changes in higher education (Henkel, 2005) to remain competitive and survived (Henkel, 2007). Originally, higher education is not for commercial (Altbach & Umakoshi, 2004). However, as performance matters for higher education (Hicks, 2012), the started to manage academic staff like any manpower in other productive sectors (Winter, 2009). Malaysia is not spared to focus on internationalization and competitiveness (Lucas, 2017; Altbach & Knight, 2007).

Limitations and Future Research

The study has a few limitations. Firstly, the feedback was from 10 academic staffs and also representatives of academic associations of public universities in Malaysia. Secondly, the informants were interviewed during the break of academic associations meetings. Thirdly, personal interviews were supposed to provide more details, but due to the context of the

interview led to lack breath of the subject matter being studied. Future research may want to consider using cross-sectional data collection method, i.e. closed-ended, scaled-type questionnaires to complement the interview results.

CONCLUSION

This paper has explored the critical importance of *Tawhidic* paradigm for academic rights, duties and accountability. Although the modes of operations have been aligned with commercial interest, the academic rights, duties, and accountability (RDA) remain unchanged. Interestingly, not many academic staffs are aware of their academic rights, duties and accountability. From *Tawhidic* paradigm, education is a *Divine* mechanism to mold and shape thinking, feeling and behaviour of people. The results of the study are significant to the academic staffs, academic managers and the stakeholders to know the duties and responsibilities of academic staffs in today's competitive and dynamic world. The conceptual aspects of the *Tawhidic* paradigm (Islamic monotheism) provide a natural links (natural disposition) with the spirit of *Tawhid* (monotheism) into the academic rights, duties and accountability and then they are integrated with the ethos of *Tawhid* which harmonize other worldly (*Al-Akhirah*) (the Hereafter) and the worldly (*Al-Duniya*). The interview results obtained from 10 selected representatives of academic staff association that participated in various meetings at the Malaysian Academic Associations Council (MAAC) between 2010-2015 suggested that there should be more awareness, education and serious continuous engagement to understand and comprehend the academic rights, duties and accountability from the current practices and the way forward from their religious and spirituality perspectives. The results of the study also shows that the academic rights, duties and accountability are not well comprehend due to survival issues that overwhelmed the members. Nevertheless, the survival issues are not totally value free from religiosity and spirituality rituals and practices.

REFERENCES

- Åkerlind, G. S., & Jenkins, S. (1998). Academics' views of the relative roles and responsibilities of teachers and learners in a first-year university course. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 17(3), 277-289.
- Åkerlind, G. S. (2003). Growing and developing as a university teacher--variation in meaning. *Studies in higher education*, 28(4), 375-390.
- Altbach, P. G., & Umakoshi, T. (2004). *Asian universities: Historical perspectives and contemporary challenges*. JHU Press.
- Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3-4), 290-305.
- Billot, J. (2010). The imagined and the real: Identifying the tensions for academic identity. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 29(6), 709-721.
- Chambliss, D. F., & Schutt, R. K. (2012). *Making sense of the social world: Methods of investigation*. Sage Publications, Incorporated.
- Coates, H., & Goedegebuure, L. (2012). Recasting the academic workforce: why the attractiveness of the academic profession needs to be increased and eight possible strategies for how to go about this from an Australian perspective. *Higher Education*, 1-15.
- Crosby, R. H. J. (2000). AMEE Guide No 20: The good teacher is more than a lecturer-the twelve roles of the teacher. *Medical Teacher*, 22(4), 334-347.

- Doherty, I., Steel, C., & Parrish, D. (2012). The challenges and opportunities for professional societies in higher education in Australasia: A PEST analysis. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 28(1), 105-121.
- Education International (2012) Marginalization, http://www.ei-ie.org/en/websections/content_detail/3247
- Hazelkorn, E. (2015). *Rankings and the reshaping of higher education: The battle for world-class excellence*. Springer.
- Henkel, M. (2005). Academic identity and autonomy in a changing policy environment. *Higher education*, 49(1-2), 155-176.
- Henkel, M. (2007). Can academic autonomy survive in the knowledge society? A perspective from Britain. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 26(1), 87-99.
- Hesse-Biber, S. N., & Leavy, P. (2010). *The practice of qualitative research*. Sage Publications, Incorporated.
- Hicks, D. (2012). Performance-based university research funding systems. *Research Policy*, 41(2), 251-261.
- Kolsaker, A. (2008). Academic professionalism in the managerialist era: A study of English universities. *Studies in Higher Education*, 33(5), 513-525.
- Lafferty, G., & Fleming, J. (2000). The restructuring of academic work in Australia: Power, management and gender. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 21(2), 257-267.
- Lucas, C. M. (2017). Educational Leaders and Partnerships: A Critical Examination of the GLOBE Model for Higher Education Contexts in the Asia Pacific Region. In *University-Community Engagement in the Asia Pacific* (pp. 11-19). Springer International Publishing.
- King, N., & Horrocks, C. (2010). *Interviews in Qualitative Research*. Sage Publications Limited.
- Ministry of Education (2015). *Malaysia Education Blueprint (2015-2025)(Higher Education)*. Putrajaya: Ministry of Education.
- Mohd Kamal Hassan (2010). A return to the Qur'ānic paradigm of development and integrated knowledge: The Ulū al-Albāb model. *Intellectual Discourse*, 18 (2), 183-210.
- Mokhtar, S. B. (2017). Teaching-Learning Model of Islamic Education at Madrasah Based on Mosque in Singapore. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, 7(3), 218-225.
- MOHE (2012). PSPTN, <http://www.mohe.gov.my/portal/en/info/psptn.html>
- O'Neill, G., & McMahon, T. (2005). Student-centred learning: What does it mean for students and lecturers. *Emerging issues in the practice of university learning and teaching*, 1.
- Rayner, S., Fuller, M., McEwen, L., & Roberts, H. (2010). Managing leadership in the UK university: a case for researching the missing professoriate?. *Studies in Higher Education*, 35(6), 617-631.
- SA, G., & Kayrooz, C. (2003). Understanding academic freedom: The views of social scientists. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 22(3), 327-344.
- Tan, C., & Ibrahim, A. (2017). Humanism, Islamic Education, and Confucian Education. *Religious Education*, 1-13.
- Taylor, D., & Miflin, B. (2008). Problem-based learning: Where are we now? *Medical Teacher*, 30(8), 742-763.
- UK Prospect for Higher Education Career. (2012). UK graduate career official website. http://www.prospects.ac.uk/higher_education_lecturer_job_description.htm, 5 Nov 2012

- Williams, K. (2008). Troubling the concept of the 'academic profession' in 21st Century higher education. *Higher Education*, 56(5), 533-544.
- Whitchurch, C., & Gordon, G. (2010). Diversifying academic and professional identities in higher education: Some management challenges. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 16(2), 129-144.
- Whitchurch, C. (2010). Some implications of 'public/private' space for professional identities in higher education. *Higher education*, 60(6), 627-640.
- Winter, R. (2009). Academic manager or managed academic? Academic identity schisms in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 31(2), 121-131.