**International Journal of Commerce and Management Research**
**www.managejournal.com**
**E-ISSN: 2455-1627**
**Received: 11-09-2026, Accepted: 11-10-2026, Published: 26-10-2026**
**Volume 12, Issue 4, 2026, Page No. 176-182**

# A study on the impact of frequent changes in academic syllabus among college students and teachers at Thiruvalluvar College, Papanasam

**M Kalyani[1], Dr. A Ponmozhi[2]**
[1] Research Scholar, Department of Commerce, Thiruvalluvar College, Affiliated to Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Abishekapatti, Papanasam, Tamil Nadu, India
[2] Associate Professor & Head, Department of Commerce, Thiruvalluvar College, Affiliated to Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Abishekapatti, Papanasam, Tamil Nadu, India

**Abstract**
Curriculum development and syllabus revision are essential components of higher education, enabling academic institutions to respond to emerging knowledge, changing societal needs, technological advancements, and evolving professional requirements. However, frequent changes in academic syllabi may create challenges for students and teachers, particularly when revisions are introduced without adequate preparation, consultation, or institutional support. The present study examines the issue of frequent changes in academic syllabi among students and teachers at Thiruvalluvar College, Papanasam. It focuses on the demographic and professional profiles of the respondents, students' perceptions of syllabus changes, and the implications of curriculum revision for teaching and learning. The study adopts a descriptive research approach and employs simple random sampling, with a sample comprising 152 students and 43 teachers. The available data indicate that 58% of the student respondents perceive syllabus changes positively, while 26% remain neutral, 12% express a very positive perception, and 4% report a negative perception. The findings suggest that syllabus revision may be viewed favourably by a considerable proportion of students, although the available descriptive data do not establish its direct effects on academic performance, teacher workload, or learning outcomes. The study recommends systematic curriculum reviews, stakeholder consultation, phased implementation, professional development for teachers, and continuous evaluation of revised syllabi. These measures may help educational institutions balance academic innovation with curricular stability and improve the overall teaching-learning experience.

**Keywords:** Academic syllabus, curriculum revision, higher education, college students, teachers, teaching-learning process, curriculum development, Thiruvalluvar College

## Introduction

Education is a dynamic process that requires continuous improvement in curriculum design, instructional practices, assessment methods, and learning resources. In higher education, the academic syllabus serves as a fundamental framework for organising course content, identifying learning objectives, determining instructional priorities, and establishing the expected outcomes of a programme of study. It provides direction to both teachers and students by outlining the knowledge, skills, concepts, and competencies to be developed during an academic period.

Syllabus design is an important aspect of the teaching-learning process because it determines what should be taught, how the content should be organised, and which instructional approaches may be appropriate for achieving the intended learning outcomes. The selection and organisation of syllabus content require careful consideration of the nature of the discipline, the academic level of learners, available resources, and the educational objectives of the institution.

A syllabus is not merely a list of topics to be covered during a semester. It also communicates the expectations of a course, the scope of learning, the methods of assessment, and the relationship between individual learning activities and broader educational objectives. As Nilson observes in her discussion of effective course design, a syllabus can function as both a guide to the academic journey and a means of stimulating students' interest in learning. The precise source and wording of this quotation should be verified before publication.

In contemporary higher education, syllabus revision has become increasingly important because of developments in knowledge, technology, research, employment requirements, and interdisciplinary learning. Regular revision can help institutions remove outdated content, introduce emerging concepts, improve the relevance of courses, and strengthen students' academic and professional competencies.

Nevertheless, frequent syllabus changes may also create difficulties. Students may experience uncertainty regarding examination preparation, learning priorities, recommended textbooks, and the expectations associated with revised courses. Teachers may need to redesign lesson plans, identify new teaching materials, revise assessments, and familiarise themselves with unfamiliar content within limited periods.

The impact of syllabus changes may depend on several factors, including the frequency and extent of revisions, the time available for implementation, the nature of the subject, the availability of learning resources, and the effectiveness of communication between educational authorities, teachers, and students.

At the institutional level, curriculum revision requires coordination among academic departments, faculty members, administrators, and other stakeholders. When revisions are planned systematically and communicated

clearly, they may create opportunities for academic improvement. Conversely, poorly coordinated changes may disrupt the teaching-learning process and increase the demands placed on students and teachers.

Against this background, the present study examines the issue of frequent changes in academic syllabi among students and teachers at Thiruvalluvar College, Papanasam. It seeks to understand students' perceptions of syllabus changes and to identify institutional strategies that may facilitate effective curriculum revision while maintaining continuity, clarity, and academic quality.

**Statement of the Problem**

The academic syllabus plays a central role in determining the content, organisation, and direction of higher education. Although syllabus revision is necessary to maintain academic relevance, frequent changes may create practical challenges for both students and teachers. The nature and extent of these challenges depend on the timing of revisions, the amount of content modified, the availability of learning resources, and the support provided during implementation.

For students, frequent revisions may require adjustments in study plans, learning materials, examination preparation, and the allocation of time to different subjects. Students may also experience difficulties when prescribed textbooks, assessment patterns, or course expectations change without sufficient advance notice.

For teachers, syllabus changes may require modifications to lesson plans, teaching methodologies, instructional materials, and assessment practices. These adjustments may increase preparation time and create additional professional demands, particularly when changes are introduced during an ongoing semester or without adequate training.

At the same time, syllabus revision can offer important opportunities for improvement by incorporating contemporary knowledge, strengthening practical learning, and aligning academic programmes with changing educational and professional requirements.

The central problem, therefore, is not simply whether academic syllabi should be changed, but how frequently such changes should occur, how they should be implemented, and how their effects on the teaching-learning process can be evaluated.

The present study focuses on Thiruvalluvar College, Papanasam, and examines the issue of frequent syllabus changes from the perspectives of students and teachers. It aims to provide an institutional basis for understanding stakeholder perceptions and developing recommendations for more effective curriculum planning and implementation.

**Review of Literature**

Curriculum development and syllabus design have long been recognised as important areas of educational research. Existing discussions of curriculum planning emphasise the need to establish clear educational objectives, organise learning experiences systematically, and evaluate whether intended outcomes have been achieved.

**1. Curriculum Planning and Educational Objectives**

Curriculum planning involves the identification of educational goals, the selection of appropriate content, the organisation of learning experiences, and the evaluation of outcomes. A well-designed syllabus provides a structured framework for implementing these elements. Regular evaluation can help institutions determine whether course content remains relevant and whether learning objectives continue to meet the needs of students.

**2. Syllabus Revision and Academic Relevance**

Syllabus revision may improve the relevance of higher education by incorporating new developments in a discipline, removing outdated material, and strengthening the relationship between theoretical knowledge and practical application. However, revisions are more likely to be implemented effectively when they are supported by clear academic objectives, adequate preparation time, and suitable learning resources.

**3. Student Adaptation to Curriculum Changes**

Students need clear information about course requirements, learning objectives, assessment methods, and prescribed materials. Changes in these elements may require students to modify their learning strategies and study schedules. The extent to which students adapt successfully may depend on the clarity of communication, the accessibility of resources, and the time available to respond to the revisions.

**4. Teacher Preparedness and Professional Demands**

Teachers play a central role in translating syllabus requirements into classroom practice. Curriculum revisions may require them to update subject knowledge, prepare new instructional materials, modify assessment practices, and develop alternative teaching strategies. Professional development and collaboration among faculty members may support the effective implementation of revised syllabi.

**5. Need for Institutional Evaluation**

Systematic evaluation is necessary to determine whether syllabus changes achieve their intended educational purposes. Such evaluation may include student feedback, teacher feedback, examination performance, curriculum coverage, and the adequacy of teaching resources. Evidence-based evaluation can help institutions distinguish beneficial revisions from changes that introduce unnecessary disruption.

Note: This review provides a thematic synthesis. For a journal submission requiring a formal literature review, each theme should be supported by verified scholarly publications. The specific references supplied in the original manuscript are listed in Section 13 but require bibliographic verification.

**Research Gap**

Curriculum revision is an important aspect of academic development, but the effectiveness of revision depends on how changes are planned, communicated, and implemented. While syllabus changes may be intended to improve educational quality, their practical implications for students and teachers require institutional examination.

The present study addresses this issue in the context of Thiruvalluvar College, Papanasam, by bringing together information on student perceptions and the demographic and professional profiles of students and teachers.

A specific evidence gap remains in the available dataset: although student perceptions of syllabus changes are reported, detailed responses concerning teacher workload, academic performance, learning difficulties, satisfaction, and adaptation are not provided. Similarly, the available teacher data primarily describe demographic and professional characteristics rather than their direct experiences of curriculum revision.

Accordingly, this study provides a preliminary descriptive account and identifies areas requiring further investigation. A more comprehensive assessment of the impact of frequent syllabus changes would require additional survey items and, where appropriate, statistical analysis of the responses.

**Objectives of the Study**

The study is guided by the following objectives:

1. To examine the demographic and professional profiles of students and teachers at Thiruvalluvar College, Papanasam.
2. To assess students' perceptions of frequent changes in academic syllabi.
3. To identify potential challenges and opportunities associated with syllabus revision in higher education.
4. To examine the implications of syllabus changes for curriculum planning and the teaching-learning process.
5. To suggest practical strategies for minimising avoidable disruption and improving the implementation of revised syllabi.

**Research Questions**

The study seeks to address the following questions:

1. What are the demographic and professional characteristics of the student and teacher respondents?
2. How do students perceive changes in academic syllabi?
3. What potential academic and professional challenges may arise from frequent syllabus revisions?
4. What institutional measures may help students and teachers adapt effectively to revised syllabi?

The third and fourth questions are addressed through conceptual analysis and recommendations. They cannot be conclusively answered from the descriptive tables alone.

**Scope of the Study**

The study is confined to Thiruvalluvar College, Papanasam, Tamil Nadu. It focuses on students and teachers associated with the institution and considers the issue of frequent changes in academic syllabi within the context of higher education.

The scope includes the demographic characteristics of the respondents, students' reported perceptions of syllabus changes, and the institutional implications of curriculum revision. It also considers measures that may support effective implementation, including advance communication, faculty development, collaborative planning, and periodic syllabus evaluation.

The study is intended to provide an institutional perspective rather than to establish conclusions applicable to all colleges or universities. Its findings should therefore be interpreted within the limits of the sample and the information available.

**Research Methodology**

**1. Research Design**

The study adopts a descriptive research design. This approach is suitable for presenting the characteristics of respondents and summarising their reported perceptions using frequencies and percentages.

**2. Study Area**

The study was conducted in the context of Thiruvalluvar College, Papanasam, Tamil Nadu, India.

**3. Population of the Study**

The study population comprises students and teachers at Thiruvalluvar College, Papanasam. The total population size from which the sample was selected was not specified in the information supplied.

**4. Sample Size**

The study includes 195 respondents, consisting of two groups:

- **Students:** 152 respondents.
- **Teachers:** 43 respondents.

These groups are analysed separately wherever the relevant characteristics differ.

**5. Sampling Technique**

Simple random sampling is reported as the sampling technique adopted for the study. Under this method, eligible members of the defined population are selected through a random procedure.

For publication, the researchers should specify the sampling frame, the selection procedure, and whether simple random sampling was applied independently to the student and teacher groups.

**6. Sources of Data**

The study presents respondent-profile information and student-perception data supplied for the research. The original data-collection instrument, survey dates, and procedures used to administer the questionnaire were not specified in the material available for revision. These details should be added from the actual research records.

**7. Tools for Data Analysis**

The study uses simple descriptive statistical techniques, particularly frequency distributions and percentages, to present the available data.

The percentage is calculated using the following formula:

Percentage = (Number of respondents in a category / Total respondent in the relevant group) × 100.

No inferential statistical test is reported because the necessary item-level data and test results were not supplied.

**8. Ethical Considerations**

The study should follow appropriate research ethics, including voluntary participation, informed consent, confidentiality, and the responsible presentation of findings. The authors should add details of any institutional approval,

ethics review, or consent procedure applicable to the actual research.

## Data Analysis and Interpretation

### 1. Age Distribution of Student Respondents

**Table 1:** Age-wise distribution of student respondents

| Age group | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| 18–19 years | 80 | 53% |
| 20–21 years | 49 | 32% |
| 22–23 years | 21 | 14% |
| Above 23 years | 2 | 1% |
| Total | 152 | 100% |

**Source:** Primary data as supplied by the researchers.

Table 1 presents the age distribution of the student respondents. The largest group consists of students aged 18–19 years, representing 80 respondents (53%). Students aged 20–21 years account for 49 respondents (32%), while 21 respondents (14%) belong to the 22–23 age group. Only two respondents (1%) are above 23 years of age.
The distribution indicates that the sample predominantly comprises students aged 18–21 years. This profile provides the demographic context for interpreting the student-perception data.

### 2. Age Distribution of Teacher Respondents

**Table 2:** Age-wise distribution of teacher respondents

| Age group | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| 25–35 years | 13 | 30% |
| 36–45 years | 11 | 25% |
| 46–55 years | 14 | 33% |
| Above 55 years | 5 | 12% |
| Total | 43 | 100% |

**Source:** Primary data as supplied by the researchers.

Table 2 shows that 14 teachers (33%) belong to the 46–55 age group, constituting the largest category. Thirteen respondents (30%) are aged 25–35 years, while 11 respondents (25%) fall within the 36–45 age group. Five respondents (12%) are above 55 years of age.
The distribution demonstrates that the teacher sample includes respondents from different age groups and levels of professional maturity. However, age distribution alone does not establish differences in attitudes towards syllabus changes.

### 3. Gender Distribution of Student Respondents

**Table 3:** Gender-wise distribution of student respondents

| Gender | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Male | 69 | 45% |
| Female | 83 | 55% |
| Total | 152 | 100% |

**Source:** Primary data as supplied by the researchers.

Table 3 indicates that 83 students (55%) are female and 69 students (45%) are male. Female respondents constitute the larger proportion of the student sample.
The gender distribution describes the composition of the respondents. Further analysis would be required to determine whether perceptions of syllabus changes differ by gender.

### 4. Gender Distribution of Teacher Respondents

**Table 4:** Gender-wise distribution of teacher respondents

| Gender | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Male | 14 | 33% |
| Female | 29 | 67% |
| Total | 43 | 100% |

**Source:** Primary data as supplied by the researchers.

Table 4 shows that 29 teachers (67%) are female, while 14 teachers (33%) are male. Female teachers constitute approximately two-thirds of the teacher sample.
This information describes the gender composition of the participating teachers but does not independently indicate their experiences of curriculum revision.

### 5. Distribution of Students by Course Type

**Table 5:** Classification of student respondents by course type

| Course type | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Regular | 112 | 74% |
| Self-financing | 40 | 26% |
| Total | 152 | 100% |

**Source:** Primary data as supplied by the researchers.

Table 5 indicates that 112 students (74%) belong to regular courses, whereas 40 students (26%) belong to self-financing courses.
The sample therefore includes students from both course categories, with a greater representation of students from regular courses. A comparison of perceptions across the two categories would require separate syllabus-perception data for each group.

### 6. Distribution of Teachers by Course Type

**Table 6:** Classification of teacher respondents by course type

| Course type | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Regular | 20 | 47% |
| Self-financing | 23 | 53% |
| Total | 43 | 100% |

**Source:** Primary data as supplied by the researchers.

Table 6 shows that 23 teachers (53%) are associated with self-financing courses and 20 teachers (47%) are associated with regular courses.
The distribution indicates that the teacher sample contains respondents from both categories, with a slightly higher representation of teachers associated with self-financing courses.

### 7. Students' Perceptions of Syllabus Changes

**Table 7:** Student perceptions of changes in academic syllabi

| Perception | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Very positive | 18 | 12% |
| Positive | 89 | 58% |
| Neutral | 39 | 26% |
| Negative | 6 | 4% |
| Total | 152 | 100% |

**Source:** Primary data as supplied by the researchers.

Table 7 presents students' reported perceptions of academic syllabus changes. The largest category consists of students

with a positive perception, accounting for 89 respondents (58%). Eighteen respondents (12%) report a very positive perception, while 39 respondents (26%) remain neutral. Six respondents (4%) express a negative perception.

When the positive and very positive categories are combined, 107 students, representing approximately 70.4% of the sample, express favourable perceptions. Neutral respondents constitute approximately 25.7%, while the negative category accounts for approximately 3.9%.

The results indicate that favourable perceptions predominate among the student respondents. However, the table does not clarify whether respondents evaluated the frequency of changes, the value of syllabus revision, or their personal experience of the changes. Consequently, the findings should be interpreted as reported perceptions rather than direct evidence that frequent revisions improve academic performance or reduce learning difficulties.

### 8. Teaching Experience of Teacher Respondents

**Table 8:** Distribution of teachers by years of teaching experience

| Teaching experience | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| 1–2 years | 3 | 7% |
| 3–4 years | 5 | 12% |
| 5–10 years | 15 | 35% |
| Above 10 years | 20 | 46% |
| Total | 43 | 100% |

**Source:** Primary data as supplied by the researchers.

Table 8 indicates that 20 teachers (46%) have more than ten years of teaching experience. Fifteen teachers (35%) have between five and ten years of experience, while five respondents (12%) have three to four years of experience. Three teachers (7%) have one to two years of teaching experience.

The findings show that the largest group consists of teachers with more than ten years of professional experience. Their participation may provide opportunities for further investigation into how curriculum revisions are experienced across different stages of a teaching career. Nevertheless, the present data do not directly measure their views on syllabus changes.

### Major Findings of the Study

The major findings derived from the available descriptive data are presented below:

1. **Age of student respondents:** The majority of students, 80 respondents (53%), belong to the 18–19 age group.

2. **Age of teacher respondents:** The largest age category among teachers is 46–55 years, comprising 14 respondents (33%).

3. **Gender distribution of students:** Female students constitute 83 respondents (55%), while male students account for 69 respondents (45%).

4. **Gender distribution of teachers:** Female teachers represent 29 respondents (67%), whereas male teachers account for 14 respondents (33%).

5. **Course type among students:** Most student respondents, 112 (74%), are enrolled in regular courses, while 40 (26%) belong to self-financing courses.

6. **Course type among teachers:** A slightly higher proportion of teacher respondents, 23 (53%), are associated with self-financing courses, compared with 20 (47%) associated with regular courses.

7. **Student perceptions:** A total of 89 students (58%) report a positive perception of syllabus changes, while 18 (12%) report a very positive perception. Combined, the two favourable categories account for approximately 70.4% of the student sample.

8. **Neutral and negative perceptions:** Thirty-nine students (26%) report a neutral perception, while six (4%) report a negative perception.

9. **Teaching experience:** Twenty teachers (46%) have more than ten years of teaching experience, constituting the largest category in the teacher sample.

10. **Need for further evaluation:** The available data describe respondent characteristics and student perceptions but do not establish the direct effects of syllabus changes on examination results, student engagement, teacher workload, or overall educational satisfaction.

### Suggestions and Recommendations

Based on the research problem, the available findings, and the broader considerations associated with curriculum planning, the following recommendations are proposed.

#### 1. Establish a Systematic Syllabus Review Mechanism

Educational institutions should establish a structured process for reviewing academic syllabi at appropriate intervals. Reviews may be conducted annually or according to the academic regulations of the affiliating university. Each review should assess the relevance of existing content, the achievement of learning outcomes, and the need for modification.

#### 2. Maintain a Balance Between Innovation and Stability

Syllabus revision should introduce necessary academic improvements without creating avoidable instability. Core concepts and essential competencies should be preserved unless there is a clear academic justification for changing them. New topics should be integrated in a planned manner that maintains coherence across the course.

#### 3. Consult Teachers and Students

Teachers and students should be given appropriate opportunities to provide feedback before major syllabus revisions are finalised. Faculty members can identify practical difficulties associated with content coverage, assessment, and teaching resources, while students can report learning needs and challenges. Such consultation can improve the relevance and implementability of revised syllabi.

#### 4. Communicate Changes in Advance

Revised syllabi, course objectives, reading lists, assessment patterns, and implementation dates should be communicated clearly and sufficiently in advance. Where possible, institutions should provide a comparison of the previous and

revised syllabi so that students and teachers can identify the changes easily.

**5. Introduce Changes Through a Planned Transition**

Major revisions should be implemented according to a clear transition plan. Teachers should receive adequate preparation time, and students should be informed about the implications of the revised syllabus for their studies and assessments. Appropriate transitional arrangements should be considered where permitted by the relevant academic regulations.

**6. Provide Professional Development for Teachers**

Faculty development programmes, orientation sessions, workshops, and departmental meetings should be organised when significant syllabus revisions are introduced. Such programmes can help teachers understand new content, identify appropriate teaching strategies, and develop suitable learning materials.

**7. Improve Access to Learning Resources**

Libraries, departmental collections, digital repositories, and learning management systems should be updated to support revised syllabi. Where new textbooks or resources are prescribed, institutions should make reasonable efforts to ensure that students can access them.

**8. Encourage Departmental Collaboration**

Faculty members within departments and related disciplines should collaborate during syllabus planning and implementation. Sharing teaching materials, lesson plans, assessment methods, and classroom experiences can reduce duplication of effort and improve consistency in course delivery.

**9. Monitor the Effects of Curriculum Revision**

Institutions should assess the effectiveness of syllabus changes through student feedback, teacher feedback, curriculum coverage, assessment outcomes, and other relevant indicators. Such evaluation should distinguish between the intended benefits of revision and any implementation difficulties that emerge.

**10. Avoid Unnecessary Mid-Semester Changes**

Changes that substantially affect course content or assessment requirements should, wherever possible, be introduced at an appropriate academic transition point. Urgent revisions may occasionally be necessary, but they should be accompanied by clear instructions and adequate support for the stakeholders concerned.

**11. Develop a Feedback and Grievance Mechanism**

Institutions should provide a transparent mechanism through which students and teachers can communicate concerns about syllabus implementation. Feedback should be reviewed by the appropriate academic authorities and used to identify practical improvements.

**12. Strengthen Evidence-Based Curriculum Decisions**

Curriculum revision should be guided by academic objectives, disciplinary developments, stakeholder feedback, and evidence of educational need. Changes should not be introduced merely for the sake of frequent updating. Their intended purpose, implementation requirements, and expected outcomes should be clearly established.

**Educational Implications**

The study highlights the importance of considering both academic improvement and implementation feasibility when revising higher education syllabi.

For institutional administrators, the findings reinforce the need for transparent communication, systematic planning, and stakeholder participation. Clear procedures can help ensure that revisions are implemented consistently across departments and course categories.

For teachers, structured implementation and appropriate professional support may reduce uncertainty and facilitate the preparation of effective teaching materials. Collaboration among faculty members may also help departments respond more efficiently to changes in academic requirements.

For students, access to clear course information, updated learning resources, and advance notice of revisions can support effective study planning and academic engagement.

For curriculum developers and affiliating universities, the study points to the value of assessing the practical implications of syllabus changes rather than evaluating revisions solely in terms of their content. The success of curriculum reform depends not only on what is changed but also on how the change is communicated, supported, and evaluated.

These implications are recommendations arising from the research problem and descriptive findings. Their effectiveness would need to be assessed through further empirical investigation.

**Limitations of the Study**

The present study has several limitations that should be considered when interpreting its findings.

First, the study is confined to Thiruvalluvar College, Papanasam. Its findings cannot automatically be generalised to other colleges or universities.

Second, the sample comprises 152 students and 43 teachers, but the total population and detailed sampling frame have not been specified in the information available.

Third, the supplied data include demographic characteristics, student perceptions, and teachers' years of experience. Detailed item-level data concerning academic performance, learning difficulties, teacher workload, student satisfaction, and the actual frequency of syllabus revisions are not available.

Fourth, the student-perception categories do not clearly establish whether the respondents evaluated the frequency of changes, the usefulness of syllabus revision, or their overall experience of curriculum changes.

Fifth, the available information does not include the survey instrument, data-collection dates, reliability assessment, or inferential statistical analysis. Therefore, the study cannot establish causal relationships between syllabus changes and educational outcomes.

Finally, the findings are descriptive and should be interpreted accordingly. Further research involving additional institutions, clearly defined measures of syllabus change, and detailed student and teacher responses would provide a more comprehensive understanding of the issue.

**Suggestions for Further Research**

Future research may extend the present study in the following directions:

1. Conduct comparative studies across colleges affiliated with different universities to identify variations in the implementation of syllabus revisions.
2. Examine the relationship between the frequency of syllabus changes and students' academic performance using appropriate longitudinal or comparative data.
3. Investigate the effects of syllabus revision on teachers' workload, lesson preparation, assessment practices, and professional development requirements.
4. Compare the perceptions of students and teachers across regular and self-financing courses.
5. Study differences in adaptation across disciplines, academic years, and levels of study.
6. Examine whether advance communication, faculty orientation, and access to updated learning resources improve the implementation of revised syllabi.
7. Develop and validate a questionnaire specifically designed to measure the frequency, extent, perceived usefulness, and practical consequences of syllabus changes.
8. Use suitable inferential statistical methods when the research questions, sampling design, and collected data justify their application.

These directions may help develop a more detailed evidence base for curriculum planning and educational policy.

**Conclusion**

Syllabus revision is an essential component of higher education because academic institutions must respond to developments in knowledge, teaching practices, technology, and professional requirements. Nevertheless, the effectiveness of curriculum revision depends on the manner in which changes are planned, communicated, implemented, and evaluated.

The present study examines the issue of frequent changes in academic syllabi among students and teachers at Thiruvalluvar College, Papanasam. The descriptive findings show that the largest proportion of student respondents, 58%, report a positive perception of syllabus changes, while 12% report a very positive perception. A further 26% remain neutral, and 4% express a negative perception. The sample also includes students and teachers from different age groups, gender categories, course types, and levels of teaching experience.

These findings indicate that favourable perceptions of syllabus changes predominate among the participating students. However, they should not be interpreted as evidence that frequent revisions necessarily improve learning outcomes or that they have no adverse effects. The available data do not directly establish the impact of syllabus changes on academic achievement, student engagement, teacher workload, or educational satisfaction.

The study therefore emphasises the importance of a balanced approach to curriculum development. Educational institutions should retain the flexibility to introduce necessary academic improvements while ensuring that changes are academically justified, communicated in advance, and supported by appropriate resources and professional development.

Regular curriculum reviews, stakeholder consultation, collaborative planning, planned transitions, and systematic evaluation can help institutions identify the need for revision while minimising avoidable disruption. Such measures may contribute to a more coherent and responsive teaching-learning environment.

Ultimately, effective syllabus revision should be guided by the educational needs of students, the professional requirements of teachers, and the broader objectives of higher education. A systematic and evidence-based approach can help maintain academic relevance while preserving the continuity and stability required for effective teaching and learning.

**References**


1. Chou C, Chou H. E-learning adoption and its impact on student adaptation to syllabus changes in higher education. Computers in Education, 140, Article 103607. Skaalvik EM, Skaalvik S. Teacher stress and burnout: A review of the literature. Educational Psychology Review,2019:31(4):793–815.
2. Tomas LL, Ferreira P. Exploring student perceptions of syllabus changes and their impact on learning outcomes. Higher Education Research & Development,2019:38(4):827–839.
3. Zhao Y, Liu Y. Curriculum reform in China: Policy and practice. Springer, 2019.