Read this page first

What this file is. A sample synopsis for the MHUP 014 Dissertation/Project of IGNOU's Master of Arts in Human Values and Ethics (MAHUE), written as study reference. It shows how a proposal can be planned and worded. It is not a proposal you can submit.

Why it follows this structure. On 19 October 2026 IGNOU had not published an MHUP 014 guideline, proforma or list of synopsis parts. The eight parts used here are the ones printed in the MDIP 001 Project Manual of the same School (SOITS), with a section on research ethics added because MHU-007 Research and Innovation Ethics belongs to the MAHUE first year. When SOITS issues the MHUP 014 guideline, follow it wherever it differs from this file.

Square brackets. Every [bracket] is a place for your own facts: your city, your colleges, your sample size, your supervisor and the studies you have read yourself. Nothing in brackets has been filled for you, and no figure in this file is real data.

How it was made. Prepared by the ignouproject.com editorial desk with AI assistance, from the IGNOU Common Prospectus (July 2026), Academic Programme Launch Notification No. 173 (6 February 2026), the MDIP 001 Project Manual (SOITS) and the MHU-004 assignment booklet for TEE December 2026, all read in October 2026. Each reference listed in Part 8 was checked to exist. Published under BK Sahni's editorial responsibility.

Your work stays yours. IGNOU expects original work from the learner. Choose your own topic or rewrite this one completely, collect your own data and write every line yourself.

Topic used in this sample

Ethical reasoning about generative AI in coursework among undergraduate students in [city]: a descriptive survey.

The topic was chosen because three MAHUE courses meet in it: MHU-004 Values and Decision-Making (its TEE December 2026 assignment asks about value conflict in AI), MHU-007 Research and Innovation Ethics and MHU-008 Values and Ethics in Education and Media.

SAMPLE FOR STUDY

Indira Gandhi National Open University

School of Interdisciplinary and Trans-disciplinary Studies (SOITS)

Master of Arts in Human Values and Ethics (MAHUE)

MHUP 014: Dissertation/Project

SYNOPSIS

Ethical Reasoning about Generative AI in Coursework among Undergraduate Students in [City]: A Descriptive Survey

Item	Details
Learner's name	[Your full name]
Enrolment number	[Your enrolment number]
Regional Centre / Study Centre	[Your Regional Centre and Study Centre]
Address, e-mail, mobile	[Your contact details]
Proposed supervisor	[Name, designation, institution]
Session	[Session of MHUP 014 registration]

SAMPLE FOR STUDY REFERENCE — NOT FOR SUBMISSION

1. Topic statement

Generative AI tools that produce essays, summaries and answers on request are now within reach of most undergraduate students. Whether a student uses such a tool to understand a text, to draft an assignment or to hand in work that is not their own is a moral choice as much as a technical one. It asks the student to weigh honesty, fairness to classmates, the purpose of learning and the rules of the institution.

The UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (2021) frames AI use around human rights, human agency and accountability, and UNESCO's Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research (Miao and Holmes, 2023) asks institutions to set age-appropriate and purpose-specific rules. In India the UGC academic integrity regulations of 2018 already treat submitting another's work as one's own as plagiarism. What is less known is how students themselves reason when these values pull in different directions.

This study will describe that reasoning among undergraduate students in [city], using Rest's (1986) account of moral action, in which a person must notice the moral side of a situation, judge what is right, give that judgment priority over other aims and act on it.

2. Research aims and objectives

Aim. To describe how undergraduate students in [city] reason about the ethics of using generative AI tools in their coursework.

Objectives. The objectives are worded neutrally, with no assumption about what the findings will be.

- To study the ways in which undergraduate students in [city] report using generative AI tools for coursework.

SAMPLE FOR STUDY REFERENCE, NOT FOR SUBMISSION

- To identify the values students name when they judge a given use of these tools as acceptable or unacceptable.
- To examine whether students' judgements differ by [discipline / year of study / type of college].
- To explore how far students know and refer to the rules of their own institution when they make these judgements.

Research questions. (a) For which coursework tasks do students use generative AI tools? (b) Which values do they appeal to in judging different uses? (c) Do these judgements vary across [groups]? (d) What part do institutional rules play in their reasoning?

3. Review of the literature

The review will be organised by theme rather than by author, so that it leads to the gap this study addresses.

Theme	What will be reviewed	Source to start from
Ethical principles for AI	Human rights, agency, transparency and accountability as principles for AI use	UNESCO (2021)
Generative AI in education	Institutional guidance on validated use, age limits and academic integrity	Miao and Holmes (2023)
Academic integrity in India	How Indian regulation defines plagiarism and the duties of institutions	UGC (2018)
How people reason morally	Moral sensitivity, judgement, motivation and character as components of moral action	Rest (1986)
Studies of students and AI	[Recent empirical studies you have located and read yourself]	[Your sources]

[Add eight to twelve recent studies, published in the last five years where possible, that you have read in full. Give each one a sentence on what it found and a sentence on what it leaves open. Do not cite a study you have not read.]

SAMPLE FOR STUDY REFERENCE, NOT FOR SUBMISSION

Gap. [State, from your own review, what the studies you read do not yet show about undergraduate students in your region or in your type of college.]

4. Study design

A descriptive survey design will be used, because the objectives ask what students do and how they reason, not whether one factor causes another.

Element	Plan
Population	Undergraduate students enrolled in [number] colleges of [city] in the [year] academic session
Sample size	[n] students, justified by [time available / access / guidance from your supervisor]
Sampling	[Stratified by discipline / convenience sampling within selected colleges], with the reason for the choice
Period of study	[Month, year] to [month, year]
Delimitations	Undergraduates only; coursework only, not examinations; [city] only

5. Research methods

Tool. A questionnaire prepared by the researcher, in three parts: (i) background details without names; (ii) short scenarios, each describing one use of a generative AI tool, followed by a rating of how acceptable the respondent finds it and the main reason for that rating; (iii) one open question on how the respondent decides.

Link to the framework. Each scenario will be written to bring out one of Rest's four components, so that the analysis can show where students' reasoning is strong and where it weakens.

Pilot. The questionnaire will be tried with [n] students outside the sample and revised before use.

Analysis. Frequencies and percentages for the ratings; cross-tabulation by [groups] for Objective 3; the open answers grouped into themes and

SAMPLE FOR STUDY REFERENCE, NOT FOR SUBMISSION

counted. [Name any statistical test only if your supervisor agrees it suits your data.]

Limitations. Self-reported behaviour may differ from actual behaviour; a sample from [city] cannot stand for all Indian undergraduates.

6. Research ethics

- Each respondent will read a short consent statement and may decline or stop at any point.
- No names, roll numbers or contact details will be recorded on the questionnaire.
- Permission will be sought from [the principal of each college] before students are approached.
- Responses will be kept by the researcher alone and used only for this dissertation.
- The questionnaire will not ask any student to admit to breaking a rule of their institution.

7. Tentative chapter outline

Chapter	Contents
1	Introduction: background, problem, objectives, research questions, significance
2	Review of literature and the framework
3	Research design and methods, including research ethics
4	Analysis and interpretation of the data
5	Findings, conclusions, suggestions and limitations
	References and appendices (questionnaire, consent statement, permission letters)

SAMPLE FOR STUDY REFERENCE, NOT FOR SUBMISSION

8. References

Indira Gandhi National Open University. (2026). *Common Prospectus, July 2026*. New Delhi: IGNOU.

Miao, F., and Holmes, W. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. Paris: UNESCO.

Rest, J. R. (1986). *Moral development: Advances in research and theory*. New York: Praeger.

UNESCO. (2021). *Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence*. Paris: UNESCO.

University Grants Commission. (2018). *UGC (Promotion of Academic Integrity and Prevention of Plagiarism in Higher Educational Institutions) Regulations, 2018*. New Delhi: UGC.

[Your own sources, in the same style throughout.]

Appendix: two example scenarios (study reference)

Write your own scenarios. These two only show the form.

Scenario A. A student reads a difficult chapter, asks an AI tool to explain three terms in simpler words, and then writes the assignment in their own words. How acceptable is this? (1 not at all acceptable to 5 fully acceptable). What is the main reason for your answer?

Scenario B. A student asks an AI tool to write a complete assignment, changes a few words and submits it under their own name. How acceptable is this? (1 to 5). What is the main reason for your answer?

SAMPLE · STUDY REFERENCE · NOT FOR SUBMISSION