Before and after: an IGNOU project correction on a sample MMPP-001 synopsis

Read this page first

This file shows what an IGNOU project correction does to a synopsis draft. Part A is a short draft written the way many drafts reach us, with six problems marked. Part B lists each change and the MMPP-001 guideline line behind it. Part C is the corrected synopsis, laid out in the order the MMPP-001 guidelines list the parts of a synopsis.

The topic, the city, the sample size and the period are invented for this file, so they appear in [square brackets]. Replace every bracket with your own facts. The file contains no data, no findings and no references, because those can only come from your own work.

This is study reference. Do not submit it, or any part of it, as your own synopsis. Your synopsis must be your own work, your guide signs the proforma, and an IGNOU evaluator decides whether it is approved.

Prepared by the ignouproject.com editorial desk with AI assistance, from the MMPP-001 Project Course guidelines of the School of Management Studies, IGNOU (central copy on ignou.ac.in, read in November 2026), and checked against those guidelines by the desk. Published under the editorial responsibility of BK Sahni. ignouproject.com is run by IGNOU Project (Chakradhar Publication, Proprietor: Bhavya Kumar Sahni) and is not affiliated with IGNOU. No IGNOU logo is used.

SAMPLE FOR STUDY REFERENCE
NOT FOR SUBMISSION

Part A. The draft as it reached the desk

Title on the draft: *Quick commerce returns in [city]*. Title written on the proforma: *A study of refund problems faced by quick commerce users*. [1]

Objectives on the draft: (a) To prove that late refunds make customers leave quick commerce apps. [2] (b) To show customers are unhappy with return rules. [2]

Methodology on the draft: A survey will be done with a questionnaire. Data will be analysed with suitable tools. [3] [4]

Sample on the draft: 100 people. [5]

References on the draft: mixed styles, two websites without dates, one book cited in the text but missing from the list. [6]

Part B. What the correction changed, and why

No.	What the draft had	What the correction did	MMPP-001 guideline line it rests on
1	Two different titles: one on the synopsis, one on the proforma	One title, written the same way on the synopsis and the proforma	The report must carry the title approved by the evaluator; no change is allowed at submission, so the title is settled at synopsis stage
2	Objectives that assume the answer ("to prove", "to show customers are unhappy")	Objectives rewritten with neutral verbs: to study, to examine, to analyse	Objectives are to be expressed neutrally, without implicit assumptions about the findings
3	No research design, no nature and source of data	Design named (descriptive survey) and data sources named (primary survey data)	The methodology must cover research design and the nature and source of data
4	"Suitable tools" with no link to objectives	Each statistical tool tied to the objective it answers	Statistical tools are listed with their relevance to the objectives
5	A number with no population, no sampling technique and no reason	Population, technique and rationale written, with the size left in brackets for the student	Sample and sampling technique are given with the rationale for the choice
6	Mixed reference styles, missing entries	One consistent style; every in-text source listed once	The guidelines list Reference/Bibliography as a section but name no style, so the desk uses one consistent style

SAMPLE FOR STUDY REFERENCE ONLY NOT FOR SUBMISSION

The proforma also gets a box-by-box read: enrolment number, study centre, regional centre, subject area (Marketing for this topic), topic, supervisor details, the number of students the supervisor already guides, and both signatures with dates. The MMPP-001 proforma says a proposal without the supervisor's complete signed bio-data will not be entertained, unless the supervisor is an approved academic counsellor.

SAMPLE FOR STUDY REFERENCE
NOT FOR SUBMISSION

Part C. The corrected synopsis

Title: Refund and return experiences of quick commerce grocery customers in [city]: a study of [period]

1. Introduction

[Two or three paragraphs in your own words: what quick commerce grocery delivery is, how returns and refunds work on the apps you study, and why the topic matters for marketing management. Cite every source you use.]

2. Rationale of the study

[Why this study is worth doing in [city]: the gap you found in the studies you read, and who can use the result. Keep it to what your reading supports.]

3. Objectives

(a) To study the return and refund procedures that customers in [city] report on the quick commerce grocery apps they use.

(b) To examine the relationship between the time taken for a refund and customers' stated intention to keep using the app.

(c) To analyse differences in refund experience across age groups and order frequency.

4. Research methodology

4.1 Research design: descriptive survey design.

4.2 Nature and source of data: primary data from a structured questionnaire; secondary sources only for the introduction and the review.

4.3 Population, sample and sampling technique: population of quick commerce grocery customers in [city]; sample of [size] respondents drawn by [technique], chosen because [your reason].

4.4 Tool and its relevance: a structured questionnaire, with sections A to C matched to objectives (a) to (c). The questionnaire goes in the annexure.

4.5 Data collection: [online form or in person], during [period].

SAMPLE FOR STUDY REFERENCE NOT FOR SUBMISSION

4.6 Statistical tools: percentages and charts for objective (a); correlation for objective (b); a test of difference such as ANOVA or chi-square for objective (c), chosen once the data type is known.

5. Limitations

[What the study cannot cover: one city, self-reported experience, the period of data collection.]

6. Proposed chapter plan

Introduction and review of literature; research methodology; results and discussion; summary and conclusion; recommendations; references; annexures.

References

[List only the sources you actually read and cited, in one consistent style.]

SAMPLE FOR STUDY REFERENCE
NOT FOR SUBMISSION