According to the University of Melbourne, collusion is when more than one individual contributes to work that submitted as the work of an individual. As suggested in the initial question, this has a series of clear short-term benefits within the context of university assignments for both the student and the teachers, however the ethical implications of collusion in the long term are less cut and dry.

When looking at this from the ethical perspective of a utilitarian, the morality of an action is determined by assessing its consequences, and selecting the outcome the maximises pleasure. By assessing collusion on an assignment through this lens, we see that it will initially provide a far greater perceived pleasure than working alone. Collusion can take the form of students working together to answer questions as a collective, or lecturers setting purposefully easy and short assignments. By doing this, the completion and marking of the assignments is made much easier, immediately benefiting both students and markers through possible reductions of stress and workload. The consequences of this collusion must however also be considered. If the students of the university are not being provided with adequately challenging and extensive assignments, then the quality of the education they are receiving will be reduced. By reducing the quality of education, students my find themselves unprepared for the professional workplace, or completing sub-standard work. This not only has great potential to harm the professional careers of the student, but also cause harm to their workplaces and anyone associated with them, increasing their pain, and decreasing pleasure. From this we can conclude that from a utilitarian perspective it is generally unethical for students and lecturers to collude with the purpose of making university workloads easier, as it poses a far greater potential long-term harm than it does a short-term benefit.

Duty ethics however suggests that an action is considered ethical if it is conducted for the sake of duty, based on rules that are deemed to be consistent, impartial, and fair. By assessing the collusion through this lens, we can see that the university has a duty to provide its student with a quality education that provides students with the tools that they require. By colluding to make assignments easier for the students and the lecturers, the university is no longer meetings its duty to provide this education. It can also be said that the university has a duty to provide for its stakeholders, and that by providing a subpar education the university’s reputation will be negatively impacted, affecting its ability to make money for these stakeholders. From this we can conclude that from a duty-based ethics perspective it is unethical for students and lecturers to collude, as it inhibits the university’s abilities to fulfil their duties.

Finally, rights ethics suggests that than an action is ethical if there exists a right, or permission to act, on behalf of the rights holder. From this perspective it can be argued that students have the right to a proper education, especially when they are paying for the service. From this outlook it can clearly be said that it is unethical to collude in this manner as it will degrade the quality of the education and thereby restrict their rights. However, it can also be argued that both students and lecturers have a right to protect their mental health. Based on this right, it can actually be deemed ethical to collude if the size of the assessment is either affecting the mental health and either parties.

Overall, it can be seen that although it is possible to argue that colluding on assignments is ethical in some manners, the majority of ethical frameworks conclude that colluding is unethical.

* What are the circumstances under which you might not need to obtain the consent or authorisation of someone to collect their personal information?

Information privacy principle 3 of the New Zealand privacy act 2020 pertains to the collection of information from a subject. In principle 3 subclause (3) it is stated that an agency is not required to obtain consent or authorisation for the collection of data if the agency has received this consent in a recent previous occasion. Principle 3 subclause (4) also lists a selection of cases in which this consent or authorisation is not required. This list includes but is not limited too when:

* The collection of consent reasonably can’t be obtained in the circumstances of the particular case.
* The lack of collection of consent is required to maintaining the enforcement of laws.
* The information cannot be used in a form in which the individual concerned is identified.
* Obtaining consent will undermine the purpose of collection

It must be noted that if information collected without consent is found to not meet the requirements of principle 3 subclause (4), it is a criminal offence.

* For how long are you allowed to retain personal information under the Privacy Act?

An agency must not hold a person information longer than is required for the purposes of which they have lawfully collected.

* Do individuals have the absolute right to “correct” information held by an agency?

Individuals are entitled to request that an agency take steps to correct information, however individuals do not have the absolute right to have it corrected. According to principle 7 subclause (3a), individuals can provide an agency with a statement of correction and request that it be either attached to their current information, or that their information be corrected to meet the statement. However according to principle 7 subclause (4) it is at the discretion of the agency to select if the information will be corrected or simply have the statement of correction attached.

* **What is the biggest problem identified in the documentary?**

In this documentary it was identified that New Zealand has a culture of workplace bullying that is currently going unchecked. It was also identified that this was due to the current preventative measures being inaccessible to workers, and not providing a legal framework that can put in place enforceable repercussions for workplace bullying.

* **Do you think Worksafe's guidance is adequate for employees?**

Worksafe provides a very comprehensive framework for identifying what confrontations count as work place bullying, what the options are for workers facing bulling, and what the requirements are of companies to deal with bullying. However, they don’t provide any enforceable measure with which bullying can be addressed once it is identified, and seem to leave it up to the discretion of the employer. This has clear issues, as it does not provide works with any form of action of the employer is the bully in a situation. Because of this I believe that Worksafe’s guidance is insufficient to prevent workplace bullying.

* **In summary, what are the changes people are recommending as required to correct New Zealand's problem with workplace bullying?**

In this documentary there are a range of changes recommended to help correct ew Zealand's problem with workplace bullying. The most pertinent suggestion was the introduction of new legislation to provide a legal framework to protect against workplace bullying. This will provide enforceable legal repercussions to prevent and mitigate workplace bullying when it is identified. It was also suggested that leadership development courses can be a successful preventative measure, teaching people how to interact with those that inherently have less power than them. A final change that has been universally suggested is a clearer framework for the reporting of workplace bullying, to make it easier for those affected to come forward and seek help.

Describe your rights as an individual professional in relation to these agencies, particularly your rights to silence or to non-cooperation

* Commerce Commission

When interacting with the commerce commission, the commission may present either an informal or formal request for information and interview. Upon making an informal request for information or interview, the recipient is asked to respond on a voluntary basis. With an informal request, recipients have the right to decline the request, however if the commission has grounds this can be followed by a formal and compulsory request under section (98 c) of the Commerce Act 1986. It should also be noted that under section 106(5), any information gathered in a formal interview cannot be used in a prosecution against you.

* Serious Fraud Office

The serious fraud office is an entity that has the ability to request any documents or attendance of any person. Under Serious Fraud Office Act 1990 section 5(1), they are able to request that any individual at any time present any documents and answer any questions that the entity present. Un this act section 9(1) they are also able to request any person give attendance to an interview. It is also stated in the Serious Fraud Office Act 1990 in section 27 that self-incrimination is not an excuse in answering any questions posed under section 5(1), and section 28(1,2) states that self-incriminating statements may be used in a prosecution for an offence where an individual provided inconsistent statements.

* Worksafe

Worksafe is an entity that presents no power over individual workers, and exclusively exercises power of employers, otherwise knows as PCBU's under the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 Section 17(1). As work safe has no power over individuals, they are unable to compel and individual to present themselves or documents. That are however able to appoint inspectors of workplaces under section 163, and under section 168(1) these inspectors are able to enter the workplace at any reasonable time.