



Admin Staff-centered Role-Playing Scenarios

Playful Pathways Towards Equity in Higher Education

Welcome to ROCKET

ROCKET is an innovative project co-funded by the Erasmus+ Cooperation Partnerships program. It seeks to develop a working concept for Critical Virtual Exchange which implements Role-Playing Games and Conflict Transformation. These novel modes of online interaction can aid participants to take on new perspectives and gain a deeper understanding of issues relating to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. In addition to students, the initiative offers educational formats aimed at teaching and administrative staff. Conceived by the universities of Göttingen, Groningen, and Uppsala, ROCKET seeks to improve European Higher Education while also connecting to local communities.

For more information visit <https://rocket-erasmus.eu/>

Author

Kjell Hedgard Hugaas

Co-Author

Sarah Lynne Bowman

Graphic Design

Caterina Blomgren | Daria Shpak

This work is licensed under CC BY NC. To view a copy of this license, please visit www.creativecommons.org



This material was created within '[ROCKET: Role Playing Games on Conflict Transformation for Equity in Higher Education through Virtual Exchange](#)', a joint Erasmus+ Higher Education Cooperation Partnership project in the Higher Education sector between the Universities of Göttingen, Uppsala and Groningen. <https://rocket-erasmus.eu/>



UPPSALA
UNIVERSITET



university of
 groningen



**Co-funded by
the European Union**

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or Erasmus+ National Agency for Higher Education (German Academic Exchange Service). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

ADMIN STAFF-CENTERED ROLE-PLAYING SCENARIOS



Overview of the ROCKET scenario design.....	2
Scenario structure.....	3
Core seeds for the role-playing scenarios.....	5
References.....	6
Readings.....	6
Preparatory materials.....	7
Videos.....	7
Additional materials.....	7
Videos.....	7
ROCKET role-playing scenarios for Administrative Staff.....	8
Scenarios about group work dynamics.....	8
Basic scenarios.....	8
You have to ask me first!.....	8
Advanced scenarios.....	9
I am trying to work here!.....	9
Go get your own damn pens!.....	9
Why can't we do it the easy way?!.....	10
Scenarios about power.....	11
Basic scenarios.....	11
I am not part of your tribe.....	11
Advanced scenarios.....	11
But it is everybody's responsibility!.....	11
I cannot work like this!.....	12
Scenarios about rejection.....	13
Basic scenarios.....	13
Why wasn't I invited?.....	13
Advanced scenarios.....	13
But I did all the work!.....	13
I was passed over for a permanent job!.....	14
Scenarios about demands on time.....	15
Basic scenarios.....	15
This is important!.....	15
I need an answer!.....	15

Advanced scenarios.....	15
Did you even read the report? Do you even care about my work?!	16
Scenarios about different belief systems.....	17
Basic scenarios.....	17
Is that really appropriate?.....	17
Advanced scenarios.....	17
My beliefs are valid!.....	17
We solved that a long time ago.....	17
Scenarios about different needs.....	19
Basic scenarios.....	19
That is not my job. And it is not fair!.....	19
Please slow down!.....	19
Advanced scenarios.....	20
It's too loud!.....	20

ADMIN STAFF-CENTERED ROLE-PLAYING SCENARIOS



This document describes the role-playing game workshops and offers scenarios developed for administrative staff in Higher Education for the Erasmus+ Cooperation Partnership ROCKET. Developed by the universities of Uppsala, Göttingen, and Groningen, ROCKET develops critical virtual exchange (CVE) learning opportunities that train skills in conflict transformation through role-playing games (RPGs) to address issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) in higher education. For more on ROCKET, see [our linked website](#).

Note that this document is part of a larger Open Educational Resource (OER) that includes the entire trainings for students, teachers, and administrative staff. Please see those more extensive resources if you would like to adapt parts or all of the trainings for your own learning contexts. Our aim is to make these materials as accessible for new facilitators as possible, so we encourage you to feel emboldened to try these practices with your learners regardless of how experienced with role-playing games you are.

Overview of the ROCKET scenario design

In ROCKET, we focus on short, easy to play role-playing game scenarios with minimal details so that players can easily engage without feeling cognitively overwhelmed. The scenarios focus on common, everyday conflicts that occur in higher education settings. The characters are usually students, faculty members, and/or administrative staff. While students may not have experience working in a university setting, these roles are familiar enough that they can easily engage. Furthermore, imagining oneself in various positions can be illuminating, especially when exploring issues related to power and inclusion.

In terms of conflict related to DEI, we have decided upon a careful approach. Because of our emphasis on intercultural communication, some scenarios integrate common conflicts that arise as a result of language, cultural, belief systems, or religious differences. In some cases, characters will have caring responsibilities and other pressures related to diverse backgrounds. However, role-playing characters with marginalizations that one does not share can lead to stereotypical or even harmful behavior (Leonard, Janjetovic, and Usman 2021). Therefore, we do not usually detail the character's demographic characteristics, e.g., age, gender, sexuality, ethnicity.

We also try to avoid scenarios that prompt players to engage in micro- or macroaggressions toward one another. While such role-play can be illuminating in the right conditions, they require much stronger consent and safety practices than we believe can be established within the short timeframe and online context of a Critical Virtual Exchange with

mandatory participation. For an example of a longer-form scenario designed to explore microaggressions, see Bowman, Hatcher, and Kim (2018).

Instead, we instead encourage participants to bring aspects of their own identities into the scenarios to the extent they feel comfortable doing so. We ask players to choose their character's name and pronouns, which can add elements of diversity, privilege, and/or marginalization depending on the context. We also lead them through improvisational play using metatechniques called the Hot Seat and Monologue, which prompt players to improvise their characters' inner thoughts and speak them externally. This practice allows them to insert content that is relevant to their own experience. These inner thoughts are heard by the players, but not the characters; the players can use them to subtly escalate the scene. For example, one character monologues, "I can't believe they are expecting me to do schoolwork on the weekends. I have to babysit my siblings all day." The player can then direct their own play accordingly to increase drama, e.g., having their character say, "It's not like you have anything better to do this weekend."

In this way, our role-playing game scenarios are not intended to be a competition between players with winners and losers, but rather exercises to help players increase intensity so they can feel conflict somatically in their body and have enough insight into the situation to analyze it, e.g., through identifying their character's positions, interests (Fischer and Ury 1981), feelings, and needs (Glasser 1998). They have the opportunity to practice different conflict styles, such as competing, avoiding, accommodating, compromising, and collaborating (Kilman 2024; Kraybill 2024). Participants can also practice skills in nonviolent communication (Rosenberg 2015), e.g., through "I" Statements (adapted from Ohio Commission 2020).

Our aim is to teach the basics of conflict transformation in an environment that feels safe enough for them to engage, but not so activating that they have difficulty learning. Important to this process is immediate debriefing just after the scene ends, so that players are still experiencing *bleed*, or the spillover of psychological aspects from the character to the player (Bowman 2015; Hugaas 2024). In this state, they can better understand the motivations and inner world of the character, as well as locate in their body where they can feel their reactions to conflict, e.g., somatically. This practice is built upon the principle that conflict is not just an intellectual exercise, but often deeply affects us emotionally in ways that can make it difficult to engage constructively, e.g., if we experience fight, flight, or fawn responses. Thus, ROCKET grounds socioemotional learning in embodied practice in addition to teaching theoretical knowledge relevant to conflict transformation.

Scenario structure

The scenarios are basic: no more than 2-3 lines. They feature 3 characters: Character A, who is confronting Character B and possibly also Character C about a conflict situation. Character B is sometimes directly involved in the conflict; other times they just happen to be the person delivering information or handling the situation.

Characters A and B are the primary people in the scene, with Character C also involved, observing, mediating or supporting in some way. This practice enables scenes with 3 participants to take part. If your group only has 2 groups, you can remove Character C. An extra character is also briefly present to deliver the starting line, e.g., the administrative assistant,

department head, or teacher. The facilitator will play that role and say the start phrase, then exit the scene as the character, transitioning back to the facilitator role.

The scenarios are intended to describe the situation neutrally, meaning no party is clearly in the right or wrong. This enables players to explore more nuanced aspects of conflict rather than leaning on stereotypical behavior or moralizing through the character. However, they are intended to be short. They should take no more than 3-5 minutes total with workshop and debrief, although in practice sometimes they take longer, especially if participants ask questions or want to discuss at length in the debrief.

These scenes are intended to be tightly facilitated: one facilitator for every 3 characters. Therefore, in large classes, you will need multiple facilitators, e.g., a ratio of 1:6. In these cases, we recommend making sure you have at least 30 minutes for the actual role-playing part of the session, which gives you enough time to play two scenes and rotate among the players so everyone has a chance.

However, if you run out of time or only have time for one scene, you can allow the others to watch in their small group. As we tell our participants, "Observation is also potent." We do not recommend asking students to role-play in front of the entire class, as they may feel more inhibited, which can lead to shyness, shutting down, shallow play, or disruptive behavior. However, in some cases, if you have willing participants who are eager to play, this practice may be your best option. Alternatively, you can ask facilitators to demo 2-person scenes in front of the whole class and have the participants analyze what is happening.

Regardless of the number of facilitators, we usually include a demo session before every role-play. This practice allows learners to understand the flow of the role-play, witness the meta-techniques in action, and see how the scene should be played. Also, the thought of escalating conflict in a work place setting may feel uncomfortable for participants, so watching teachers model this behavior can often be a great ice-breaker and give them permission to play more bravely. Importantly, you should model for them that the scenario is not meant to be solved, but rather escalated. Active conflict often feels uncomfortable for people. In polite settings, they will often unconsciously role-play constructive collaboration rather than allowing the conflict to increase in intensity. You may need to pause the scene and remind them to escalate. They will also be given a safety technique called Softer they can use to decrease the intensity of the scene if needed.

The facilitator does not need to be an expert at role-playing, but does need to have some skills at guiding a group workshop, being assertive, and managing time. Some of the metatechniques require interrupting the players, e.g., to ask for a Monologue or ask one of the characters to say the Last Line. This practice is described in more detail in the Facilitation video featured later in this document.

After the scenarios, we recommend bringing the larger class together to have more general debriefing questions for them. These questions should invite them to share, but not require personal details about their role-playing experience; allow them to opt-in to how deeply they want to share with the big group.

Similarly, if a player wants to opt-out of a scenario and just watch or pass during a debriefing round, we recommend allowing them to do so, provided they do not disrupt the activity. If they are strongly resistant to role-play, we recommend offering an alternative

assignment, e.g., watching the recorded demo video in this document and analyzing it according to the concepts in conflict transformation.

Finally, if your context permits, we recommend having one facilitator assigned to safety duties. For example, in some higher education institutions, you may be able to request a counselor join the session, whether sitting aside in a physical classroom or in the main room in a video conference while the small groups are in breakout rooms. This person can address anything that arises for players that needs to be processed in the moment, for example by taking them to a breakout room. In critical virtual exchanges, we also recommend having someone stay in the main room to handle any technical issues that arise, such as participants arriving late or having internet issues who need to be moved to their breakout rooms. This person can also be responsible for safety if need be.

While in most situations, safety help will not be needed, clearly indicating to the learners who they should contact if something emotionally overwhelming arises can help everyone feel safer engaging with these activities. For more information, see the Safety video later in this document.

ROCKET facilitation, safety techniques, and demos are explored in more depth in videos featured later in this document.

Core seeds for the role-playing scenarios

In the ROCKET project through collaboration with our advisory board, we identified several core seeds that often fuel conflicts relevant to diversity, equity, and inclusion. These seeds form the core of the scenes, which are often tied to the basic human needs. These core seeds allow anyone to adapt the details of the scenarios for different contexts as long as they keep the basic component the same, e.g., adapting situations more relevant to students for an admin staff training group.

The core seeds are the following:

- Issues with **group work dynamics**, e.g., being late, ghosting, not contributing work;
 - *Example human need involved:* Security.
- Issues with **power**, e.g., feeling overpowered, cut out of decision making, unfairly treated, talked over;
 - *Example human need involved:* Power.
- Issues with **rejection**, e.g., feeling overlooked, ignored, one's ideas being removed or not considered, one's culture critiqued, the “odd one out”;
 - *Example human need involved:* Belonging.
- Issues with **demands on time**;
 - *Example human need involved:* Freedom.
- Issues with **different belief systems**;
 - *Example human need involved:* Belonging.
- Issues with **different needs**, e.g., one person needs to be social (positive face) whereas another needs to get work done alone (autonomous face) (Goffman 1967).
 - *Example human need involved:* Fun.

Note that while we have suggested some human needs here, your participants should be invited to detail one or more human needs relevant to the situation for their characters, which they do in the Hot Seat and debriefing exercises. Often, characters will have different human needs at stake, which offers insights that you can help them unpack during the debrief.

The scenarios are organized according to core seeds, as well as our assessment of the difficulty, i.e., whether they are basic or more advanced. By difficulty, we mean that some scenarios are more sensitive or feature more challenging content. We recommend only trying these scenarios in contexts where the learners have high trust established with the facilitator(s) and each other and a certain degree of maturity to handle the content sensitively. You should also consider these matters when designing your own scenarios.

When in doubt, stick to the basic scenarios. Remember, the goal of these exercises is not to explore complex topics related to diversity, equity, and inclusion or other sensitive topics. You might consider approaching such topics instead in a structured class discussion or reflection journal. We ask participants to role-play so they can learn the basic skills that can help them in more complex situations in their daily lives.

If you are interested in adapting these scenarios for your own context or designing your own, we recommend playtesting your scenarios before piloting them in your courses, ideally with your target group, but if not, with your co-facilitators.

For more information about scenario design, see Josefin Westborg's "Scenario Design" video featured later in this document.

References

Readings

Bowman, Sarah Lynne. 2015. "Bleed: The Spillover Between Player and Character." Nordiclarp.org, March 2. [Link here](#).

Bowman, Sarah Lynne, Patricia Hatcher, and Yeonsoo Julian Kim. 2018. "Microaggressions: A Thousand Cuts -- An Educational Live Action Role-playing Experience (Edu-larp)." Designed for the Big Read Project. Austin Community College. [Link here](#).

Fisher, Roger, and William Ury. 1981. *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*. 1st Ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Glasser, William. 1998. *Choice Theory: A New Psychology of Personal Freedom*. Harper.

Goffman, Erving. 1967. "On Face-Work." In *Interaction Ritual*. Pantheon, New York.

Hugaas, Kjell Hedgard. 2024. "Bleed and Identity: A Conceptual Model of Bleed and How Bleed-Out from Role-Playing Games Can Affect a Player's Sense of Self." *International Journal of Role-Playing* 15 (June): 9-35. [Link here](#).

Kilmann, Ralph. 2024. "Take the Thomas-Kilmann Instrument (TKI)." Kilmann Diagnostics. [Link here](#).

Kraybill, Ron S. 2024. "Compare Style Matters and The Thomas-Kilmann Instrument." Riverhouse ePress. [Link here](#).

Leonard, Diana J., Jovo Janjetovic, and Maximilian Usman. 2021. "Playing to Experience Marginalization: Benefits and Drawbacks of 'Dark Tourism' in Larp." *International Journal of Role-Playing* 11: 25-47. [Link here](#).

Ohio Commission on Dispute Resolution and Conflict Management and The Ohio Department of Education. 2000. *Let's Resolve Conflicts Together: Elementary School Classroom Activities*. Conflict Management Week, May 1-7, 2000. Retrieved from ERIC. [Link here](#).

Rosenberg, Marshall. 2015. *Nonviolent Communication: A Language of Life*. 3rd Ed. Encinitas, CA: PuddleDancer Press.

Preparatory materials

Videos

Bowman, Sarah Lynne. 2025. "Facilitating ROCKET Educational RPGs." ROCKET - Erasmus. YouTube, December 17. [Link here](#).

Bowman, Sarah Lynne. 2025. "ROCKET Safety in Educational RPGs." ROCKET - Erasmus. YouTube, December 17. [Link here](#).

Westborg, Josefin. 2025. "Scenario Design - Josefin Westborg." ROCKET - Erasmus. YouTube, September 11. [Link here](#).

Westborg, Josefin, Kjell Hedgard Hugaas, and Sarah Lynne Bowman. 2025. "Example Role-play." ROCKET - Erasmus. YouTube, September 11. [Link here](#).

Additional materials

Videos

Westborg, Josefin. 2025. "What are Role-Playing Games?" ROCKET - Erasmus. YouTube, September 11. [Link here](#).

Westborg, Josefin. 2025. "Educational RPGs - Josefin Westborg." ROCKET - Erasmus. YouTube, September 11. [Link here](#).

Westborg, Josefin. 2025. "Transformative RPGS - Josefin Westborg." ROCKET - Erasmus. YouTube, September 11. [Link here](#).

ADMIN STAFF-CENTERED ROLE-PLAYING SCENARIOS



ROCKET role-playing scenarios for Administrative Staff

The scenarios are grouped based on the core seed of the conflict, as well as our assessment of whether they are basic or require more advanced engagement. Note that some scenes contain more than one core seed.

Scenarios about group work dynamics

Basic scenarios

* * *

You have to ask me first!

Administrator A is responsible for all the procurement at the office. **Colleague B** and **Colleague C** have been making plans with other departments that have led to significant increase in **Administrator A**'s workload and overtime hours, including on Friday afternoons. **Administrator A** has not been consulted about these plans. **Administrator A** confronts **Colleague B** and **Colleague C** in the lunchroom.

Start phrase:

Another colleague: "Have a great weekend everyone. I'm off to the mountains!"

* * *

Advanced scenarios

* * *

I am trying to work here!

Administrator A's office is in a hallway that connects to group work spaces that are available to students. This semester, **Student B** and **Student C** leave the door open in the space when working and engage in loud conversations in the corridor, interrupting **Administrator A's** work. **Administrator A** decides to confront them.

Start phrase:

Another student: "I'll see you at the lecture. Bye!"

* * *

Go get your own damn pens!

The department has an office supply room that is impractically located several floors away. **Lecturer B** has repeatedly interrupted **Administrator A** asking for white board pens instead of going to the supply room themselves. **Administrator A** confronts **Lecturer B** about this, just as **Administrator C** is passing by.

Start phrase:

Student worker A: "The new supplies shipment has arrived..."

* * *

Why can't we do it the easy way?!

Researcher A believes they spend too much time on expense reports, filling in minute details in highly specific ways. **Researcher A** has sent numerous emails to **Staff Member B** suggesting easier and less time consuming ways to do this work. **Staff Member B** has said that the university will not reimburse unless the reporting is done in this one specific way. **Department Head C** has called the two to their office to discuss.

Start phrase:

Assistant: "The department head will see you now. . ."

* * *

Scenarios about power

Basic scenarios

* * *

I am not part of your faction.

Administrator A is responsible for supporting **Researcher B** and **Researcher C** with admin tasks, but often feels excluded when **Researcher B** and **Researcher C** use complex jargon that is highly specific to their field. **Administrator A** decides to approach and confront **Researcher B** and **Researcher C** about this issue.

Start phrase:

Manager: "That concludes the meeting. See you next week."

* * *

Advanced scenarios

* * *

But it is everybody's responsibility!

The department has a lunch break area with a small kitchen. There is no set system for keeping this area stocked and cleaned, but everyone should take some responsibility. In practice, **Administrator A** has quietly done most of the work, without receiving much, if any recognition for it. **Colleague B** has once again left their dirty dishes on the counter, not in the dish washer. **Administrator A** confronts **Colleague B**. **Head of Department C** happens to witness the interaction.

Start phrase:

Another colleague: "See you on Monday."

* * *

I cannot work like this!

30 minutes before the end of the work day, **Department Head C** asks **Administrator A** to compile a report that **Lecturer B** needs for tomorrow's 8am meeting. **Administrator A** often has to drop everything and work overtime to help **Lecturer B** on short notice. **Lecturer B** is considered a rockstar academic in the field. **Administrator A** confronts **Lecturer B** and **Department Head C**.

Start phrase:

Administrative assistant: "Only 30 more minutes until the day is over!"

* * *

Scenarios about rejection

Basic scenarios

* * *

Why wasn't I invited?

Administrator A was not invited to a meeting by **Manager B** with a delegation from another university, instead doing administrative tasks. **Administrator A** is often left out of networking meetings that are relevant to their job. **Administrator A** confronts **Manager B** about it in front of **Professor C**, who was included at the meeting.

Start phrase:

Head of department: "That is all we had for today's meeting folks. Have a great lunch."

* * *

Advanced scenarios

* * *

But I did all the work!

Administrator A has just attended a department meeting where **Head of Department C** handed flowers to **Professor B** for impressive results on a project and announced their promotion. **Administrator A** was responsible for much of this success and their contributions were not mentioned. **Administrator A** is confronting **Professor B** and **Head of Department C**.

Start phrase:

Administrative Assistant: "Professor, please come to my office on Monday to sign the paperwork on your promotion!"

* * *

I was passed over for a permanent job!

Administrator A was doing a job in the department as a substitute for a colleague who left, but was not given the permanent position when one became available. **Manager B** hired another person instead of **Administrator A**. **HR representative C** is also present on the request of **Manager B**.

Start phrase: *Administrative Assistant:* "The supervisor is now back from lunch..."

* * *

Scenarios about demands on time

Basic scenarios

* * *

This is important!

Administrator A repeatedly has to ask **Colleague B** and **Colleague C** to return borrowed equipment, taking time and energy away from other important tasks. **Colleague B** and **Colleague C** often fail to respond. **Administrator A** confronts **Colleague B** and **Colleague C** in the lunch room.

Start phrase:

Administrative Assistant: “Enjoy your lunch!.”

* * *

I need an answer!

Administrator A has been writing time sensitive emails about their project to **Colleague B** over the weekend needing a response as soon as possible. **Colleague B** does not check emails over the weekend. **Lecturer C** cannot move forward with their work until **Colleague B** answers.

Start phrase: *Head of Department:* “Great meeting. See you all next week”

* * *

Advanced scenarios

* * *

Do you even care about my work?!

Administrator A has to complete an important evaluation report for the University board, which depends on input from teachers. Neither **Lecturer B** or **Professor C** have

read the report template or prepared input as requested. **Administrator A** is confronting **Lecturer B** and **Professor C**.

Start phrase:

Head of department: "Please send me the report for signature by Friday morning..."

* * *

Scenarios about different belief systems

Basic scenarios

* * *

Is that really appropriate?

Administrator A does not believe alcohol should be allowed on campus at university and is confronting **Colleague B**, who had a beer at lunch, before going to supervise their students. **Colleague C** has health issues and cannot drink alcohol at all. **Administrator A** confronts **Colleague B** in the break room.

Start phrase: *Another Colleague* “We’ll start our meeting again in 5 minutes!”

* * *

Advanced scenarios

* * *

My beliefs are valid!

Administrator A is religious and gets upset when **Colleague B** makes anti-religious comments in class. **Colleague B** is an atheist who has strong opinions about religion. **Colleague C** is culturally religious and takes part only in holidays. **Administrator A** confronts **Colleague B** after a staff meeting where **Colleague B** once again made a comment when Religious Studies was mentioned.

Start phrase: *Another Colleague:* “See everyone again next week!”

* * *

We solved that a long time ago...

Administrator A is confronting **Colleague B**, who has been making comments on the department message platform discussions that they don’t think there is a need for feminism in society anymore. **Administrator A** believes feminism is more needed than ever before. **Head of Department C** wants to guide the discussion to remain constructive.

Start phrase: *Assistant:* “The Head of Department will see you now..”

* * *

Scenarios about different needs

Basic scenarios

* * *

That is not my job. And it is not fair!

Administrator A has just been informed by **Manager B** via email that they have to do extra work tasks outside of their job description. **Administrator C** has the same job description as **Administrator A**, but has not been asked to do extra tasks. **Manager B** and **Administrator C** are in the lunch room, talking about sports results from yesterday's game in a friendly manner. **Administrator A** decides to confront them.

Start phrase:

Another colleague: "Oh, here comes the sports brigade. That's my cue to leave."

* * *

Please slow down!

Administrator A works in an office where the common language is English, which is not **Administrator A** and **Colleague C's** first language. **Manager B** is a native speaker and talks quickly in their department meetings. **Administrator A** has difficulty participating fully and perceives that their competence is questioned. **Administrator A** confronts **Manager B** after a meeting. **Colleague C** also lingers, as they need **Manager B's** signature on a form.

* * *

Start phrase:

Colleague D: "See you at lunch folks!"

* * *

Advanced scenarios

* * *

It's too loud!

Administrator A and **Colleague B** share an office. **Administrator A** needs the office to be quiet while they work and is confronting **Colleague B**, who often plays background music when working in the same office. **Colleague C** is a good work friend of **Colleague B**, and is listening in on the conversation.

Start phrase: *Radio Announcer:* "You are listening to the Relaxing Tracks radio station..."

* * *