

**Online Supplemental Material for:**

“Risk and Realism: Using a Board Game Mobile App to Illustrate an IR Theory” by Petra Hendrickson, Northern Michigan University, USA ([pehendri@nmu.edu](mailto:pehendri@nmu.edu))

Appearing in *PS: Political Science and Politics*

**Appendix 1. Post-Activity Survey.**

1. Which of the following realism concepts identified by the textbook do you think were present in Risk? (select all that apply)
  1. Anarchy
  2. Self-help
  3. States
  4. Sovereignty
  5. Power
  6. Geopolitics
  7. Security dilemma
  8. Balance of power
  9. Power balancing
  10. Hegemony
  11. Power transition
  12. Polarity
  13. Alliance
  14. Defense
  15. Deterrence
  16. Compellence
2. Which of the following realism concepts identified by the textbook do you think you understand better as a result of playing Risk? (select all that apply)
  1. Anarchy
  2. Self-help
  3. States
  4. Sovereignty
  5. Power
  6. Geopolitics
  7. Security dilemma
  8. Balance of power
  9. Power balancing
  10. Hegemony
  11. Power transition
  12. Polarity
  13. Alliance
  14. Defense
  15. Deterrence
  16. Compellence

3. Which concept(s) do you think were best illustrated as you played Risk? Why? (open-ended text response)
4. How many players did you play against? What did you do to try to win? How effective was this strategy? Did you win? How long did the game take? (rough estimate of “not very long,” “a long time,” etc. is fine). (open-ended text response)

## Appendix 2. Illustration of a Play-Through

Image 1. Allocated map at start of Turn 1.



Image 1 shows the allocation of territories at the start of Player 1's (always the human player) first turn in a two-player game on medium difficulty. Lighter territories are those in possession of Player 1. In this phase of the game, Player 1 has seven troops to distribute in any number to the territories of their choice. Player 1 distributed troops to Ontario and Western Europe.

Image 2. Player 1's first attack.



During their first attack phase, Player 1 chooses to attack Quebec from Montreal. A smarter move would have been to have attacked the Northwest Territories to the Northwest of Ontario and then moved to Quebec, which would have secured an interior portion of Canada for Player 1. In this image, the darker territories are those possessed by Player 1 while the lighter and highlighted territories are in the possession of Player 2. This decision will come to haunt Player 1.

**Image 3. Movement of Player 1's troops after first attack**



After successfully attacking Quebec, Player 1 foolishly abandons the Northwest Territories' southeastern flank and moves the maximum number of available troops to Quebec to prepare for an attack on Greenland.

**Image 4. Player 1's second attack**



Player 1 successfully takes Greenland.

**Image 5. Movement of Player 1's troops after second attack**



Having gained Greenland, Player 1 then moves the maximum number of available troops from Quebec to that territory, with an eye toward the remainder of Europe. However, this is leaving northeastern Canada increasingly exposed.



**Image 6. End of Player 1's first turn**



The map during the Fortify stage of Player 1's first turn after all attacks have been mounted. Highlighted territories indicate which paths troops may follow for fortification. Player 1 opted not to adjust any troop positions during the Fortify stage, so this distribution of territory is how Player 1's first turn ended. Outside of highlighted territories, darker territories are Player 1's while the slightly lighter territories are Player 2's.

**Image 7. Start of Player 1's second turn**



After the computer-controlled Player 2's second turn, it's clear not attacking the Northwest territories first was a strategic blunder, as Player 2 placed some of their

additional troops during the allocation phase in the Northwest Territories and launched a successful attack on Alaska from there. So instead of possessing all of Canada, Player 1 has managed to lose ground in the continent.