

**How can we improve behaviour management through a Good Behaviour
Game adaptation in a KS2 classroom?**

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 - Introduction	1
Chapter 2 – Methodology	5
2.1 – Pilot Study.....	5
2.2 – Ethical Considerations	5
2.3 – Sample	6
2.4 – Design	6
2.5 – Materials.....	8
2.6 – Procedure.....	9
2.7 – Method of Analysis.....	9
Chapter 3 – Results	9
<i>Lesson Study 1 Results and Analysis.....</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Lesson Study 2 Results and Analysis.....</i>	<i>11</i>
Chapter 4 – Discussion	12
References.....	17
Appendices.....	20
Appendix A- Observation Checklist 1.....	20
Appendix B- transcribed interview 1.....	21
Appendix C – Observation Schedule 2.....	23
Appendix D- Transcribed interview 2	24
Appendix E- Reflections.....	26
Appendix F – information sheet.....	27
Appendix G - completed BIRS questionnaire.....	28

Word Count = 6031

Chapter 1 - Introduction

When developing this research project, the authors both considered the key issues that are faced in the prospective schools. Both researchers concurred that behaviour management was a key issue in both schools, thus the decision was made to focus on a behaviour management intervention. Both schools are challenging schools in terms of being in deprived areas, for example both schools having a high percentage of free school meals (see chapter 2.3). The author is currently a year 6 teacher, where this class is particularly challenging. The school has a strong behaviour management policy to try and tackle these challenging behaviours which is regularly enforced. The researcher is confident in behaviour management, although the challenge is how regular these problematic behaviours arise. This was discussed with the co-researcher, who expressed her difficulty in dealing with difficult behaviours and lacking confidence. This resulted in a consideration of what behaviour management intervention which would be suitable for both of our personal challenges in our schools, leading to the decision of using a behaviour management game as an intervention. The research question for this project is, therefore, *'how can we improve behaviour management through the Good Behaviour Game in a KS2 classroom?'*. For both classes for the researchers, this will mean that there is an opportunity to test a behaviour management technique which can potentially reduce problematic behaviours, building confidence for both trainee teachers and exploring what works and what does not work. These classes will have the opportunity to self-monitor their behaviour, and police their peer's behaviour in order to win the behaviour game.

When considering the definition of classroom management, Kratochwill, DeRoos and Blair (n.d.) stated it is a process that both the school and teachers develop in order to maintain appropriate behaviour. This will help enhance other aspects central to schooling such as displaying prosocial behaviour and academic engagement (Emmer and Sobornie, 2015). Poor pupil behaviour is a frequent concern of teachers (Yeung, Mooney, Barker and Dobia, 2009), thus revealing a need to minimise this is concern due to the high rates of teachers leaving the profession (Education Policy Institute, 2018). The link between this concern and teachers leaving the profession was investigated by Beaman and Wheldall (2000), who concluded that poor

behaviour management was one of the main reasons why teachers would leave the profession. It has also been found that whilst teachers are still in the profession classroom management has a negative effect on stress, wellbeing and confidence, as well as having negative effects on pupil learning and achievements (Clunies-Ross, Little and Kienhuis, 2008; Yeung, Mooney, Barker and Dobia, 2009).

One intervention which targets improving behaviour management is the '*Good Behaviour Game*' (GBG). The GBG is an intervention used to improve problem behaviours in the classroom which utilises peer influence, team competition and reinforcement procedures (Tingstrom, Sterling-Turner and Wilczynski, 2006). The game allows the class teacher to create a set of rules for the children to follow and incentivise the following of these rules in the form of a game. This game has a flexible approach, where the following of rules can be awarded in the form of giving points to individuals or to teams. This intervention is particularly advantageous as it allows the teacher to adapt the game as they see fit, and to create a set of classroom rules which is suited to the needs of each class. This intervention was implemented in the United States in 1985 by the Baltimore City Public School System (BCPSS) and Kellam et al (1998) in 19 primary schools, which as well as measuring its short-term effects also simultaneously examined the long-term effects of this game. The results of this intervention reveal extremely positive effects for both short term and long term. The original GBG intervention study conducted by Kellam et al (1998) was a good quality study, as there were three conditions in this study- the GBG intervention, an enhanced reading intervention and a control group who received no intervention. The pupils were randomly assigned one of the three conditions. However, this study does have some ethical concerns, for example, the control group were not given either intervention once the short-term data collection was completed. This means that the children who were randomly assigned to this group did not have the care given to them as those children in the intervention groups. However, this can be argued as necessary when examining the longitudinal nature of this study, and needing a control group to compare the findings to.

Many researchers have examined the short-term effects of the GBG (Kellam et al, 2011; Lannie and McCurdy, 2007; Leflot et al, 2010; Nolan et al, 2014), with results indicating classroom behaviour significantly improves when using this intervention. More specifically, a reduction in aggression, talking out of turn and children being out

of their seat was noted (Kellam et al, 2011), a reduction in disruptive behaviour and an increase in task engagement (Lannie and McCurdy, 2007), as well as a reduction in impulsiveness (Embry, 2002). This research indicates the effectiveness of reducing problematic behaviours commonly seen in classrooms as well as increasing positive behaviours.

The GBG intervention displays particularly impressive long-term effects in adulthood. In the original longitudinal study exploring the long-term effects, it was found that the GBG group had a significant reduction in problems, such as drug abuse, suicidal thoughts, criminal behaviour and alcohol addiction. When looking at those who smoked in early adulthood it was revealed that 6% of males who received the GBG intervention smoked, whereas 19% of males who received the alternative intervention smoked. Kellam et al (2011) stated the effectiveness of the GBG is clearest when examining the most illicit behaviours, such as dependence disorders, incarceration for violence and having a diagnosis of antisocial personality disorder. However, the original study investigating the GBG found these effects were mostly found in male participants, and different effects were found for females, except for suicidal thoughts and alcohol abuse. These findings have been supported further by researchers, for example, Poduska et al (2008) concluding that a positive impact was found on the GBG acting as a preventative intervention on later addiction service use or emotional services. However, this effect was only found with male participants, which somewhat correlates with the original study investigating the GBG.

The applicability of the GBG has been researched, for example in a recent review by Nolan et al (2014). They concluded that the GBG has been replicated in a variety of settings and populations many of which displaying its effectiveness. Studies of the GBG have been conducted in the United Kingdom (Phillips and Christie, 1986), the Netherlands (van Lier et al, 2004) and Germany (Huber, 1979). Nolan et al (2014) stated that the success of this intervention across a wide range of cultures, languages and socioeconomic status indicates the utility of this tool and its valuable use in education. When examining the applicability of the GBG to the present study, it is apparent that it can be generalised to the author's school context. For example, the original GBG study was conducted on an inner-city primary school. The author's placement school is also a city primary which replicates a primary school seen in

inner city London according to a class teacher. This means similar challenges will appear in the author's school as what did in the original study of the GBG. However, one challenge of its applicability is the time difference- the original GBG study was conducted 34 years ago, thus differences in the education system are now very apparent. Another challenge to its applicability to this study is that it was conducted in the United States. However, this is a Western culture similar to the United Kingdom. Furthermore, much replication of the GBG has been conducted as discussed above, leading the author to conclude that the GBG is applicable to the placement primary school.

One theory that underpins the GBG is the behaviourist theory. Introducing an incentive or prize to the children for winning the game is a motivator for them to win the game. McLeod (2017) stated behaviourism is concerned with observable behaviour that changes as a result of an external event. In this case, the external event is the points being given to or against the children when playing this game. When the children are given a point when playing the GBG this positively reinforces the good behaviour they are displaying, and are one step closer to receiving their reward, meaning they are more likely to display this behaviour again to receive a point. Conversely, negative reinforcement is also observed with the GBG, as the teacher strengthens the positive behaviours displayed by the children by removing a negative outcome (the teacher getting a point in the GBG). Furthermore, this behaviour management strategy utilises positive punishment- the teacher wins a point resulting in the weakening of negative behaviours displayed in the classroom.

Taking into consideration this range of literature displaying the success of this intervention, this study will explore an adaptation of the GBG developed by the researchers, in the form of the game being played teacher versus pupils. To determine suitability of this intervention the researcher completed the Behaviour Intervention Rating Scale (BIRS) which measures teachers' perceptions of the perceived effectiveness of a potential classroom intervention. After completing the BIRS (see appendix G), it was revealed the GBG scored very highly for its acceptability of use and potential effectiveness in the classroom. One example question from the BIRS is, 'the intervention would be appropriate for a variety of children' and 'soon after the intervention, the teacher would notice a positive change in the problem behaviour'. The research question for this study is, 'does playing the

GBG where the pupils compete against the teacher improve behaviour in a KS2 classroom?’ This will be done by observing pupils using the ‘Lesson Study’ model that is discussed in 2.4. After this observation, 6 pupils will be interviewed and the researcher will complete a reflection at the end of this process.

Chapter 2 – Methodology

2.1 – Pilot Study

This study piloted several aspects of this study, the first aspect being the observation schedule. The researchers gave out the observation schedule to a colleague who gave feedback on the problematic behaviours and positive behaviours listed. The feedback for the positive behaviours was that there was a well-rounded list of desired behaviours, although the feedback for the problem behaviours was not as positive. For example, the colleague stated an overlap in some of the behaviours. This resulted in the researchers removing two problematic behaviours, to try and categorise each behaviour with minimal overlap as possible. Another aspect of this study that was piloted was the interview schedule. The researchers asked the same colleague to review the interview schedule, with a particular eye to reading the questions as though a year 5 and 6 pupil would. This was to encourage the colleague to provide scrutiny over any area in which the child may misinterpret the questions or be confused over. The feedback for the interview schedule was entirely positive, with comments including the researchers having written the questions clearly in a manner in which children will understand.

2.2 – Ethical Considerations

BERA (2018) guidelines were followed when conducting this study, for example anonymising each child involved in the study and treating their data as confidential. The ethical considerations for this study included first obtaining ethical consent from the ethics panel at University of Wales Trinity Saint David. Both primary schools involved in this research (see 2.3) consented to the research before it was conducted. The children were told what the trainee teachers were looking at in the classroom and asked if they would like to take part in a conversation after a lesson to answer some questions. When the children agreed to this, consent was asked for

and gained by the parents/caregivers of the children. The notes made from this study were kept in a locked cupboard and the audio recordings were taken on a mobile phone device which was then immediately transferred onto a password protected PC and the original recording deleted.

2.3 – Sample

This research was conducted in two schools, both of which were vastly different. One school was located at a primary school in Cardiff, which had a high percentage (89%) of children who present with English as an additional language (EAL), whereas the other school was located in Barry where only two pupils had EAL. Another difference between the two schools is the percentage of children who qualify for free school meals. Both schools have above average percentages of child accessing free school meals, although the primary school in Barry has around 36% of free school meals whereas the Cardiff primary school has approximately 28% of children who qualify for free school meals. This suggests that the catchment area for the school in Barry is more deprived and filled with families with lower income than the catchment area in which the Cardiff school is located.

3 children from each school were asked to participate, giving a total of 6 participants for this study. Consent was gained from both parents and pupils before this study was conducted (see 2.2). The children from the primary school in Cardiff were all from Year 6, whereas the children from Barry were all in Year 5. The children selected to participate in this research were carefully selected by the researchers, on a convenience sample basis, with a keen eye to choosing children who were representative of the class (such as choosing both males and females). This helps to generalise the findings of this study to wider populations, such as the whole class from both schools and other children who were of similar age and backgrounds. Once the children's parents consented to the study, the chosen children then gave verbal assent to the researcher after reading the information sheet detailing the study (see appendix F).

2.4 – Design

The design of this study is qualitative and observational in nature. A Lesson Study research methodology was chosen because it is a model which is used to help improve teaching practice (Dudley, 2014). It is a process which encourages teacher collaboration on planning, teaching and observing lessons, and working in cycles to

improve teaching over a period of time (Dudley, 2014). Lesson Study has the advantage of involving pupils within the school, allowing teachers to make a real change for the pupils in their classroom. This method does have a disadvantage of its practicality and the reality of a school allowing teachers to take time off from teaching to observe a colleague and improve their practice via this method. In a recent evaluation of Lesson Study in the UK (Godfrey, 2018), it was revealed that this model had a positive impact in primary and secondary schools. This qualitative approach was chosen over quantitative because the researchers would get a more rounded and in-depth view of the intervention. Furthermore, this approach allowed the researchers to interview some children and gain their insight and opinion to the behaviour intervention which is being considered increasingly important (Estyn, 2016). However, qualitative data does have its limitations, for example a large volume of data can be time consuming to analyse and interpret (Anderson, 2010). Observations have the strength of examining children's behaviour in a classroom setting which is not constrained by an artificial laboratory setting (Coolican, 2014). However, observations can be problematic in terms of reactivity effects (Coolican, 2014)- the children's behaviour may have been affected by their awareness of the presence of an observer. The researchers decided on an event sampling observational method, where the researchers wait for specific events to happen and record this behaviour. This is advantageous for researching a desired event or behaviour, although it can limit the amount of other behaviours present (Andrews, n.d). After the observations had been done, a semi structured interview was conducted on 3 children from each class. This type of interview was chosen as this method allows the researchers to use guidelines with selected topics on, meaning the researchers can collect the information required by the researchers whilst exploring other aspects that arise. This allows flexibility in the interview, and can be adjusted based on the research lesson which just happened, as well as allowing the participants the freedom to explore what they see as important. However, this could be problematic if the participants go off the desired topic too much, thus the researchers are not getting enough information on the subject they are exploring. Finally, reflections were captured using two models, Brookfield (1995) 4 lenses model and Gibbs (1988) which will be presented in the discussion of this report.

Using these three methods (observations, interviews and reflections) allows triangulation of data- using multiple methods within qualitative research to develop a more robust understanding of the presented phenomena, as well as improving the validity and reliability of the study (Carter et al, 2014).

2.5 – Materials

The materials for this study included observation schedules (see appendix A), which both researchers used to observe one another identifying both problematic behaviours and positive behaviours in the lesson. This was created by examining similar observation schedules online, in particular what the most common problematic behaviours were as well as what desirable behaviours were wanted from teachers (Sun and Shek, 2012). This was then combined with the view of both researchers for this study, considering what the problem behaviours were common in their classrooms and what desirable behaviours were wanted. These were then added to the list from what was researched. Table 2.5.1 notes each problematic behaviour and positive behaviour that the researchers decided to include for this study. It is important to note that these behaviours are context dependent for the lesson, for example talking and being out of seat may be a part of the lesson so wouldn't be considered a problematic behaviour for that lesson.

<u>Problematic Behaviours</u>	<u>Positive Behaviours</u>
Shouting out	Hands up
Out of seat	Completing task
Talking	Listening
Rude language	Participating
Aggression	Helping others
Off task	Concentrating
Distracting others	Respectful
Not following direction	Following instructions
Inattentive	Tidy work area
	Engaged (eg asks questions)

Table 2.5.1- a table showing the problem and positive behaviours for this study.

2.6 – Procedure

Participants from both classes were instructed that they would be carrying on their work from the previous lesson, although a game would be played simultaneously. The researchers explained the rules of the game, for example, if any children were displaying positive behaviours (such as concentrating and being respectful) then they would get a point. If any children were doing things they shouldn't be doing (such as talking, off task or distracting others) then the teachers would get a point. Once these rules were explained the teacher told the children that they would get an incentive if they won the game.

The incentives for both schools were different, and were based on what the student teacher thought would motivate the children from both classes. One prize included an extra 5 minutes at play time whilst the other prize was some tokens for the children to win.

5 minutes prior the lesson ending, the researchers took the selected pupils out of the lesson and conducted a short interview with them. Participants had been given an information sheet the previous day detailing the study as well as a verbal explanation from the trainee teacher and assent for the interviews was gained after this process.

2.7 – Method of Analysis

An observation checklist was used to analyse how often certain behaviours did or did not occur. This checklist was analysed to see the frequency of problematic versus positive behaviour, and alongside the observation notes and reflections whether the displayed behaviour can be deduced to the Good Behaviour Game.

Chapter 3 – Results

Lesson Study 1 Results and Analysis

The first Lesson Study cycle was completed in a year 5 class in Barry. This lesson was a success where all children achieved the lesson goals. When looking at the observation schedule (see appendix A), it is apparent that there are many more positive behaviours tallied in comparison to the negative behaviours.

The 3 observed children displayed listening skills, participation, helping others, concentration, helping others, following instructions, being respectful and were engaged throughout the lesson. One of the observed children did score fairly highly for talking throughout the lesson, although he was always still on task and completing his work despite talking.

After the lesson, the researchers took the 3 children off to be interviewed (see appendix B). Results from the interview revealed positive feedback about the Good Behaviour Game. For example, when asked what they liked about the GBG the children responded with:

EB stated, *"It gives us something to work towards"*

AS added to this, *"It helps other people who don't usually behave"*

EM concluded, *"It's... a challenge because people like to get things"*

This response gives a variety of reasons why the children enjoyed the GBG. To add to this, when asked if there was anything that they did not enjoy about the game each child said no, and that they would not change anything about the GBG. When asked about the usual behaviour of the class and the impact that the GBG had upon behaviour it was revealed that the GBG did positively impact behaviour.

AS stated, *"Well [Pupil A], [Pupil B] and [Pupil C] usually sit by each other and chat but cuz of this game they don't"*.

EB added, *"Usually when Miss is talking everyone will talk"*.

These quotes demonstrate the impact the GBG has, particular on chattiness amongst the class. Finally, when asked for feedback as to how often the game should be played in class there was some disagreement among the 3 children, with varying responses to monthly, several times a week and just once per week. This discussion concluded with the children agreeing that varying the prizes when playing the GBG would keep it entertaining so it would not get boring for the children.

EB *"Like maybe tokens one day and golden time the next"*.

When reflecting on this lesson, both researchers agreed that the points for the game needed to be used/given out more. For the first lesson study approximately 5 points were given out between the pupils and teachers throughout the whole lesson. It was

decided upon that giving out the points more often would make the Behaviour Game more effective, as this would enhance the frequency of reinforcement and punishment seen in the behaviourist approach.

Lesson Study 2 Results and Analysis

The second cycle of Lesson Study was conducted in a Year 6 class in Cardiff. It is important to note to begin with, that as soon as the student teacher told the children what their incentive would be (extra 5 minutes at play time) that all children got extremely excited that they could win something which immediately created comments among the class such as “we have to win!” or “yes let’s do this”. This particular class is an extremely competitive class, where the trainee teacher learned throughout the placement that the children thrived when there were elements of competition.

This lesson was particularly successful, as children were tasked with continuing to write their own poem. All children were focused and on task throughout, achieving the lesson objective of finishing their poem and going onto extension work.

Behaviour in this school is usually poor- the school has a very strict behaviour management policy to combat this, where this policy is frequently used by the trainee teacher. However, this lesson behaviour was excellent, the behaviour management strategy did not have to be used once as the points system in the GBG would manage this effectively enough.

When looking at the observation checklist, it’s apparent that the GBG was highly effective for task completion, concentrating, listening and being respectful. When interviewing 3 children after the lesson to get their feedback on the GBG all children stated they enjoyed playing the GBG and the competition it provided against the teacher. What was very effective with this class was they would highly self-monitor each other. For example, if somebody was talking or displaying any minor negative behaviour then their peers would tell them off for it, so the teacher would not get the point.

AJ stated *“If someone talked that person would get told by another person to be quiet”* line 13.

AJ added to this, *“If they keep talking...if the teachers get like a point everyone will get mad and they will stop talking again”* line 15.

When the children were asked if they thought the GBG had an effect upon the class's behaviour they all agreed it did have a positive effect due to the incentive of having an extra 5 minutes at playtime.

FS *“...We were like we are gonna get more play so wanted to be quiet”* line 25

SY *“They are just doing it for one reason”* line 26

When asking this class on how often they would like to play the GBG there was more of an agreement with how often this would like to be done, with the agreed frequency being weekly, preferably on a Friday so the children could win golden time. The interview then deviated back to why the children enjoyed the game, with an expressed desire to want to concentrate and work harder in class.

AJ *“I like this game because when somebody wants to concentrate like the other person is gonna keep talking but if we play the game everybody is going to be quiet”* line 45

SY *“Therefore we can just concentrate more and work harder”* line 47

AJ *“We can get more things in our brain”* line 48

These quotes reveal the second round of positive feedback gained from interviewing the pupils (see appendix D), enabling the researchers to get a real insight into what the children thought about the game and how they would like it to be adapted in the future. The results from the second cycle of lesson study support the findings from the first cycle, revealing the positivity the GBG received from the children and their enjoyment of playing this game in class.

Chapter 4 – Discussion

This study aimed to improve behaviour management through the Good Behaviour Game in a KS2 setting, with a research question of ‘does playing the GBG where the pupils compete against the teacher improve behaviour in a KS2 classroom?’. The GBG helps improve problem behaviours in the classroom by utilising peer influence, competition and reinforcement procedures (Tingstrom et al, 2006). Previous

research has found the GBG to be very successful with both impressive short-term and long-term effects. For example, a reduction in aggression, talking out of turn and children being out of their seat (Kellam et al, 2011), as well as a reduction in disruptive behaviour and an increase in task engagement (Lannie and McCurdy, 2007). The positive long-term effects of the GBG are a reduction in problem behaviours, such as drug abuse, suicidal thoughts, criminal behaviour and alcohol addiction (Kellam et al, 2011). The results in this study found support for positive short-term behavioural effects, such as concentrating, task completion, listening, helping others and task engagement. Other prosocial effects were also observed (see observation checklist in appendix A and C). Interviews with 6 children revealed all children enjoyed playing the GBG, particularly the competition element with the teachers. Children thought it improved the class's behaviour by peer influence and motivation to win the reward. When reflecting on the lesson study (see appendix E), Brookfield's (1995) model of reflection was used for this assignment, as it has the advantages of using multiple points of reference which was done for this study. For example, self-reflection was done (fulfilling lens 1), using pupil voice by the means of interviews (fulfilling lens 2), working with a partner (fulfilling lens 3) and finally this is being linked back to literature (satisfying lens 4). This means it is a good model to use for this purpose. However, one disadvantage of this model is that it does not tell somebody how to self-reflect, thus Gibbs (1988) reflective model was also used to gain a more in-depth reflection as this evaluates all aspects of this event (see appendix E) and to overcome this limitation. My reflection concluded that the GBG was a very effective strategy to use which the children enjoyed, although the incentive needs to be regularly changed in order to keep the GBG exciting.

The results for these two classes mean that the GBG is very effective as a behaviour management strategy. Due to the similar demographics of the children from each class being representative of their prospective schools, these results are likely to be generalisable to the whole school- as opposed to singular classes. Furthermore, the GBG appeared to be successful with competitive children in the class, as they would want to 'beat' the teacher in this game, where they were particularly spurred on if the teacher scored a point. This means that the GBG is likely to be successful on other children who are competitive, widening its generalisability further. Lastly, the second Lesson Study was conducted in an extremely multicultural school where English is

an additional language for 60% of children and many are new to the country. This means that the GBG is not limited to British children, as it was an effective intervention on many other ethnicities and cultures.

This study supports the previous research findings. For example, a reduction in disruptive behaviour and an increase in task engagement was observed in this study. This supports the findings from Lannie and McCurdy (2007), who also found the same results. Furthermore, a reduction in aggression was noticed by the class teacher during this research lesson, which supports findings from Kellam et al (2011).

The behaviourist principles of reinforcement and punishment were observed in this study, for example, the instant motivator in the prizes presented to children at the start of the research lesson after the explaining the GBG rules, where the children became extremely excited with comments including “we have to win!”. When the children were awarded a point for any positive behaviour, this was received with the children continuing to display these positive behaviours as they wanted to win more points. Similarly, the trainee teachers would use negative reinforcement during this GBG- removing a negative outcome by the means of the teachers getting a point. Lastly, positive punishment was also utilised by the trainee teachers through weakening the negative behaviours observed by awarding a point to the teachers. Using these elements of reinforcement and punishment made this intervention very effective. After the first lesson study cycle the researchers decided to use more reinforcement and punishment procedures to make the GBG even more effective in the second cycle of lesson study.

One limitation of this study is there is no comparator behaviour- resulting in uncertainty as to how effective the GBG was. One way to overcome this is to conduct an observation prior to the Lesson Study observation. This allows the researcher to gain a perspective as to what behaviour in the class is usually like- whether there are more problematic behaviours than positive ones. This would allow the researchers to make a direct comparison, by the means of having a pre-intervention observation and post-intervention observation. Another limitation with this study is observer expectancy effect (Coolican, 2014). Both researchers were expecting to observe an effect with the GBG, as much research had already been

conducted and reading into the success of the GBG. This could have resulted in the researchers conveying this expectancy of the success of the GBG onto the children. Similarly, the Hawthorne Effect (Roethlisberger and Dickson, 1939) could also be a limitation of this study- participants were aware they were being observed and this could have impacted their behaviour that lesson. This is arguably an enhanced effect when observing children, as children are very eager to please. Overcoming this effect will always be difficult in educational settings, as children will be aware of an observer in their classroom. One potential way to overcome this limitation is to place the observer in a viewing room or placing cameras in the classroom. However, other issues arise with this, both viability and the ethics of these methods.

One advantage of the methodology of this study is the Lesson Study technique. This allowed the researchers to focus in on a specific area of behaviour management and collaborate on developing this adapted technique. The Lesson Study approach offers advantages in its methodology by collaborative working, by giving inter-rater reliability. For example, two researchers worked on developing this approach together, where the pilot study gave an agreement between the two researchers on how best to score observed behaviours and what would constitute as problem or positive behaviour. This allowed a consistency in both the researchers scoring in the research lessons, resulting in high inter-rater reliability. Previous research has not used pupil voice in the research of the GBG, which is one advantage of the methodology. Pupil voice is now being considered increasingly important (Estyn, 2016), where allowing pupils to have a say on their learning results in the children having greater control of their education and how it can be improved. This can also mean the children feel listened to, respected and are being taken seriously in school.

Piloting this study did help improve this study, for example improving the reliability of the study as discussed above. Furthermore, the researchers were able to go through the interview schedule and deliver this to peers in order to get feedback. This allowed both the observation and the interview to go ahead smoothly with no unpredictable occurrences.

In the next teaching placement, both researchers have decided to use this behaviour management strategy in the next schools, and experiment if this strategy will work in other schools. Having practiced this strategy once this gives the trainee teachers an

advantage when implementing it in their teaching practice, as it has already been done for a research lesson. This means that the strategy can be perfected further over time, and implement the suggestions made by the children in the interviews, such as using different prizes to keep the game entertaining and effective for improving behaviour.

This study has important practical applications for the researchers, as this is now a behaviour management strategy that will be used in the future. This game is very advantageous for its adaptability. For example, this study was able to create its own set of rules for awarding points to the pupils or children based on the classroom rules. This means teachers can adapt the game based on the needs of the children in their class. Furthermore, this game is also being adapted for use outside the classroom (McCurdy, Lannie and Barnabas, 2009), such as playing the GBG at lunch times in schools to reduce problem behaviours faced at these times, such as aggression and violence. This shows the GBG's flexibility and adaptability in schools. In light of these results the researchers would recommend use of this intervention in schools and for teacher use, particularly those with disruptive and/or competitive children. Additionally, it has been reported that teachers often express having little training in behaviour management (Kellam et al, 2011), thus having a simplistic behaviour management intervention that is effective, adaptable, flexible and the ability to be implemented straight away is very beneficial for teachers. Future research needs to look at conducting a study that measures behaviour before the GBG is being played, in order to get a more accurate view of the effectiveness of this intervention.

To conclude, this study explored the effects of the Good Behaviour Game, which revealed positive short-term behavioural effects, such as increased concentration and task completion and decreased disruptive behaviour such as talking. This was done by the means of observations, interviews and reflections. This was in line with the current existing body of literature surrounding the GBG. Future research needs to conduct a pre-intervention observation to see the exact impact the GBG is having upon behaviour and its effectiveness. This study has important practical applications showing the success it's had in two vastly different classrooms, with a recommendation for teachers to use this behaviour management strategy, particularly with competitive children.

References

- Anderson, C., 2010. Presenting and evaluating qualitative research. *American journal of pharmaceutical education*, 74(8), p.141.
- Andrews, M. (n.d.). Methods of Observing Young Children. [online] Michigan State University. Available at: https://msu.edu/~mandrews/mary/obs__methods.htm [Accessed 25 Feb. 2019].
- Beaman, R., & Wheldall, K. (2000). Teachers' use of approval and disapproval in the classroom. *Educational Psychology*, 20, 431–446.
- Brookfield, S. (1995). *Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- British Educational Research Association [BERA], 2018. Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research, fourth edition, London.
<https://www.bera.ac.uk/researchersresources/publications/ethicalguidelines-for-educational-research-2018>
- Carter, N., Bryant-Lukosius, D., DiCenso, A., Blythe, J. and Neville, A.J., 2014, September. The use of triangulation in qualitative research. In *Oncology nursing forum* (Vol. 41, No. 5).
- Coolican, H., 2014. *Research Methods and Statistics in Psychology*. East Sussex: Psychology Press.
- Dudley, P., 2014. *Lesson Study: a handbook*.
- Education Policy Institute. (2018). *Is pay more important than workload for teacher retention? - EPI*. [online] Education Policy Institute. Available at: <https://epi.org.uk/publications-and-research/teacher-retention-pay-workload/> [Accessed 22 Jan. 2019].
- Embry, D.D., 2002. The Good Behaviour Game: A best practice candidate as a universal behavioural vaccine. *Clinical child and family psychology review*, 5(4), pp.273-297.
- Emmer, E. and Sabornie, E.J. eds., 2014. *Handbook of classroom management*. Routledge.

Estyn. 2016. *'Pupil voice' benefits pupils and helps schools to improve*. [online] Available at: <https://www.estyn.gov.wales/news/%E2%80%98pupil-voice%E2%80%99-benefits-pupils-and-helps-schools-improve>. [Accessed 25 February 2019].

Gibbs, G. (1988). *Learning by doing: A guide to teaching a learning methods*. Further Education Unit. Oxford Polytechnic: Oxford.

Godfrey, D., Seleznyov, S., Anders, J., Wollaston, N. and Barrera-Pedemonte, F., 2018. A developmental evaluation approach to lesson study: exploring the impact of lesson study in London schools. *Professional Development in Education*, pp.1-16.

Huber, H. (1979). The value of a behavior modification programme, administered in a fourth grade class of a remedial school. *Praxis der Kinderpsychologie und Kinderpsychiatrie*, 28, pp.73–79.

Kellam, S. G., Mayer, L. S., Rebok, G. W., & Hawkins, W. E. (1998). Effects of improving achievement on aggressive behavior and of improving aggressive behaviour on achievement through two preventive interventions: An investigation of causal paths. In B. P. Dohrenwend (Ed.), *Adversity, stress, and psychopathology* (pp. 486-505). New York, NY, US: Oxford University Press.

Kellam, S.G., Mackenzie, A.C., Brown, C.H., Poduska, J.M., Wang, W., Petras, H. and Wilcox, H.C., 2011. The good behaviour game and the future of prevention and treatment. *Addiction science & clinical practice*, 6(1), p.73.

Kratochwill, T.R., DeRoos, R., and Blair, S. (n.d.). Classroom Management. [online] Available at: <https://www.apa.org/education/k12/classroom-mgmt.aspx> [Accessed 22 Jan. 2019].

Lannie, A.L. and McCurdy, B.L., 2007. Preventing disruptive behaviour in the urban classroom: Effects of the good behaviour game on student and teacher behaviour. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 30(1), pp.85-98.

Leflot, G., van Lier, P.A., Onghena, P. and Colpin, H., 2010. The role of teacher behaviour management in the development of disruptive behaviours: An intervention study with the good behaviour game. *Journal of abnormal child psychology*, 38(6), pp.869-882.

- Nolan, J.D., Houlihan, D., Wanzek, M. and Jenson, W.R., 2014. The Good Behaviour Game: A classroom-behaviour intervention effective across cultures. *School Psychology International*, 35(2), pp.191-205.
- McCurdy, B.L., Lannie, A.L. and Barnabas, E., 2009. Reducing disruptive behavior in an urban school cafeteria: An extension of the Good Behavior Game. *Journal of School Psychology*, 47(1), pp.39-54.
- McCleod, S. (2017). *Behaviourist Approach*. Retrieved from <https://www.simplypsychology.org/behaviorism.html> [accessed 3rd Feb19]
- Phillips, D. and Christie, F., 1986. Behaviour management in a secondary school classroom: Playing the game. *Maladjustment & Therapeutic Education*, 4(1), pp47-53.
- Poduska, J.M., Kellam, S.G., Wang, W., Brown, C.H., Ialongo, N.S. and Toyinbo, P., 2008. Impact of the Good Behavior Game, a universal classroom-based behavior intervention, on young adult service use for problems with emotions, behavior, or drugs or alcohol. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 95, pp.S29-S44.
- Roethlisberger, F.J., Dickson, W. (1939). *Management and the worker*. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press.
- Sun, R.C. and Shek, D.T., 2012. Student classroom misbehaviour: an exploratory study based on teachers' perceptions. *The Scientific World Journal*, 2012.
- Van Lier, P.A., Muthén, B.O., van der Sar, R.M. and Crijnen, A.A., 2004. Preventing disruptive behavior in elementary schoolchildren: impact of a universal classroom-based intervention. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, 72(3), p.467-478.
- Yeung, A.S., Mooney, M., Barker, K. and Dobia, B., 2009. Does School-Wide Positive Behaviour System Improve Learning in Primary Schools? Some Preliminary Findings. *New Horizons in Education*, 57(1), pp.17-32.

Appendices

Appendix A- Observation Checklist 1

JA observing

Classroom Behaviour- Observation Checklist

Primary ✓

		Children		
		Child A EM	Child B AS	Child C EB
Problematic Behaviour	Shouting out			
	Out of seat			
	Talking			
	Rude language			
	Aggression			
	Off task			
	Distracting others			
	Not following direction			
	Inattentive			
Positive Behaviour	Hands up			
	Completing task			
	Listening			
	Participating			
	Helping others			
	Concentrating			
	Respectful			
	Following Instructions			
	Tidy work area			
	Engaged (e.g. Asks questions)			
	Comments		Child B would talk throughout although would stay on task.	

Appendix B- transcribed interview 1

Interviewees: EM, AS, EB Interviewers: GJ, JG

GJ: So, what did you enjoy about the game?

EB: It gives us something to work towards.

AS: And, um, it helps other people who don't usually behave behave.

EM: It's just like a challenge because people like to like get things when they do challenges.

GJ: So, is there anything you didn't like about the game?

EB/EM/AS: No.

GJ: Nothing you would want to change, nothing you thought was a bit...no?

AS: I just thought why were the teachers red because teachers aren't evil.

GJ/JG: 'Smile and laugh at response.'

JG: But nothing about the game though?

AS: No.

JG: So, if you guys wanted to do it again you'd do it exactly the same? You wouldn't change anything?

EB/AS/EM: No.

GJ: So, what do you think of class behaviour normally? Like if I wasn't doing this game, what's it like usually when we do a lesson?

AS: Well, um, [Pupil A], [Pupil B] and [Pupil C] usually all sit by each other and chat but cuz of this game they don't.

GJ: 'Nods head at AS and turns to EM/EB' What did you two think?

EB: Um usually when Mrs is talking everyone will talk.

AS: Well some people.

EM: And it kinda annoys people who want to actually learn. Like all you can hear is people talking from behind you.

GJ: I think your right there.

AS: With me when I talk on the carpet I just talk to myself.

GJ: There's nothing you want to change about the game? Would you want it done in groups, would you want a different prize, anything like that? Because right now it's the whole class against me and Mrs. Would you like blue group, red group, purple group?

AS: Maybe we could do it like, um, two separate groups but two of the coloured groups join.

GJ: Oh like red and orange against blue and purple.

EM: Yeah.

EB: If we wee to do a different prize I think it would be golden time.

GJ: Golden time.

AS: Golden time. 'Says while nodding head and rubbing hands together.'

GJ: That your favourite? Golden time?

EM/EB/AS: Yeah.

AS: I usually have golden time all the time at my house. I just go on my PS4 and play Spiderman because it's my favourite game.

GJ: So, what do you think of playing the game regularly? Once a week, everyday, once a month?

AS: I'd say once a month.

GJ: Once a month, like a treat day?

EB: I'd say.. 'Cut off by EM.'

EM: Yeah but like, two to three times a week.

EB: Yeah.

EM: Like two days of it.

EB: Yeah, like maybe Tuesdays and Thursdays or Mondays and Fridays, like the start of the week and the end of the week.

EM: And you can think about how good your gonna be that day and be good that day.

AS: But the only downside I would have thought about two days in one week would be that the two das would kind of get boring.

GJ: Okay.

AS: Because we are doing the same thing twice.

GJ: If it was a different prize everyday would that make it more interesting?

EB/EM/AS: Yep.

EB: Like maybe tokens one day and golden time the next.

EM: If it was on Thursday our prize would be us simply going to our club after dinner time.

EB: Yeah.

GJ: Yeah, that's true. So maybe not on Thursday then?

EB: Maybe on another day then.

AS: Friday is always a treat because it's the end of the week and you get star awards.

EB: So, maybe Monday or Tuesday or Wednesday or I don't know.

JG: Good suggestion guys.

GJ: Hmmm very good. Anything else you'd like to add about the game? Stuff you liked, stuff you didn't like? Things you'd change, things you wouldn't.

AS: I'm happy with how it's going.

GJ: Yeah?

AS/EB/EM: Yeah.

GJ: You think the scores were fair?

EM: Every time when we got one a few minutes after a teacher got one. They had to two then we had one, then we got one and it kept going like that back and forth.

JG: Did you think when the teachers did get a point that everyone else settled down to work harder so you guys would get a point.

EB: Yeah.

AS: Yeah. Well, most people did.

EM: Yeah, because [Pupil D] asked me to hold sheepy and I told her that miss said if we win the game that we can keep sheepy. [Pupil D] went oh and went around to all the other students saying that we have to stay quiet because if we are quiet sheepy can stay.

GJ: Brilliant. Anything you'd like to ask miss?

JG: No, that was everything thanks guys.

Appendix C – Observation Schedule 2

Classroom Behaviour- Observation Checklist

		Children		
		Child A F.S	Child B E.B	Child C S.Y
Problematic Behaviour	Shouting out			
	Out of seat			
	Talking			
	Rude language			
	Aggression			
	Off task			
	Distracting others			
	Not following direction			
	Inattentive			
	Positive Behaviour	Hands up		
Completing task				
Listening				
Participating				
Helping others				
Concentrating				
Respectful				
Following Instructions				
Tidy work area				
Engaged (e.g. Asks questions)				
Comments		Had moments where she was off task but when the teacher gained points she became focused	Initially started off following instructions but eventually became inattentive	Consistent throughout

Appendix D- Transcribed interview 2

Interviewers: JG and GJ.

Interviewees: SY, FS & AJ

- 1 JG: We would like to ask you some questions about the game we just played in the lesson just now if that's ok? What do you think of the class's
- 2 behaviour normally?
- 3 AJ: Well when are doing a poem or something like that it just usually stays quiet.
- 4 FS: Because we are all concentrating and if it's a competition we don't want to shout out or share ideas.
- 5 SY: Yeah
- 6 JG: Ok, so what did you think of the game?
- 7 AJ: I thought it was really fun.
- 8 SY: Yeah I liked it.
- 9 JG: Did you like the competition?
- 10 All: Yeah
- 11 JG: So, what specifically did you like or enjoy about this behaviour game?
- 12 FS: I liked that the whole class took part
- 13 AJ: If someone talked that person would get told by another person to be quiet
- 14 JG: Yes I liked that about the game as well
- 15 AJ: And if they keep talking...if the teachers get like a point everyone will get mad and they will stop talking again.
- 16 JG: So was there anything you didn't enjoy about the behaviour game?
- 17 FS: One thing I didn't like was when the teachers got the point
- 18 JG: *Laughing* What about you 'SY' did you not like anything?
- 19 SY: Ummm, I think it was fair because if you got a point then you got a point you shouldn't sulk about it.
- 20 FS: If the teachers got a point then everyone sulked and then they would get another point.
- 21 AJ: I liked the game because every time we would win a point everyone said yes and then the teachers get another point so we'd all be quiet again
- 22 and then earn another point and I just say to everyone "shut up!".
- 23 JG: *Laughing* Good ok, so do you think that the game had an effect on the class's behaviour then? Do you think they were more quiet than usual?
- 24 SY: Yeah
- 25 FS: Yeah because we were like we are gonna get more play so we wanted to be quiet
- 26 SY: They are just doing it for one reason that they are gonna get more...
- 27 AJ: Like in maths in Miss Wood's class to be quiet she just gave us *inaudible*
- 28 JG: Would you change anything about the game to improve it if we played it again?
- 29 AJ: We can do like, ummm, if if we want to draw like the teacher would get like 2 minutes
- 30 FS: If we had a draw we could put all our names in a hat
- 31 JG: So different prize then do you mean? Instead of extra play you'd get something else?
- 32 All: Yeah
- 33 FS: But if we had a draw then maybe we could all our names in a hat and put teacher too and mix them all around
- 34 AJ: And if it said teacher then...
- 35 FS: Then we don't get *inaudible*
- 36 JG: Ok. And what are your thoughts about playing the behaviour game more regularly?
- 37 All: Yeah
- 38 AJ: It would make us be more quiet

- 39 FS: Like to be honest our class is kind of a quiet class
- 40 AJ: I think we can't be quiet
- 41 GJ: Would you want to play it once a week? Every day?
- 42 AJ: Every day
- 43 FS: Once a week, every Friday maybe golden time
- 44 SY: Yeah we used to have golden time
- 45 AJ: I like this game because when somebody wants to concentrate like the other person is gonna keep talking but if we play the game everybody is
- 46 just going to be quiet because everyone wants to get 5 minutes after
- 47 SY: Therefore we just concentrate more and work harder
- 48 AJ: We can get more things in our brain.
- 49 JG: Fab
- 50 AJ: But when someone is talking what they said is in my head and I would write it down
- 51 JG: Ok I think that is it, do you have anything else to add Miss?
- 52 GJ: No that's everything
- 53 JG: Good well thanks guys you can go back to class.

Appendix E- Reflections

Brookfield 4 Lenses Model

① Self

When I was a learner, I would enjoy participating in games, especially through competitive elements. This means I now like to implement competitive games as a teacher.

② Students

I see myself as a young, lively + energetic teacher where the pupils will see these features in my personality. They will see my enthusiasm when playing these games and my encouragement for each child to do their best.

③ Peers

Extensive conversations with my co-researcher about this study. After the 1st cycle we discussed how the intervention could be improved for the following day. Conversations post study too.

④ Scholarship

Lots of research took place prior to this study + a literature review has been carried out looking at effects of the intervention. The results will be discussed in relation with the current literature body surrounding this intervention.

Gibb's Model 1988

1) Describe event

- Lesson Study 1 - very successful but the points need to be given more freely for a greater effect.
- Lesson Study 2 - worked excellent, children loved the competitive element.

2) Describe Feelings

- Positive! Excited about using this behaviour management technique in the future. Very pleased at how much the children enjoyed too.

3) Evaluate!

- +ves - Great response from children, enjoyable + effective.
- ves - Ensure to give out points regularly. Change the prize too so it's not always the same thing.

4) Analyse

Previous literature talks about its short term benefits - these were observed in this study. Eg less disruptive behaviour + increased pupil engagement.

5) Conclude

Very effective strategy which the children enjoyed, particularly the competitive element. Change the incentive to keep the game exciting each time.

6) Action Plan

I will be using this strategy in the future, particularly with competitive children, as this element really spurred children on to 'beat' the teacher.

Appendix F – information sheet



Information Sheet

Aim of the study

This aim of this research is to investigate whether behaviour can be improved by playing the “Good Behaviour Game” by the means of the class competing against the teacher.

Purpose of research

Improving pupil behaviour will improve the teaching and learning that occurs in schools and will make the classroom environment more positive.

Who is needed?

The student teacher will carry the research out with the assistance of an observer. The observer will watch the class’s lesson and will then ask 3 children to have a conversation about the lesson with the teacher and observer afterwards.

What will happen?

The conversation will be audio recorder for the teacher and observer to listen back to. None of the children in the conversation will be identified as their names will be removed from the study. Children can withdraw from the study at any point without facing any negative implications. Any notes made during the lesson and afterwards will be kept confidential and kept securely. Only the student teacher and observer will see the data.

Appendix G - completed BIRS questionnaire

BIRS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree
1. This would be an acceptable intervention for the child's problem behavior.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Most teachers would find this intervention appropriate for behavior problems in addition to the one described.	1	2	3	4	5
3. The intervention should prove effective in changing the child's problem behavior.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I would suggest the use of this intervention to other teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
5. The child's behavior problem is severe enough to warrant use of this intervention.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Most teachers would find this intervention suitable for the behavior problem described.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I would be willing to use this in the classroom setting.	1	2	3	4	5
8. The intervention would <u>not</u> result in negative side-effects for the child.	1	2	3	4	5
9. The intervention would be appropriate intervention for a variety of children.	1	2	3	4	5
10. The intervention is consistent with those I have used in classroom settings.	1	2	3	4	5
11. The intervention was a fair way to handle the child's problem behavior.	1	2	3	4	5
12. The intervention is reasonable for the behavior problem described.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I like the procedures used in the intervention.	1	2	3	4	5
14. This intervention was a good way to handle this child's behavior problem.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Overall, the intervention would be beneficial for the child.	1	2	3	4	5
16. The intervention would quickly improve the child's behavior.	1	2	3	4	5
17. The intervention would produce a lasting improvement in the child's behavior.	1	2	3	4	5
18. The intervention would improve the child's behavior to the point that it would not noticeably deviate from other classmates' behavior.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Soon after using the intervention, the teacher would notice a positive change in the problem behavior.	1	2	3	4	5
20. The child's behavior will remain at an improved level even after the intervention is discontinued.	1	2	3	4	5
21. Using the intervention should not only improve the child's behavior in the classroom, but also in other settings (e.g., other classrooms, home).	1	2	3	4	5
22. When comparing this child with a well-behaved peer before and after use of the intervention, the child's and the peer's behavior would be more alike after using the intervention.	1	2	3	4	5
23. The intervention should produce enough improvement in the child's behavior so the behavior no longer is a problem in the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
24. Other behaviors related to the problem behavior also are likely to be improved by the intervention.	1	2	3	4	5

117
120