The Good Behaviour Game

The Good Behaviour Game (GBG) is a classroom management approach designed to improve student behaviour and build confidence and resilience. The game is played in groups and rewards students for good behaviour.

EEF Summary

Behaviour is a major concern for both teachers and students. EEF funded this project because GBG is an established programme, and previous evidence suggests it can improve behaviour, and may have a longer-term impact on attainment.

This trial found no evidence that GBG improves pupils’ reading skills or their behaviour (concentration, disruptive behaviour and pro-social behaviour) on average. There was also no effect found on teacher outcomes such as stress and teacher retention. However, there was some tentative evidence that boys at-risk of developing conduct problems showed improvements in behaviour.

Most classes in the trial played the game less often and for shorter time periods than recommended, and a quarter of schools stopped before the end of the trial. However, classes who followed the programme closely did not get better results.

GBG is strictly manualised and this raised some challenges. In particular, some teachers felt the rule that they should not interact with students during the game was difficult for students with additional needs, and while some found that students got used to the challenge and thrived, others found the removal of their support counter-productive. The EEF will continue to look for effective programmes which support classroom management.
Research Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome/Group</th>
<th>Impact - the size of the difference between The Good Behaviour Game pupils and other pupils</th>
<th>Security - how confident are we in this result?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>0 Months' Progress</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading (FSM)</td>
<td>-1 Months' Progress</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Were the schools in the trial similar to my school?

The trial involved 77 schools from Greater Manchester, Yorkshire, and the Midlands. All the schools were state-maintained.

Around a quarter of the pupils in the schools were eligible for FSM, around a fifth were pupils with a SEND and 23% had English as an additional language. Eight of the 77 schools were rated “Outstanding” by Ofsted, 54 as “Good”, nine as “Requires Improvement”, and six as “Inadequate”.

Could I implement this in my school?

GBG is available for large groups of schools from Mentor UK.

Participating teachers attend two days of initial training, with one day of follow-up training midway through the first year, and additional coaching support.

Delivered by Teachers

Participant group Whole Class

Intervention length 2 Years

How much will it cost?

Costs in the first year were around £4,000 per school. Over 3 years, the average cost would be £34 per pupil per year.

The preparation time required from staff for lessons was estimated to be marginal. There were monthly GBG coaching visits of around 30 minutes.

Cost per pupil £37

No. of Teachers/TAs Variable

Training time per staff member 3 Days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Pupils</th>
<th>Key Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>3084</td>
<td>Key Stage 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start date</th>
<th>End date</th>
<th>Type of trial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>July 2018</td>
<td>Efficacy Trial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation Conclusions

1. We found no evidence that the GBG improves pupils' reading. This result has a high security rating.

2. We found no evidence that the GBG improves pupils’ behaviour (specifically, concentration problems, disruptive behaviour, and pro-social behaviour).

3. Implementation was variable and in particular, the frequency and duration with which the GBG was played did not reach the levels expected by the developer. One-quarter of schools in the intervention arm ceased implementation before the end of the trial.

4. Higher levels of pupil engagement with the game were associated with improved reading, concentration, and disruptive behaviour scores at follow-up. There was no clear evidence that other aspects of implementation (for example, how well or how frequently the game was played) were related to whether pupil outcomes improved. These results were sensitive to changes in how we analysed the data, and so should be interpreted with caution.

5. There was tentative evidence that boys identified as at-risk of developing conduct problems at the beginning of the project benefitted from the GBG. For these children, small reductions in concentration problems and disruptive behaviour were observed.