London Review of Education
Vol. 10, No. 1, March 2012, 19–33

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

The effect of active teaching and subject content coverage on students' achievement: evidence from primary schools in Kenya

Moses Oketch[a]*, Maurice Mutisya[b], Jackline Sagwe[bc], Peter Musyoka[b] and Moses W. Ngware[b]

[a]*Institute of Education, University of London, London, UK;* [b]*African Population and Health Research Center, Nairobi, Kenya;* [c]*University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya*

(*Received 25 October 2011; final version received 13 December 2011*)

There is a growing public concern in Kenya over the persistent gap between those schools that are consistently ranked at the top and those ranked at the bottom of the annual Kenya Certificate of Primary Education (KCPE) examination league tables. This has raised the issue of inequality in educational opportunity. Our primary concern in this paper is to understand some of the classroom–school factors that may explain the persistent differences in achievement between the top and bottom schools. We focus on time-on-task (the length of exposure to any particular teaching and learning task) and curriculum content, and ask whether this explains the difference in performance. We test the following hypotheses: differences exist on teachers' time-on-task between low and high performing schools; greater teacher time-on-task has a positive effect on student gain score; and greater content coverage has a positive effect on student achievement. For the student achievement gains, we use item response theory test scores of 1889 Grade 6 pupils from 70 schools in Kenya. Data on time-on-task were generated from 70 maths lessons observed in these schools, while content coverage was developed from students' maths note books for the entire period they were in Grade 6. The study was conducted by a team of researchers at the African Population and Health Research Center (APHRC) with funding from Google.org. Using two level hierarchical modelling, we control for pupil, teacher and school factors. Results show that exposure to content is positively correlated with pupil gain scores (gain score is the difference in score between test at time *t1* and test at time *t2* of the same pupil taught by the same teacher). Maths teachers in both bottom and top performing schools spend the same proportion of time-on-task. However, we do not find that time-on-task is related to achievement in this sample.

Keywords: time-on-task; content coverage; achievement; item response theory; gain score; opportunity to learn

Introduction

There are numerous studies going as far back as the 1970s which are devoted primarily to understanding the effect of instructional time on learner achievement, but regrettably, the duration required for improving student achievement is still blurred (Abadzi 2009; Benavot and Amadio. 2004). The consequence of the lack of this vital information is that policy advice has been difficult to come by, particularly in low income, developing countries where there are desperate efforts to find what works in improving learning outcomes for the majority of pupils. Therefore, reasons that cannot be easily manipulated through policy such as lack of

*Corresponding author. Email: m.oketch@ioe.ac.uk

ISSN 1474-8460 print/ISSN 1474-8479 online

http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14748460.2012.659057
http://www.tandfonline.com

incentives, limited or no community involvement, malnutrition, and poverty are often blamed for poor achievement. This paper explores further in the context of Kenya the relationship that exists between instructional time, content coverage and student achievement. It does this through the analysis of classroom observation videos of 72 schools from across the country, randomly chosen within low and bottom performing schools categories in the Kenya Certificate of Primary Education (KCPE) examination taken at the end of the eight years primary cycle, and which is used for selecting pupils into the various categories of secondary schools across the country. The objective is to establish if there are differences in the active teaching (teaching strategies maximising interaction opportunities) and content coverage that may explain the persistent difference in pupil achievement in the top and bottom performing categories of schools. The rest of the paper presents a summary of the literature relevant to this theme. This is followed by presentation on the methodology, including data used, the findings, analysis and discussion, and finally the conclusion and recommendations.

Summary of the literature

Student achievement is a product of, among many other factors, the amount of exposure students have had to the content of what is to be assessed (Suter 2000). Carroll (1963) in his classical work suggested that the amount of time spent learning is determined by two factors: (1) the opportunity to learn in the form of the amount of time the school and the teacher allocate to a particular learning task or subject area; and (2) learner perseverance, or the amount of time the learner is willing to engage actively in learning. Studies have found existence of a strong, positive, and consistent relationship between the time students spend in learning and their subsequent achievement performance – and this continues to be an area of interest in teaching research (Rowan, Correnti, and Miller 2002). However, in process–product research, it is argued that what matters is not the amount of time assigned to learning any particular subject, or the time students are actively engaged in instruction during class time, but how teachers use this instructional time (Rowan, Correnti, and Miller 2002). Time-on-task provides pupils with the opportunity to be exposed to the subject content and hence the opportunity to learn (Gillies and Quijada 2008).

The time-on-task literature indicates that opportunities to learn and student performance are increased in classrooms where teachers maintain the continuity of the lesson. Understanding the effect of instructional time on academic achievement is therefore regarded as being very important because of two main reasons: (1) time in class is a choice variable that is affected by policies (e.g., prolonging the school calendar year); and (2) it provides a more general sense of how schooling produces better academic performance irrespective of pupil level variables (Marcotte 2007). In addition to active teaching, process-product research also finds a strong relationship between content coverage and student achievement, and that variations in student achievement can be explained, at least in part by variations in content coverage (Barr and Dreeben 1983).

Literature based on developing countries shows that students are often taught for only a fraction of the intended number of hours. Normally, instructional time is wasted through informal school closures, teacher absenteeism, delays, early departures and poor use of classroom time (Abadzi 2007; Gillies and Quijada 2008). Further, it is argued that teachers who are present are often involved in other activities, leaving students to play instead of engaging in learning (Pontefract and Hardman 2005). In most cases, valuable time is spent handing out textbooks, copying from the blackboard or doing small chores. Also, teachers may interact only with the small number of students who are of higher ability and exclude the rest and, to worsen the situation (Baumert 2010), there is no evident system to track

and improve the situation (Abadzi 2007; Independent Evaluation Group [IEG] 2008). Teachers, as they interact with students, are the ultimate arbiters of what is taught (and how); they make decisions about how much time to allocate to a particular school subject, what topics to cover, when and in what order, to what standards of achievement, and to which students, and collectively these decisions and their implementation define the content of instruction (Schwille et al. 1983; Brophy 1982). Increasing time on learning has also been linked to enhanced skill development and deeper conceptual understanding (Clark and Linn 2003; Smith 2002). These and other studies show a positive correlation between time spent on content and student learning (Huyvaert 1998; Rangel and Berliner 2007).

There continues to be inquiry by scholars on how time is spent in schools. Benavot and Amadio (2004) and Benavot (2006) indicate that primary school curricula can be classified into six subject areas. These are mathematics, science (natural), social science, physical education, aesthetic education and languages. A study by Abadzi (2007) indicates that these subjects receive between 80% and 90% of overall instructional time during the first six years of schooling. In primary schools, one-third of all instructional time on average is devoted to language instruction while 20% is devoted to mathematics. Arts, sciences, physical education and the social sciences (history and geography) get about 10% of instructional time each on average. However, some systems, including many in sub-Saharan countries, may also include religious/moral education, hygiene/health education, and vocational education/practical skills. The time devoted towards language is a reflection of the fact that pupils have to learn English or French, or other 'colonial' languages that have been accepted as the national language. In other instances, language time also doubles as literacy time.

Methodology

Data

Data for this study comes from the classroom observation study carried out by the Education Research Program (ERP) at the African Population and Health Research Center (APHRC) in May and July 2009 and February and March 2010. The study involved collection of data from randomly selected schools in randomly picked districts of Kenya. The sampling process is random but within certain categories. First, districts were chosen for inclusion in the study by their performance rank in the Kenya Certificate of Primary Education (KCPE) Examination, which, as noted earlier, is a summative examination taken by pupils at the end of the primary education cycle. The score in this examination is normally used to for screening those who transit into the different categories of secondary schools in Kenya. The Kenyan 76 districts were first stratified into 10 (10% each) deciles according to their performance in KCPE over the recent past four consecutive years. This stratification enabled us to select districts that have consistently performed at the top 10%, middle 20% and bottom 10% for each of the four years. Using this criterion, six districts were randomly selected, two from each of the categories.

The second level of sampling involved random selection of schools from the sampled districts. The selection of schools largely followed the procedure used to select districts: however, schools within each district were ranked into five quintiles (of 20%) according to their performance in KCPE during the same period. Thereafter, a random selection of six schools that were ranked consistently in the top 20% and six ranked consistently in the bottom 20% was undertaken. In total, 72 schools were randomly selected, 12 from each of the six districts on the basis of their ranking in the KCPE examination.

The classroom observation study employed a mixed methods approach: that is, data were collected using various methods and tools during the two rounds. The first round

involved lesson observation using observation checklists and video-recording of an actual lesson (with the consent of the teacher and the head teacher on behalf of all the pupils, as tends to be the practice in Kenya); use of a questionnaire to collect data on school, pupil, and teacher characteristics, and a maths test for the Grade 6 pupils and their maths teachers. The second round involved collection of the opportunity to learn (OTL) data and retesting the pupils using the same test used in Round 1 with the questions re-shuffled. The OTL data collection involved reviewing exercise books from at least three high ability pupils[1] in each subject and recording the content, sub-topic, and topic covered within the classroom for the whole academic year using a structured questionnaire.

This paper uses data generated from the maths video-recording, teacher, pupil and school characteristics, and maths OTL. In total 72 video recordings were collected and 2437 and 72 pupils and teachers were interviewed and tested respectively. School characteristics information was also collected from 72 head teachers, and included information on school management, staffing, enrollment and parental participation in the school's affairs. In the second round, 1907 of the pupils from 71 schools who had participated in the first round were re-tested, and OTL data was collected from 70 maths teachers. Therefore, this study uses data from 70 schools, involving 1889 pupils and 70 maths teachers, with complete OTL, teacher, and pupil and school information. The teacher questionnaire collected information on teacher attributes such as age, sex, years of teaching experience, level of education and any other relevant professional qualifications. It also gathered data on teacher socio-economic status, and the internal and external support teachers had received, among other things. The pupil questionnaire collected information on pupil bio-data, socio-economic background of the pupils, the school environment and their parental educational level (Ngware et al. 2010).

Analytical plan

The purpose of this paper is to establish the effect of active teaching and content coverage on student achievement levels between low and high performing schools, and thereby attempt to answer the question of why some schools continue to dominate the examination league tables while others are confined to lower ranks. We made the assumption that active teaching and content coverage is a resource that varies between schools, while pupil ability varies among pupils in the same school. To conduct this analysis we will fit a two-level multilevel model to evaluate to what degree content coverage, proportion of lesson time spent on active teaching, and pupil and school and other teacher variables influence student achievement.

Variables and their measurement

- Maths (test) gain score: item response theory (IRT) was used to calculate test scores at Time 1 and Time 2. The IRT scores generated from 40 items in each test using the Rasch models implemented in Winsteps software (Rasch Measurement Software and Publications 2002). IRT uses maximum likelihood estimation methods and comprises a group of parametric and non-parametric models. The Test 1 and Test 2 IRT scores were thereafter used to calculate the student IRT gain score.
- Proportion of lesson time spent on active teaching: Active teaching in this study is defined as the proportion of lesson time spent on active teaching activities. In total, the video rubric had 33 specific activities of which 11 (33.33%) were identified to involve active teaching. The amount of time spend in the 11 activities was tallied and

the proportion relative to lesson duration calculated in cases where the lesson was more than 35 minutes, or else used 35 minutes. This is due to the fact that a single lesson in Kenya Upper Primary (Grades 4 to 8) school is 35 minutes long.

- NBTLM: This is the availability of non-basic teaching and learning materials (NBTLM) in the classroom such as wall charts and visual aids: coded as 0 = not available and 1= available.
- Opportunity to learn (OTL): This is the proportion of content covered in mathematics at Grade 6 relative to the Grade 6 math syllabuses. The syllabus contains broad areas of study (topics), which are further sub-divided into sub-topics. Under each sub-topic are the finer areas (contents) of coverage.
- Teacher sex: This is the gender of the teachers coded as 0 = female and 1 = male.
- Teacher math score: Teacher pedagogical knowledge as percentage score in the maths teacher test.
- Lesson observation: Frequency in which the head teachers carries maths lesson observation as reported by the subject teacher.
- Pupil sex: Gender of the pupil coded as 0 = female and 1 = male.
- Mother and father education: Education level of the pupils parents as reported by the pupil: Coded as 1 = no/primary; 2 = at least secondary and 3 = don't know.
- Maths homework: The number of days the pupil has maths homework, coded as 1 = less than four days a week; 2 = at least four days a week
- School category: School category during sampling, 1 = top schools; 2 = bottom schools.
- School type: Type of school: 1 = private; 2 = public.
- PTR: Pupil teacher ratio: coded as 1 = less than 26; 2 = between 26 and 45; 3 = above 45.
- School poverty – poorest 20%: Wealth index is calculated at pupil level and aggregated at school by calculating the proportion of pupils within the school ranked in the poorest 20% relative to the district's wealth index.

Models

The model fitted in this study takes the form shown in Equation 1, which is a value-added model, that describes the gain achievement (ΔY_{ij}) for pupil *i* in school *j* decomposed into fixed and random effects.

$$\Delta Y_{ij} = \beta_x X_{ij} + \beta_t T_j + \beta_s S_j + \varepsilon_{ij} \quad (1)$$

The pupil gain score is a function of pupil (X), teacher (T) and school (S) characteristics and a random error (ε) (Rivkin, Hanushek, and Kain 2005). The pupil characteristics include age, gender and parental education; teacher characteristics include gender, subject pedagogical knowledge, use of non-basic teaching and learning materials and experience; while the school characteristics included head–teacher supervision, school type and category. Since our data consists of one teacher per school, the teacher characteristics can also be said to be school level characteristics. However, for the purpose of highlighting which characteristics describe schools and which describe teachers, we present them independently in the model. Therefore, the proportion of time on active teaching and content coverage, our main explanatory variables, are considered as teacher characteristics.

From Equation 1, we first fitted a null model with an aim of detecting significant differences in student achievement between schools without predictors being considered (Equa-

tion 2). The null model is used as a base to determine the relative reduction in variance that is attributable to the predictors added thereafter in the model (e.g., school and pupil variables).

$$\begin{cases} \Delta y_{ij} = \beta_j + e_{ij}\ ; \quad e_{ij} \sim N(0, \sigma_e^2) \\ \beta_j = \beta_0 + u_j\ ; \quad u_j \sim N(0, \sigma_u^2) \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

In the next model we carry out a univariate analysis using the main explanatory variables, time on active teaching and OTL. OTL was calculated in three different ways: proportion of topic, sub-topic and content covered. We fit a univariate model for each of the OTL measures in order to isolate the one that is highly related with pupil gain score and to be used in the subsequent models. We thereafter control for pupil and both school and teacher characteristics independently as the only predictors. In the final model, we control for both pupil and school level characteristics in the same model. The final model is as presented in Equation 3.

$$\begin{cases} \Delta y_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + \beta_1 . x_{ij} + \beta_2 . t_j + \beta_3 . s_j + e_{ij}\ ; \quad e_{ij} \sim N(0, \sigma_e^2) \\ \beta_{0j} = \beta_0 + u_j\ ; \quad u_j \sim N(0, \sigma_u^2) \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

This type of modelling allows us to estimate the relative variance attributable to the different level predictors – i.e., the amount of variation attributable to Level 2 predictors relative to Level 1 predictors.

Results

Background characteristics

The study involved 1889 pupils: girls (924) and boys (965) and 70 teachers and schools. There were notable significant differences in parental education: 57.73% of the pupils in top schools reported that their mothers had at least secondary education compared to 46.1% in the bottom performing schools (Table 1). Similarly, 63.63% of the pupils in top schools reported that their fathers had at least secondary education compared to 49.74% in the bottom performing schools.

In the top schools teachers scored a mean of 62.83% in the maths test whereas those in the bottom schools scored a mean of 58.32%; however the difference was not statistically significant. There is a significant difference in the availability of non-basic teaching and learning materials (NBTLM) in the maths lessons between the top and bottom schools. That is 82.35% of the bottom ranked schools had no NBTLM as compared to 58.33% of the top ranked schools. Head teacher lesson observation was rare; with 60% of the maths teachers reporting that head teachers rarely or never observed them teach. There is also a significant difference in the proportion of poor pupils in a school ranked in the poorest 20% category relative to its district wealth index: 25.90% compared to 13.74% among the top schools.

OTL and time on active teaching by school category

Table 2 shows the mean content coverage and proportion of lesson time used in active teaching by school category. Teachers in both bottom and top performing schools spend the same proportion of lesson time in active teaching as well as content coverage. Table 2 also shows that while most of the teachers covered 91% and 88% of the Grade 6 math syllabus

Table 1. Pupil, school, and teacher background characteristics.

	Top schools	Bottom schools	Total	
	Number (%)	Number (%)	Number (%)	p-value
Pupil level variables				
Pupil sex: Female	563 (50.31)	361 (46.88)	924 (48.91)	0.078
Male	556 (49.69)	409 (53.12)	965 (51.09)	
Mean pupil age †	*12.05 (sd=1.57)*	*12.36 (sd=1.74)*	*12.18 (sd=1.65)*	*0.989*
MEDU: None/primary	345 (30.83)	341 (44.29)	686 (36.32)	0.001
Secondary and higher	646 (57.73)	355 (46.1)	1001 (52.99)	
Don't know	128 (11.44)	74 (9.61)	202 (10.69)	
FEDU: None/primary	233 (20.82)	248 (32.21)	481 (25.46)	0.001
Secondary and higher	712 (63.63)	383 (49.74)	1095 (57.97)	
Don't know	174 (15.55)	139 (18.05)	313 (16.57)	
Math homework <4 times/week	453 (40.48)	358 (46.49)	811 (42.93)	0.011
At least 4 times a week	666 (59.52)	412 (53.51)	1078 (57.07)	
School level variables				
Math teacher mean score	*62.83 (sd = 15.48)*	*58.32 (sd =15.66)*	*60.64 (sd =15.62)*	0.432
NBTLM: Not available	21 (58.33)	28 (82.35)	49 (70.00)	0.038
Available	15 (41.67)	6 (17.65)	21 (30.00)	
Public school: No	7 (19.44)	7 (20.59)	14 (20.00)	1.000
Yes	29 (80.56)	27 (79.41)	56 (80.00)	
H/Teacher obs: rarely/never	19 (52.78)	23 (67.65)	42 (60.00)	0.231
Sometimes/often	17 (47.22)	11 (32.35)	28 (40.00)	
Mean of poor pupils (20%)	*13.74 (sd = 14.20)*	*25.90 (sd = 17.54)*	*19.65 (sd =16.94)*	0.039
Teacher sex: Female	15 (41.67)	17 (50)	32 (45.71)	0.632
Male	21 (58.33)	17 (50)	38 (54.29)	

Note: † Means are reported since the variables are continuous ones.

Table 2. OTL and time on active teaching by school category.

	Top		Bottom		
	Mean	Std. dev	Mean	Std. dev	P-values
Proportion of topic covered	0.910	0.125	0.875	0.141	0.280
Proportion of sub-topic covered	0.737	0.160	0.685	0.153	0.167
Proportion of content covered	0.540	0.147	0.474	0.164	0.079
Proportion of lesson time on active teaching	0.621	0.168	0.617	0.186	0.911

in terms of topics, the content coverage was very low (54% and 47%) among the top and bottom schools respectively.

Univariate results: OTL and time on active teaching

Table 3 presents both null model and univariate results on the effects of proportion of topics, sub topics and content coverage, as well as time on active teaching on pupil IRT gains score. The intercept of 0.56 in the null model indicates the estimated overall school average in student achievement. The random part of the null model reveals that the variance at pupil and school level is significantly different from zero. This means that there is significant variation in mean school gain scores. Therefore, 10.4% of the total variance in pupil IRT gains score is attributable to the school level.

The univariate results also show that a unit increment in the proportion of topic and content covered in math classes significantly increases pupil IRT score by 0.585 and 0.372 respectively; while the proportion of sub-topics covered is significant at 10%. However, the proportion of time on active teaching is not significantly associated with pupil gain score. The proportion of topic, sub-topic and content covered, as well as time on active teaching, are at school level, and are associated with decreases in the school level variance (14.83%, 7.14% and 7.14% respectively); hence each of these OTL measures account for some of the variation in school level seen in the null model. From Table 3, since the proportion of topic covered (OTL) is highly associated with pupil achievement; it is used in the subsequent analysis, together with time on active teaching.

Effect of OTL and time on active teaching controlling for Level 1 predictors

In Table 4, Model 3 shows the results on both OTL and time on active teaching. The results indicate that OTL significantly influences pupil IRT score, while time-on-task still remains insignificant and negatively influences pupil IRT gain score. The variance at Level 2 decreases insignificantly by 2.63% in Model 3, when compared to univariate results on the proportion of topic coverage on IRT gain score presented in Table 3 (Model 2(a)). Model 4 controls for pupil characteristics, where OTL remains positive and statistically significant. With an exception of pupil age (significant at 10%), the other pupil characteristics insignificantly influence pupil IRT score. The intra-class correlation for Model 3 reduces insignificantly when the pupil level factors are introduced; i.e., from 8.9% to 8.1% in Model 4. This is coupled by a reduction in school level (Level 2) variance by 10.81% with very little proportional variance reduction at pupil level. Furthermore, when the null model is compared with Model 4 that controls for pupil (Level 1) predictors there is a 25% decrease in variance at Level 2.

Model 5 of Table 5 shows the effect of OTL and active time on teaching when controlling for school and teacher characteristics. The significant effect of OTL as seen above dimin-

Table 3. Multilevel coefficient: univariate analysis (pupils = 1889; schools = 70).

	Proportion of () covered				
Fixed effects	Model 1: Null model Coef. (CI)	Model 2(a): Topic: Coef. (CI)	Model 2(b): Sub-topic: Coef. (CI)	Model 2(c): Content Coef. (CI)	Model 2(d): Active teaching Coef. (CI)
Constant	0.563	0.042	0.308	0.374	0.644
	[0.505; 0.621]	[−0.328; 0.413]	[0.045; 0.571]	[0.179; 0.568]	[0.421; 0.868]
Coefficient		0.585***	0.359*	0.372**	−0.13
		[0.173; 0.996]	[−0.001; 0.719]	[0.007; 0.737]	[−0.478; 0.217]
Random effect					
School	0.044	0.038	0.041	0.041	0.043
Pupil	0.379	0.379	0.379	0.379	0.379
Intra-class correlation	0.104	0.090	0.098	0.098	0.103
Log likelihood	−1,810.726	− 1,807.103	− 1,808.876	−1,808.781	−1,810.460

Notes: *** significant at 1%; ** significant at 5%; * significant at 10%.

Table 4. Multilevel coefficient (pupils = 1889; schools = 70).

		Model 3		Model 4, Pupil characteristics	
		Coef.	CI	Coef.	CI
Fixed effects	Variable category				
Constant		0.112	[−0.326; 0.55]	0.274	[−0.212; 0.761]
Proportion of topic covered		0.575***	[0.164; 0.986]	0.528***	[0.13; 0.925]
Prop. of time on active teaching		− 0.098	[−0.429; 0.232]	−0.077	[−0.397; 0.243]
Pupil gender	Female			-	
	Male			0.021	[−0.037; 0.079]
Pupil age				−0.017*	[−0.036; 0.002]
Mother education	No education/ primary			-	-
	Post primary education			−0.012	[−0.086; 0.061]
	Don't know			−0.041	[−0.151; 0.07]
Father education	No education/ primary			-	
	Post primary education			0.061	[−0.016; 0.138]
	Don't know			0.067	[−0.032; 0.166]
Math homework	Less than 4 times			-	
	At least 4 times/ week			0.046	[−0.022; 0.115]
Random effects					
School		0.037		0.033	
Pupil		0.379		0.378	
Intra class correlation		0.089		0.081	
Log likelihood		−1,806.93		−1802.46	

Notes: *** significant at 1%; ** significant at 5%; * significant at 10%.

Table 5. Multilevel coefficient (pupils = 1889; schools = 70).

		Model 5: school character		Model 6: full model	
		Coef.	CI		Coef.
Fixed effects	Variable category				
Constant		0.428	[−0.028; 0.884]	0.549	[0.043; 1.055]
Proportion of topic covered		0.268	[−0.103; 0.638]	0.258	[−0.105; 0.620]
Proportion of time on active teaching		-0.189	[−0.480; 0.103]	−0.171	[−0.458; 0.116]
Pupil gender	Female			-	-
	Male			0.018	[−0.04; 0.076]
Pupil age				−0.016*	[−0.035; 0.003]
Mother education	No education/primary			-	-
	Post primary education			−0.025	[−0.098; 0.047]
	Don't know			−0.052	[−0.162; 0.058]
Father education	No education/primary			-	-
	Post primary education			0.053	[−0.024; 0.13]
	Don't know			0.064	[−0.035; 0.163]
Math homework	< 4 days a week			-	-
	At least 4 days a week			0.041	[−0.027; 0.108]
School category	Top	-	-	-	-
	Bottom	−0.063	[−0.169; 0.042]	-0.060	[−0.163; 0.044]
Teacher math score	Score	0.002	[−0.001; 0.005]	0.002	[−0.001; 0.005]
Head teacher observation	Never or rarely	-	-	-	-
	Sometimes or often	−0.074	[−0.174; 0.027]	−0.075	[−0.174; 0.024]
Teacher sex	Female	-	-	-	-
	Male	−0.019	[−0.114; 0.075]	−0.013	[−0.106; 0.080]
NBTL materials	Not available	-	-	-	-
	Available	0.181***	[0.072; 0.291]	0.175***	[0.068; 0.283]
School poverty (poor 20%)	-0.002	[−0.006; 0.002]	−0.002	[−0.005; 0.002]	
School type	Private	-	-	-	-
	Public	0.036	[−0.121; 0.192]	0.060	[−0.095; 0.214]
PTR	Less than 26	-	-	-	-
	Between 26 and 45	−0.072	[−0.217; 0.073]	−0.075	[−0.218; 0.067]
	Above 45	−0.213**	[−0.397; −0.028]	−0.205**	[−0.387; -0.024]
Random effects					

(*Continued*)

Table 5. (*Continued*)

	Model 5: school character		Model 6: full model
	Coef.	CI	Coef.
School	0.022		0.020
Pupil	0.379		0.378
Intra class correlation	0.054		0.051
Log likelihood	-1795.678		−1792.055

Notes: *** significant at 1%; ** significant at 5%; * significant at 10%.

ishes, though it remains positive (0.428, CI: -0.028; 0.884). The proportion of time utilised on active teaching also remains insignificant and negatively associated with pupil IRT gain score. With the exception of the availability of non-basic teaching and learning materials (NBTLM) and pupil teacher ratio (PTR), all other school and teacher variables are insignificant. The intra-class correlation decreases to 5.4%. This shows that the school level variables are attributable to the reduction of variation at school (Level 2) level.

Effect of OTL and time on active teaching controlling for both level 1 and 2 predictors

The final model (Model 6) is the full model and shows the effect OTL and time on active teaching on pupil IRT gain score, controlling for pupil, school and teacher characteristics. Proportion of topic covered (OTL), though positive is not significant – i.e., pupil IRT score increases on average by 0.258 points holding pupil, school and teacher characteristics constant. In schools that had NBTLM available in the classroom, pupils gained significantly higher IRT scores compared with those where the materials were not available.

The results further show that an increase in pupil teacher ratio is associated with a significant decrease in pupil IRT gain scores. That is, in schools that had a PTR of more than 45, their pupils gained on average -0.213 IRT scores. Pupil IRT gain score is also negatively associated with pupil age. A one year increment in the age of the pupil is associated with a -0.016 IRT gain score. It is also evident that there is no significant difference in pupil IRT gain score between top and bottom performing schools, despite the fact that bottom schools gained negatively (Models 5 and 6).

The random part of Model 6 shows a reduction of the intra-class correlation to 5.1%: this is attributable to the decrease in school level variance from 0.022 to 0.020 (9.10%), with pupil level variance largely remaining the same. Therefore, much of the variation noted in pupil IRT gain scores is attributable to unobserved pupil level characteristics rather than unobserved school level characteristics.

Conclusion

The purpose of this paper was to examine the effect on active teaching and content coverage on pupil achievement, and thereby to try to answer the question of why some schools dominate the league tables in Kenya certificate of primary education while are others are confined to the bottom ranks. Active teaching was measured by the proportion of lesson time spent on active teaching activities, and content coverage was measured by the proportion of content covered at Grade 6 relative to the Grade 6 Kenyan maths syllabus content. The study findings indicate that content coverage positively and significantly influences pupil achievement if it is the only predictor. There is no support for the hypothesis that time-on-task predicts achievement.

The results further indicate that the proportion of topic, sub-topic and content covered, as well as time spent on active teaching at school level, are associated with a decrease in the school level variation. This is an indication that these opportunity to learn measures account for some variation at school level. When controlling for pupil, school and teacher characteristics, schools that had non-basic teaching and learning materials available in the classroom, had their pupils gaining significantly higher IRT scores compared with those where the materials were not available. The results also show that an increase in pupil teacher ratio is associated with a significant decrease in pupil IRT gain scores.

Nevertheless, there is no significant difference in the proportion of lesson time spent on active teaching and opportunity to learn between top and bottom performing schools. It is also evident that there is no significant difference in pupil IRT gain score between top and bottom performing schools, despite the fact that bottom schools gained negatively (i.e., Test 1 was lower than Test 2). Therefore, we concluded that opportunity to learn and active time-on-task are not the source of variation in pupil achievement between top and bottom performing schools in this sample. Answers to the variation lie elsewhere, and instead of blaming teachers in low performing schools, the Kenyan government may need to look deeper at non-school factors as being, partly, the main cause of the persistent differences which yields the undesirable failing schools and a few succeeding schools in the Kenyan national examination league tables annually.

Acknowledgements

An earlier version of this paper appeared as an APHRC Working Paper.

Note

1. The high ability pupils were selected because they are likely to attend school regularly and to have organised, complete and up to date notes. The class teachers in each of the schools helped us identify which pupils were considered as high ability learners

Notes on contributors

Dr Moses Oketch is Reader at the Institute of Education, University of London. Between 2008 and 2011 he was affiliated with African Population and Health Research Center (APHRC) as Senior Research Scientist and Head of the Education Research Program, first as Sabbatical Fellow, and later, on leave from his University. His areas of research interest include economics of education, education policy analysis, impact evaluation, schooling decisions including access, quality, livelihood, learning outcomes and the inter-linkages between education and economic development. He has published extensively on these areas.

Mr Maurice Mutisya is Data Analyst, Education Research Program at the African Population and Health Research Center (APHRC). He holds a BSc (Mathematics and Computer Science) from Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology (JKUAT) and a Master of Science degree in the field of Population based Field Epidemiology from the University of Witwatersrand (Johannesburg, South Africa).

Ms Jackline Sagwe is the Head of Business Intelligence and Research at the Kenya Institute of Management and a PhD student at the University of Nairobi, School of Mathematics. She holds a MSc Statistics and a BEd (Maths and Economics) with First Class Honours from the University of Nairobi.

Mr Peter Musyoka is a Research Officer, Education Research Program at the African Population and Health Research Center (APHRC). He holds a Bachelor's degree in Education (Economics & Mathematics) from University of Nairobi and MA (Economics) from Chancellor College, University of Malawi with focus on Health and Environmental Economics.

Dr Moses W. Ngware is Research Scientist and Lead, Education Research Program at the African Population and Health Research Center (APHRC). He joined APHRC in 2007. Prior to this, Dr Ngware was a Researcher and Policy Analyst in Education at the Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis. He has also taught in universities and secondary schools. His current research and policy work interests are in teaching and learning. He has a PhD in Economics of Education from Egerton University (Kenya). Dr Ngware has published several peer reviewed articles.

References

Abadzi, H. 2007. Absenteeism and beyond: Instructional time loss and consequences. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper Series. http://ssrn.com.

Abadzi, H. 2009. Instructional time loss in developing countries: Concepts, measurement, and implications. *The World Bank Research Observer* 24, no. 2: 267–90.

Barr, R., and R. Dreeben. 1983. *How schools work*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Baumert, J., M. Kunter, W. Blum, M. Brunner, T. Voss, A. Jordan, U. Klusmann, S. Krauss, M. Neubrand, and Y. Tsai. 2010. Teachers' mathematical knowledge, cognitive activation in the classroom, and student progress. *American Educational Research Journal* 47, no. 1: 133–80.

Benavot, A. 2006. *The diversification of secondary education: School curricula in comparative perspective*. IBE Working Papers on Curriculum Issues, No.1. Geneva: UNESCO–IBE.

Benavot, A., and M. Amadio. 2004. A global study of intended instructional time and official school curricula, 1980–2000. Background paper commissioned by International Bureau of Education for the UNESCO EFA Global monitoring Paper.

Brophy, J. 1982. How teachers influence what is taught and learned in classrooms. *Elementary School Journal* 83, no. 1: 1–13.

Carroll, J.B. 1963. A model of school learning. *Teacher's College Record* 64: 723–33.

Clark, D., and M.C. Linn. 2003. Designing for knowledge integration: The impact of instructional time. *Journal of the Learning Sciences* 12, no. 4: 451–93.

Gillies, J., and P. Collins. 2008. *Opportunity to learn: A high impact strategy for improving educational outcomes in developing countries*. Washington, DC: EQUIP2. AED.

Huyvaert, S.H. 1998. *Time is of the essence: Learning in schools*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Independent Evaluation Group (IEG). 2008. Mozambique: Education and Manpower Development Project (Credit 1907); Second Education Project (Credit 2200); Capacity Building Human Resources Development Project (Credit 2436); Education Sector Strategic Program Project (Credit 3172). Project Performance Report No.44320.

Marcotte, D.E. 2007. Schooling and test scores: A mother-natural experiment. *Economics of Education Review* 26: 629–40.

Ngware, M., M. Oketch, M. Mutisya, and B. Abuya. 2010. Classroom observation study: A report on the quality and learning in primary schools in Kenya. African Population and Health Research Center report.

Pontefract, C., and F. Hardman. 2005. The discourse of classroom interaction in Kenyan primary schools. *Comparative Education* 41, no. 1: 87–106.

Rangel, E., and D. Berliner. 2007. Essential information for education policy: Time to learn. *Research Points: American Educational Research Association* 5, no. 2: 1–4.

Rasch Measurement Software and Publications. 2002. Winsteps. www.winsteps.com.

Rivkin, S.G., E. Hanushek, and J.F. Kain. 2005. Teachers, schools and academic achievement. *Econometrica* 73, no. 2: 417–58.

Rowan, B., R. Correnti, and R.J. Miller. 2002. What large-scale, survey research tells us about teacher effects on student achievement: Insights from the Prospects student of elementary schools. *Teachers College Record*.

Schwille, J.R., A.C. Porter, G. Belli, R.E. Floden, D.J. Freeman, L.B. Knappen, et al. 1983. Teachers as policy brokers in the content of elementary school mathematics. In *Handbook on teaching and policy*, ed. L. Shulman and G. Sykes, 370–91. New York: Longman.

Smith, B. 2002. Quantity matters: Annual instructional time in an urban system. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 36, no. 5: 652–82.

Suter, E.L. 2000. Is student achievement immutable? Evidence from international studies on schooling and student achievement, National Science Foundation *Review of Educational Research* 70, no. 4: 529–45.