Such questions lead to predictions while they manipulate the e-tivities which is a great indication that learning is taking place. The interactive simulations use a constructivist approach, rather than guiding learners step-by-step. Students are encouraged to make predictions, and to explain their predictions, prior to exploring the simulation to test their predictions. This approach is more effective than a prescriptive one for overcoming alternative conceptions (Windschitl and Andre, 1998). Scientifically, after the explorations, students will then conclude whether their hypotheses are correct or not. After such, the sharing and posting on the facebook group chat started to fire the conversation based on their findings about predictions which could lead others to compare their experiences as well as their predictions. Simulations provide minimal guidance, to facilitate open-ended exploration. This can take the form of one or two "driving questions," questions about the challenging underlying concepts illustrated by the simulation. Students given these open-ended conceptual questions explore simulations much the way scientists explore: posing and answering questions to themselves, driven by their own curiosity, to make sense of the phenomenon being simulated. When more guidance is given, in the form of directions to explore specific features or variables, students actually explore less, stopping as soon as they have answered the specific questions in the "guided inquiry" activity (Adams et al., 2007).

The effectiveness of the study is derived from how the students learn important concepts using the e-tivity approach. The responses of the students pertaining on how they learn from the e-tivities have made this study effective. Thus, with e-tivities, students show interest to learn, they are eager to learn more and they develop a sense of confidence to share, to elaborate more and learned pertaining to those topics in Physics. Educational games and simulations have been found to be effective in motivating students to learn (Ke, 2008; Papastergiou, 2009; Tüzün, Yilmaz-Soylu, Karakus, Inal, & Kizilkaya, 2009).

CONCLUSION

Salmon's E-tivity Approach is another strategy in teaching Mathematical Concepts in Physics due to its emphasized steps which can boast students' enthusiasm to learn. The interactive simulations made the experience of the students more meaningful. As reflected on the increment of students' performance pertaining to mentioned topics in Physics, it shows how the strategy made a difference to learning. This approach fits today's digital learners. Thus, it bridges the gap that hinders learning in the spiral progression of K to 12 curriculum not only in the discipline of Mathematics but also in other subject areas.

RECOMMENDATION

This study recommends the use of Salmon's e-tivity approach in teaching. Though the context of the study is the Mathematical concepts in Physics, this approach can also be used to other subject areas. Moreover, the study made use of Physics Education Technology's interactive simulations which can be accessed online and offline to make learning fun and interactive. The use of Facebook group chat can be optional. Teachers can find means to replace facebook group chatting to other means of conceptualizing an online classroom such as Edmodo.

REFERENCES

Dúriz-Bravo, A. (2012). A 'Semantic' View of Scientific Models for Science Education. Science & Education22 (7), 1593-1611.

Adunola, O. (2011), "The Impact of Teachers' Teaching Methods on the

Academic Performance of Primary School Pupils in Ijebu-Ode Local cut Area of Ogun State," Ego Booster Books, Ogun State, Nigeria.

Alimen, R. (2008). Attitude towards Physics and Physics Performance Theories of Learning and Prospects in Teaching Physics. John B. Lacson Maritime Foundation University-Molo.

Ardac, D., & Akaygun, S. (2004). Effectiveness of multimedia-based instruction that emphasizes molecular representations on students' understanding of chemical change. Journal of Research in Science and Teaching, 41, 317–337.

Crouch, Catherien H. and Eric Mazur (2001). Peer Instruction: Ten years of Experience and results. Hardvard University, Cambridge,

De Jong, T., & Van Joolingen, W. R. (1998). Scientific discovery learning with computer simulations of conceptual domains. Review of Educational Research, 68, 179–201.

Gilbert, J. K., Watts, D. M., & Osborne, R. J. (1982). *Students' conceptions of ideas in mechanics*. Physics Education, 17, 62-66.

Gingras, Y. (2001). *WHAT DID MATHEMATICS DO TO PHYSICS?*Université du Québec à Montréal.

Gonzales, P., Guzman, J., Partelow, L., Pahlke, E., Jocelyn, L., Kastberg, D.,Williams, T. (2004, December). *Highlights from the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS)*.

Grimellini-Tomasini, N., Pecori-Balandi, B., Pacca, J.L.A., & Villani, A. (1993). Understanding Conservation Laws in Mechanics: Students' Conceptual Change in Learning about Collisions. Science Education 77(2), 169-189.

Gunstone, R., & Watts, M. (1985). *Force and motion*. In R. Driver, E. Guesne & A. Tiberghien (Eds.), Children's ideas in science (pp. 85- 104).

Kanner, M.D. (2007). War and Peace: Simulating Security Decision Making in the Classroom. PS: Political Science & Politics, 40(04), 795-800

Ke, F. (2008). Computer games application within alternative classroom goal structures: cognitive, metacognitive, and affective evaluation. Educational Technology Research and Development, 56 (5/6), 539-556.

Kim, M., & Hannafin, M. (2011). Scaffolding problem-solving in technology-enhanced learning environments (TELEs): Bridging research and theory with practice. Computers and Education, 56, 403–417.

Konyalıoğlu, A.C., İpek, A.S. & Işık, A. (2003): On the teaching linear algebra at the University level: The role of visualization in the teaching vector spaces. Journal of the Korea Society of Mathematical Education Series D: Research in Mathematical Education, 7(1), pp.59-67

Loeblein, P. (2010, December 21). Collision Lab: Introduction to One Dimension collisions.

Malone, T. W. (1980). What Makes Things Fun to Learn? A study of Intrinsically Motivating Computer Games; Technical Report. Xerox Palo Alto, ReseachCenter, Palo Alto, California.

Mc. Demott, L.C., Shaffer, P.S. and the Physics Education Group (1998). Tutorials In Introductory Physics. Upper Saddle River, N.J. Prentice Hall.

Millar, R., & Driver, R. (1987). Beyond processes.Studies in Science Education, 14, 33-62.

Muirhead, B. (2002). E-tivities: The key to active online learning (Book review). University of Phoenix, USA

Papastergiou, M. (2009). Digital game-based learning in high school computer science education: Impact on educational effectiveness and student motivation. Computers and Education, 52 (1), 1-12.

Redish, F. & Steinberg, N. (1999). Teaching Physics: Figuring Out What Works.Rivard, L. P. & Straw, S. P. (2000). The effect of talk and writing on learning science: An exploratory study.Science Education, 84, 566-593.

Singh, Chandralekha and Rosengrant, David. (2016). Students' Conceptual Knowledge of Energy and Momentum. University of Pittsburgh.

Tüzün, H., Yilmaz-Soylu, M., Karakus, T., Inal, Y., & Kizilkaya, G. (2009). The effects of computer games on primary school students' achievement and motivation in geography learning. Computers and Education, 52 (1), 68-77.

Maunes, Rogelio B. (2016). Montague's Cognitive-Metacognitive Strategy in Solving Mathematical Word Problem. Cebu Normal University.

Panes, Luzviminda M. (2005). High School Students' Difficulty in Solving Problems in Physics.

Boyd, D.M. & Illison, N.B. (2007). Social Network Sites: Definition, History, and Scholarship. Journal of Compute-Mediated Communication, 13(1), 210-230.

Daluba, N. (2013). Effect of Demonstration Method of Teaching on Students' Achievement in Agriculture on Science. World Journal in Education.

Freedman, Roger A. Challenges in Teaching and Learning Introductory Physics. University of California, Santa Barbara.

Honey, M. A., & Hilton, M. (2011). Learning science through computer games and simulations. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Kavitha, Annie L. and Sundharavadivel, G. (2012). International Journal of Educational Research and Technology. ISSN 0976-4089.

Lindgren, R., & Schwartz, D. L. (2009). Spatial learning and computer simulations in science. International Journal of Science Education, 31(3), 419–438.

National Research Council. (1996). National science education standards: Observe, interact, change, and learn. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Njiru, S. and Karuku, S (2015). An Exploration of Factors that Contribute to Low Performance in Physics: A Case Study of a Secondary School in Kenya.

Plass, Jan L., Milne, Catherine, Homer, Bruce D., Schwartz, Ruth N., Hayward, Elizabeth O., Jordan,Trace, Verkuilen,Jay, Ng,Florrie , Wang,Yan and Barrientos , Juan (2012). Investigating the Effectiveness of Computer Simulations for Chemistry Learning. New York.

Redish, E., Steinberg, Richard N. and Saul, J. (1996). *Students Difficulties with Math in Physics Giving Meaning to Symbols*. Department of Physics, University of Maryland College Park.

Mc Carthy, J. (2012). International Design Collaboration and Mentoring for Tertiary Students through Facebook Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 28(5), 755-775.

Einosho, S. (2013). How Do Students Perceive the Difficulty of Physics in Secondary School? An Exploratory Study in Nigeria, 1. Retrieved from infonomics society.ie/wpcontent/uploads/ijcdse /published-papers/special-issue-volume-3-2013/How-Do-Students-Perceive-the-Difficulty-of-Physics-in-Secondary-School.pdf

What is Mechanical Energy? - Definition & Examples. (2013). Retrieved from http://study.com/academy /lesson*Conservation of Momentum with Examples*. Retrieved from http://www.physicstutorials. org/home/ impulsemomentum/conservation-of-momentum

Energy Education. (2014). *Forms of Energy*. Mechanical Energy. Retrieve from http://aecoop.org/wpcontent/ Mechanical Energy_

Pedagogy in Action. The SERC portal for Educators. (2015, June 17). Retrieved from http://serc.carleton.edu/sp/library/phet/what.html

Rivkin, S. G., Hanushek, E. A., & Kain, J. F. (2005). Teachers, schools,and academic achievement. Econometrics, 73, 417- 458. Retrieved from http://edpro.stanford.edu

Rockoff, J. E., Jacob, B. A., Kane, T. J., & Staiger, D. O. (2008). Can you recognize an effective teacher when you recruit one? (NBER Working Paper No. 14485). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research. Retrieved from http://www.nber.org

Science Clarrified. (2015). Projectile Motion-Real Life-Applications. Retrieved from http://www. scienceclarified.com/everyday/Real-Life-Chemistry-Vol-3Physics-Vol-1/Projectile-Motion-Real-life-applications.html

Simulations and Games. (2015). Retrieved from http://www.mrmont.com/games/

Clark, M.H. & Shadish, W. (2008). Solomon Four-Group Design. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/978 1412963947.

Da Silva, J. A. (2015). Week 7 e-tivity 1. Retrieved from http://etutoring.pbworks.com

Department of Geography. (2009). *What is an e-tivity?*. Retrieved from http://www2.le.ac.uk/ departments /geography/projects/tri-orm/

Cited Research Center. *Learning with computer games and simulations*. Retrieved from http://www.cited.org/

Salmon, G. (2014). Gilly Salmon. Retrieved from http://www.gillysalmon.com/

Singh, Chandralekda and Rosengrant, David (2001). Students' Conceptual Knowledge of Energy and Momentum. University of Pittsburgh.Retrieved on March 2, 2016.https://people.rit.edu.

Kolloff, M. (2011). Strategies for effective student/student interaction in online courses. 17thannual conference on distance teaching and learning.

Swan, K. (2002). Building learning communities in online courses: The importance of interaction. Education, Communication & Information, 2(1), 23-49.