

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No. IJAR-53936

Date: 19/09/2025

**Title:** *Balancing Fun and Exam Readiness: Teachers' Perspectives on Technology and Interactive Approaches in Malaysian Primary English Classrooms*

### Recommendation:

Accept as it is .....  
 ✓Accept after minor revision.....  
 Accept after major revision .....  
 Do not accept (*Reasons below*) .....

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		√		
Techn. Quality			√	
Clarity			√	
Significance		√		

Reviewer Name: Dr Anam Zehra

**Date:** 19/09/2025

### Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

The manuscript presents a qualitative study exploring Malaysian primary English teachers' perspectives on integrating technology to balance engaging pedagogical practices with exam readiness. The study contributes significantly to the discourse on technology-enhanced learning in exam-driven contexts. The paper is rich in thematic analysis and practical insights, but a few structural refinements are needed for stronger coherence.

**Recommendation:** Accept after minor revision

## Detailed Reviewer's Report

### Strengths

- Relevance and Timeliness:** The study highlights the growing importance of technology integration in classrooms while addressing exam preparedness, a pressing concern in Asian education systems.
- Clear Objectives:** The purpose, objectives, and research questions are well aligned with the problem statement.
- Methodological Rigor:** Thematic analysis is systematically applied, with Braun & Clarke's framework providing methodological credibility.
- Practical Insights:** The findings capture teachers' lived experiences, particularly infrastructure gaps, professional development needs, and classroom practices.
- Contribution to Policy and Practice:** The paper provides actionable implications for curriculum planners, policymakers, and teacher training institutions.

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

*www.journalijar.com*

---

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

### Weaknesses

1. **Sample Size Limitation:** With only six participants, the findings are context-specific and cannot be generalized; this limitation should be explicitly acknowledged in the discussion.
2. **Depth of Analysis:** While six themes are presented, some sections (e.g., customization vs. templates) could be expanded with more interpretive depth.
3. **Redundancy in Literature Review:** Certain references are repeated in both the introduction and discussion, leading to overlaps.
4. **Structural Refinement:** A clearer distinction between findings and discussion would strengthen readability.
5. **Formatting Issues:** Minor spacing, reference alignment, and table presentation issues need correction before publication.