

## THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STUDENTS' GRAMMAR MASTERY AND RECOUNT TEXT WRITING ABILITY

Nayla Safitri Awaliya<sup>1</sup>, Eva Rahmawati<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup> Universitas Negeri Surabaya, East Java, Indonesia

Corresponding Author Email\*: evarahmawati@unesa.ac.id

### Abstract

Grammar is often assumed to make a strong contribution to writing skill, since it governs the structure of the language used to build a good sentence. However, the correlation between grammar mastery and writing ability has varied across studies, ranging from strong to moderate to no significant relationship. Therefore, it is necessary to reexamine the relationship between those variables, especially in recount text writing context. This study aimed to investigate the students' grammar mastery, their recount text writing ability, and the relationship between grammar mastery and recount text writing ability of 8<sup>th</sup> grade junior high school students by conducting a correlational study. The sample comprised 79 students selected through purposive sampling from three classes. The grammar test as a tool to measure grammar mastery and writing rubric as a tool to assess the students' existing writing were involved as the main instrument in this study. The result showed that the grammar mastery of the students was at an average level (41.62), their recount text writing ability was at a good level (73.17), and there was no significant relationship ( $p = 0.754, > 0.05$ ) between the students' grammar mastery and their recount text writing ability. This study found that grammar did not dominantly contribute to the students' recount text writing, suggesting that other aspects of writing, such as organization, content, and mechanics, may contribute more than grammar alone.

**Keywords:** Grammar Mastery, Writing Ability, Recount Text

### INTRODUCTION

Writing is one of the productive skills in English learning that is very crucial to be learned which involves many processes (Babel, 2014; Hyland, 2022). In addition, based on Kurikulum Merdeka, writing is the ability to convey, communicate ideas, express creativity and create in various genres of written text, in an effective and understandable manner, and can boost the readers' interest with appropriate organizational structure and linguistic elements (Kementerian Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah, 2025). There are four aspects of writing that are involved in 8th grade English teachers' book "English for Nusantara" by Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia (2022), which must be applied in the writing process, and those are generic structure, content, communication, and written features. These aspects were also in line with the theory of Weigle (2002), who stated that these aspects of writing must be implied when creating a good writing. In addition, according to Mega, Ismiyati, and Silfia (2025), the writing ability consisted of four levels which are poor, fair, good, and excellent. These categories were adapted based on the language assessment principles proposed by Brown (2004) in *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. From those statements, it can be concluded that writing skill is one of the mandatory skills which is needed to be learned by the students, especially in junior high school level. Moreover, there are many kinds of genre text that have their own function and purposes and needed to be learnt by the students especially for junior high school, and one of them is recount text (Kementerian Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah, 2025). Recount text is one of the kinds of text in English writing which contains the information of what happened and when it happened with the purpose of entertaining and informing the audience, and there are three kinds of it which one of them is personal recount text which talks about story or information based on own experience (Derewianka & Jones, 2022). Thus, recount text is needed to be learned by the students.

In order to be able to write properly, grammar is the important language component that is needed to be noted (Hogue et al., 2014). According to Azar and Hagen (2016), grammar is a structure or regularity of the language that always must stick into it so that the language is systematic. Grammar has an important role in writing skill not only because it is the main structure of building a sentence, but it also generates the idea of the text clearly (Roberts & Kreuz, 2018). In addition, according to Swan (2002), there are fourteen fundamental components or aspects of grammar which are tenses and aspects, auxiliary verbs and modal verbs, adjectives and adverbs, preposition, conjunctions / connecting words, verb forms, voice, agreement, part of speech, sentence structure & word order, negation & questions, conditionals, articles & determiners, register & variations. Moreover, based on Andini, Hadriana, and Delfi (2022), there were five categories regarding the mastery of grammar, and those are very poor, poor, average, good, and very good. These categories were adapted based on grammatical theories form, meaning, and use by Celce-Murcia (2001), with the involvement of grammar accuracy and error frequency by Brown, Glasswell, and Harland (2004). In short, grammar mastery is often assumed to have a good contribution to boost the writing skill of the students since it bound the language structure of the sentence.

Unfortunately, there are still a number of pupils that are not really competent in writing English. Most of them confess that they have difficulties in writing English, so it affects the students' psychological condition to have fear when writing English (Alonzo & Gaor, 2025). Mostly, the difficulties that they faced are generating and exploring their ideas since they said that it is a hard thing to do and spend a lot of time (Lipalam et al., 2023). Other difficulties are lack of knowledge how to write well organized, having difficulties in grammar for instance the language features and English tenses, and lack of vocabulary that make them confused to write because they do not know the English word of some vocabularies (Sawetsiri & Wudthayagorn, 2025). Furthermore, according to the preliminary investigation that has been conducted by the researcher in one of the private junior high schools in Gresik, it was found that the students that have high knowledge of grammar tend to have good score in writing recount text, however the students that have lack of grammar knowledge tend to have lower score in writing recount text. So, the researcher conducted research about the relationship between mastery of grammar and the ability of writing recount text in Junior high school students to examine whether the relationship between those two variables is existed or not and how far the correlation level is.

Some previous studies were conducted to investigate the relationship between grammar mastery and writing skill of the students. The findings of the correlation level based on the previous studies were varied, ranging from strong to moderate to no relationship at all. The strong and significant correlation between grammar mastery and writing ability of descriptive and recount texts was found (Pravitasari & Kamal, 2023; Putra, Dharmayanti, & Sawitri, 2022). Moreover, the studies conducted by Iffah, Firdaus, and Fariqoh (2024) and Purba and Indriyani (2021) argued that the correlation between students' grammar mastery and their writing ability was in the moderate level. In contrast, Amelia and Indrawati (2024) and Meivita, Fitri, and Munawwaroh (2025) believed that there was no significant relationship between students' grammar mastery and their writing ability of narrative and descriptive text. In short, previous studies have indicated the inconsistent findings related to the relationship between grammar mastery and writing ability, ranging from strong to moderate to none. This inconsistency indicates that the role of grammar in writing ability, especially in the recount text is needed to be investigated further. Therefore, the researcher needs to reexamine the relationship between grammar mastery and writing recount text ability among junior high school students using a larger sample of 79 participants, while recognizing that, because the sample was drawn purposively from a single school, the findings are not intended to be broadly generalizable. This study focused to investigate several questions: "1. How is the students' mastery of

grammar? 2. How is the students' ability in writing recount text? 3. Is there any relationship between grammar mastery and recount text writing ability in junior high school students?" with the null research hypothesis ( $H_0$ ): there is no significant relationship between students' grammar mastery and their recount text writing ability, and the alternative hypothesis ( $H_1$ ): there is significant relationship between students' grammar mastery and their recount text writing ability.

## METHOD

This study utilized a correlational study. This design is suitable for this research since it is used to investigate the relationship between grammar mastery and recount text writing ability. The sample was 79 students from the total population of 110 Gresik private junior high school students of the 2024/2025 academic year. The sample was selected through purposive sampling and consisted of three intact classes that had completed the recount text writing unit and were taught by the same English teacher [author to confirm the precise selection criteria].

The instruments used in this research were grammar test to know the students' grammar mastery and writing rubric to assess the students' existing recount text writing. The grammar test consisted of 37 multiple choice questions adapted from the Practice Test for the TOEFL® Junior™ Standard Test published by Educational Testing Service (ETS) (2012), since TOEFL is the standardized test to assess the competence of English, and it was distributed via a Google Form. Moreover, the writing rubric was adapted from 8th grade English teachers' book "English for Nusantara" (Kemendikbud, 2022, pp. 96–97), since it was suitable with the students' learning objective according to Kurikulum Merdeka. The validity of both instruments was using content validity approved by the expert, while the reliability of grammar test was measured using Cronbach's alpha in SPSS version 27, and the result indicated good reliability ( $\alpha =$  [insert the value]). Moreover, the reliability of writing rubric was measured using the ICC (intraclass correlation coefficient), since it was assessed by two raters, the English teacher and the researcher, and the result showed very good reliability (ICC = [insert the value]).

Data analysis was utilized using SPSS 27, started with descriptive statistics to determine the students' level of grammar mastery and recount text writing ability using the mean score of each data. Then, the normality test was utilized using Kolmogorov–Smirnov since the sample was more than 50 people to check whether the data were normally distributed or not, indicating normally distributed if the sig. value is more than .05. Furthermore, the linearity test using ANOVA was involved to check whether the variables: grammar mastery score and recount text writing score were linear or not, indicating linear if the sig. deviation linearity is more than .05. Finally, correlation test using Spearman's rho was involved since one of the data was not normally distributed, indicating that there was a significant value if the sig (two tailed) is less than .05 with the correlation coefficient as the correlation strength between two variables. According to Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2007), the level of correlation is divided into four categories, and those are low, moderate, high, and very high. To be more specific, the level of correlation was explained as follow:

Table 1. The Level of Correlation

No	Correlation Value Ranging	Degree of Correlation
1	0.20 – 0.35	Low
2	0.35 – 0.60	Moderate
3	0.60 – 0.85	High
4	> 0.85	Very High

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### Findings

#### Students' Grammar Mastery

##### *Descriptive Statistic of Students' Grammar Mastery*

In order to gain the answer of the first research question, the grammar test was administered to 79 samples to know the grammar mastery of the students. The descriptive statistics was used to investigate the mean, minimum, maximum, and standard deviation of students' competence in grammar.

Table 2. The Descriptive Statistics of Grammar Mastery

Variable	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. deviation
Grammar score	79	14	100	41.62	21.432

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the result of the students' grammar mastery was ranging from the lowest score 14 to the highest score 100. The mean was indicated in 41.62 with the standard deviation 21.432. The mean score represented the average of students' mastery of grammar, while the large standard deviation indicated the wide variation in students' grammar score which means the students' grammar mastery was highly diverse. According to Andini et al. (2022), there are five categories of grammar mastery level started from very poor, poor, average, good, and very good. The detailed information was explained below:

Table 3. Grammar Mastery Achievement Level

Scores	Level of Achievement
0 – 20	Very Poor
21 – 40	Poor
41 – 60	Average
61 – 80	Good
81 – 100	Very Good

Based on the table above, it can be concluded that the students' grammar mastery was at the average level.

##### *Frequency Distribution of Students' Grammar Mastery*

In order to find out the detailed of students' grammar mastery, the frequency distribution was applied. The result of students' grammar mastery can be seen below:

Table 4. The Frequency Distribution of Grammar Mastery Level

Level	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percent
Very poor	5	6.3	6.3
Poor	45	57.0	63.3
Average	15	19.0	82.3
Good	6	7.6	89.9
Very good	8	10.1	100.0
Total	79	100.0	

According to the table 4, the students’ grammar mastery varied across the very poor, poor, average, good, and very good categories. The frequency distribution showed that the majority of the students’ grammar mastery were at the poor level which consisted of 45 students (57%), then followed by those who were at the average level which is consisted of 15 students (19%). The smaller number of students were indicated at a very good level which there were eight students in this category (10.1%), followed by the students who were at a good level which consisted of six students (7.6%), and finally the least number of students were at the very poor level which there were five students in it (6.3%).

### Students’ Recount Text Writing Ability

#### *Descriptive Statistic of Students’ Recount Text Writing Ability*

To find out the students’ recount text writing ability which was asked for the second research question, the writing rubric was used to assess the students’ existing writing assignment. This rubric was used by the two raters who were the researcher and the students’ English teacher, so the final scores of the students were gotten from the calculation from two raters.

Table 5. The Descriptive Statistic of Recount Text Writing Ability

Variable	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. deviation
Final writing	79	27	97	73.17	15.158

Based on the table 5, it can be seen that the result of students’ writing recount text was ranging from the lowest score 27 to the highest score 97. The mean was in 73.17 score with standard deviation 15.158. The mean score represented the average of students’ recount text writing ability, and the standard deviation indicated that the students’ writing scores varied around the mean. Due to the writing category which was divided into four: poor, fair, good, and excellent according to Mega et al. (2025), the students’ recount text ability was at the good level. The detailed information related to writing category was explained below:

Table 6. Recount Text Writing Ability Achievement Level

Scores	Level of Achievement
0 – 25	Poor
26 – 50	Fair
51 – 75	Good
76 – 100	Excellent

#### *Frequency Distribution of Students’ Recount Text Writing Ability*

In order to investigate the detailed of students’ recount text writing ability, the frequency distribution was applied. The result of recount text writing can be seen below:

Table 7. Frequency Distribution of Recount Text Writing

Level	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percent
Fair	6	7.6	7.6
Good	37	46.8	54.4
Excellent	36	45.6	100.0
Total	79	100.0	

Based on table 7, it was shown that students’ recount text writing ability varied across the fair, good, and excellent categories. The frequency distribution showed that the majority of the students’ recount text writing ability were at the good level which consisted of 37 students

(46.8%), then followed by those who were at the excellent level which is consisted of 36 students (45.6%). The smaller number of students were indicated at a fair level which there were six students in this category (7.6%), and finally there were no students at the poor level which have writing scores ranging from 0 – 25.

### Relationship between Students’ Grammar Mastery and Their Recount Text Writing Ability

#### Normality Test

The normality test was used to know whether the grammar mastery scores and writing scores were normally distributed or not, and it determined which the correlation test was the most appropriate to use. Since the research sample was more than fifty students, the Kolmogorov–Smirnov was used to find out the result of normality test.

Table 8. The Normality Test Result

Variable	Kolmogorov–Smirnov statistic	df	Sig.	Shapiro–Wilk statistic	df	Sig.
Grammar score	.216	79	<.001	.841	79	<.001
Final writing	.087	79	.200*	.964	79	.026

Note. a Lilliefors significance correction. \* This is a lower bound of the true significance.

As shown on table 8, it is known that the normality test result of grammar score is less than .001, which is smaller than .05. It means that the students’ grammar score was not normally distributed. However, the normality value of students’ writing score is 0.200 which is higher than 0.05. It indicates that the students’ writing score was normally distributed. Due to the result of the normality test, it was found that one of the data was not normally distributed which makes the nonparametric correlation test was utilized to investigate the relationship between students’ grammar mastery and recount text writing ability.

#### Linearity Test

Before analyzing the correlation test, the linearity test needs to be carried out first in order to know whether the variables which are grammar mastery and recount text ability are linear or not.

Table 9. The Linearity Test Result

Source	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Between groups (combined)	7146.464	26	274.864	1.326	.191
Linearity (weighted)	108.971	1	108.971	.526	.472
Deviation from linearity	7037.493	25	281.500	1.358	.174
Within groups	10775.979	52	207.230		
Total	17922.443	78			

Note. One way ANOVA testing the linearity of recount text writing scores across grammar score groups.

According to table 9, it can be seen in the deviation of linearity column that the result of linearity test is 0.174 which is higher than 0.05. Ghazali (2011) stated that variables can be considered linear if the sig. value is more than 0.05. It can be concluded that there is a linearity between grammar mastery and recount text writing ability.

***Correlation between Students' Grammar Mastery and Their Recount Text Writing Ability***

Finally, in order to answer the third research question which is asking about the existence of the relationship between students' grammar mastery and recount text writing ability, the correlation test was utilized. Since one of the data which is grammar score was not normally distributed, the nonparametric test which is Spearman's rho was used to gain the answer.

Table 10. The Correlation Result

Statistic	Value
Spearman correlation coefficient ( $\rho$ )	0.036
Sig. (two tailed)	0.754
N	79

From the result of the Spearman's rho correlation test, it can be shown that the correlation coefficient value between students' grammar score and writing score is  $\rho = 0.036$  with the sig. (two tailed) value of 0.754 ( $p > 0.05$ ). The correlation value 0.036 indicates the positive correlation, while the sig. (two tailed) value 0.754 which is more than 0.05 indicates the insignificant value. According to the correlation levels in Table 1, the coefficient of 0.036 falls below the lowest band reported there (0.20 to 0.35, low). However, the sig. (two tailed) value is 0.754 which is higher than 0.05, indicates that there is no significant relationship between students' grammar mastery and writing recount text ability.

**Discussion****Students' Grammar Mastery**

Answering the first research question regarding the students' grammar mastery, the result of this study shows that the students' mastery of grammar ranged from the very poor level to the very good level. Based on the result of the frequency distributions, it was found that the majority of the students' grammar mastery were at the poor level which consisted of 45 students (57%), then followed by those who were at the average level which is consisted of 15 students (19%). The smaller number of students were indicated at a very good level which there were eight students in this category (10.1%), followed by the students who were at a good level which consisted of six students (7.6%), and finally the least number of students were at the very poor level which there were five students in it (6.3%).

Moreover, based on the descriptive statistics, the students' grammar mastery was generally at an average level (41.62). It should be noted, however, that this mean lies at the lower boundary of the average band and that the modal category was poor (45 students, 57%), so overall mastery is more accurately described as uneven, with a large lower scoring group and a smaller high scoring group. According to Andini et al. (2022), the average category of grammar mastery indicated that the students have basic or average understanding of grammatical rules, even though they face difficulties in applying the grammar correctly. In other words, the students may know the basic knowledge of grammar, but they still have difficulties in maximizing the grammar application on the sentence or it is still in developing phase.

Furthermore, the standard deviation (21.432) was in the wide range in students' grammar mastery, indicated that the students' grammatical competence was not evenly distributed. It meant that some students have good performance in grammar, while the others were still facing difficulties. Swan (2002) argued that there are fourteen aspects of grammar which consisted of tenses and aspects, auxiliary verbs and modal verbs, adjectives and adverbs, preposition, conjunctions / connecting words, verb forms, voice, agreement, part of speech,

sentence structure & word order, negation & questions, conditionals, articles & determiners, register & variations. Since there are many fundamental aspects or components in grammar, each of it has their own difficulties and complexities. As a result, the students' grammar mastery was varied because some of them may master some grammar aspects, while others are still struggling to master it.

In short, the students' grammar mastery was indicated at the average level (41.62), which meant the students overall have basic knowledge of grammar with the wide standard deviation (21.432), which means the distributions of students' grammatical values is not evenly distributed, indicating that some students already have a good mastery of grammar, while the others are still facing difficulties.

### **Students' Recount Text Ability**

Answering the second research question which was investigating the students' recount text ability, the result of this study shows that the students' writing recount text ranged from the fair level to the excellent level. Based on the frequency distribution, it is showed that the majority of the students' recount text writing ability were at the good level which consisted of 37 students (46.8%), then followed by those who were at the excellent level which is consisted of 36 students (45.6%). The smaller number of students were indicated at a fair level which there were six students in this category (7.6%), and finally there were no students at the poor level which have writing scores ranging from 0 – 25.

Moreover, based on its descriptive statistics, the finding was indicated that the average of the students' writing was at the good level (73.17) with the standard deviation 15.158. Based on Mega et al. (2025), the good category of writing ability indicates that the students already explore their ideas effectively and meaningfully even though the errors of writing aspects such as grammar, mechanics, and organization are rarely found. It meant that the students overall already have good knowledge of how to write a great recount text. The value standard deviation was in the moderate level, indicating that even though the students' recount text writing ability varied, the differences among the students were not really intense, which means it is still relatively consistent writing performance across the sample.

This finding highlights that, in general, students were able to create a writing recount text with great generic structure of recount text, use relevant vocabularies in exploring the idea, use past tense and connectors, and apply the written features well such as good constructions, good grammar accuracy, and good spelling. This finding aligns with the nature of recount text described by Eggins (2004) and Knapp and Watkins (2010), who argued that recount text tells about the students' personal experiences, so the students may find an easier way to explore the ideas and develop the contents, even though their linguistics accuracy is not really fulfilled.

Furthermore, according to Weigle (2002), writing depends on five fundamental aspects which are content, organization, grammar, mechanics, and vocabulary. It means that students are still able to have a good writing ability when they can maximize the content, organization, mechanics, or vocabulary even though the grammar is still needed to be improved.

### **The Correlation between Grammar Mastery and Recount Text Writing Ability**

Answering the third research question, which was asking about the existence of the relationship between students' grammar mastery and recount text writing ability, the nonparametric correlation test which is Spearman's rho was utilized. The correlation coefficient was  $\rho = 0.036$  with a sig. (two tailed) value  $p = 0.754$ . Because the sig. (two tailed) value is more than 0.05, it indicated that there was no significant relationship between students' grammar mastery and recount text writing ability. Even though the correlation coefficient shows a positive correlation, the level of correlation is very low and insignificant. This finding

suggests that grammar mastery does not meaningfully take part in students' writing ability in recount text. Based on the result of this study, it can be said that students with high grammar mastery did not significantly achieve high writing scores, and students with lower grammar mastery were still able to create sufficient recount text.

The result of this study was in line with the previous study conducted by Amelia and Indrawati (2024) and Meivita et al. (2025), which also argued that there was no relationship between grammar mastery and writing ability. However, it was not in line with the previous study conducted by Iffah et al. (2024), Pravitasari and Kamal (2023), Purba and Indriyani (2021), and Putra et al. (2022), who argued that there was significant relationship between students' grammar mastery and their writing ability either in moderate correlation level or strong correlation level.

Previous study conducted by Amelia and Indrawati (2024), had the sig. (two tailed) value was ( $p = 0.090, > 0.05$ ), and the result found that even though the result of grammar scores and writing scores in general was at a good level, but one of the variables has a lower or higher score than other which in this study the average of grammar score is lower than the writing score. Furthermore, the findings here found that there were some students that got low scores in grammar test but had good scores in writing test, suggesting that the grammar mastery aspects did not affect a significant role in writing. There was a possibility that all grammar aspects were not useful in writing even though grammar may be a source to create an effective communication. Poor competence of grammar but good ability in writing might be caused by the other writing aspects. Furthermore, it was found that the reason why the students have poor competence in grammar was because the test was too difficult and the time too short for them resulting they could not maximize their capability in doing the grammar test. However, in writing aspect, there were some other factors that might affect the students' ability in writing such as exploring idea, think creatively, no error punctuations and spelling, even though the grammar competence was not really good, so it could increase the writing scores while the grammar scores was poor.

Furthermore, in the previous study conducted by Meivita et al. (2025), it was found that the sig. (two tailed) value was ( $p = 0.333, > 0.05$ ), and the result found that in general, most of the students have better scores in writing rather than in grammar mastery. The result of this study was mostly similar with the previous study of Amelia and Indrawati (2024), which also stated that the other aspects of writing might take a part more in increasing the students' writing score rather than the grammar itself.

Based on the finding results of those two previous studies, this study also had similar characteristics where the grammar scores were lower than the writing scores. It can be caused by the grammar test which was adapted from TOEFL junior was too difficult and the time was not enough for the students to maximize their capabilities in filling the test. Furthermore, the good score of writing might be affected by the other aspects of writing rather than grammar alone, for instance the good capability of the students in exploring ideas, applying the generic structures maximally, the lack of vocabulary misspelling or punctuation, etc.

This finding can be supported by the theoretical perspective of Weigle (2002), who stated that there are five fundamental aspects of writing, and those are content, organization, grammar, mechanics, and vocabulary. Here, grammar is not the only writing aspect, and in the recount text context, the students may rely more on their ability to elaborate the contents which is told about their own experiences, maximize the organizations, mechanics, and vocabulary aspects rather than master the grammar aspect only.

In addition, since the kind of recount text used in this study was personal recount text, the students may have more capabilities in exploring their ideas since it was talking about their own experiences and organizing the generic structure well which can support their writing

scores even their grammatical accuracy was varied. In short, the result of the study shows that there is no significant relationship between students' grammar mastery and recount text writing ability. It means that the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) which is stated that there is no relationship between students' grammar mastery and recount text writing ability was accepted, while the alternative hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) was rejected.

These results should be interpreted with several limitations in mind. First, the grammar test was a timed multiple choice instrument adapted from the TOEFL Junior test, which measures grammatical knowledge in a decontextualized way; this is a different construct from the grammar that students produce while writing, so the two instruments may not be measuring the same ability. Second, the difficulty of the test and the limited time may have lowered the grammar scores and produced a floor effect, since most students clustered in the poor band while the writing scores were higher and more narrowly spread. A restricted range on one variable can attenuate a correlation, which means that the weak and non significant result may partly reflect these measurement conditions rather than a genuine absence of a relationship. Future studies could use a grammar measure that is better matched in difficulty and that assesses grammar in production, for example through an error analysis of the students' own writing.

## CONCLUSION

This study aimed to investigate the students' grammar mastery, the students' recount text writing ability, and the relationship between students' grammar mastery and their recount text writing ability. The findings indicated that the students' grammar mastery was at an average level overall, although most students actually fell in the poor band, suggesting that they have basic knowledge of grammar but still face difficulties in applying it meaningfully. However, the students' recount text writing ability was at a good level, indicating that they already have good capability to create recount text. Furthermore, the correlation result was there is no significant relationship between students' grammar mastery and recount text writing ability. It can be said that students with high grammar mastery did not significantly achieve high writing scores, and students with lower grammar mastery were still able to create good recount text writing. Due to no significant relationship existed, suggesting that the other aspect of writing such as content, organization, and mechanics may contribute more to the students' writing than grammar does. This interpretation should be made cautiously, however, because the difficulty of the grammar test may have lowered the grammar scores and weakened the observed correlation. Thus, some considerations need to be made for future research. It is recommended for the future research to investigate the relationship between grammar mastery and other genres of writing ability to investigate whether the strength of the relationship is affected by the genre. Furthermore, future research related to specific grammatical aspects such as specific tenses, conjunctions, adverb, etc. can be correlated to the writing performance in order to know their individual contributions. This study can also be a consideration for the teacher and students to involve more the other aspect of writing such as exploring idea (content) and maintaining the generic structure (organization) to be more discussed in teaching and learning process, not only focus on grammatical accuracy.

## REFERENCES

- Alonzo, J. R. A., & Gaor, L. M. C. (2025). Sentence error analysis in the writings of first year tertiary students. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15752739>
- Amelia, R., & Indrawati, I. (2024). The correlation between students' grammar mastery and their writing ability in descriptive text. *EEdJ: English Education Journal*, 3(2), 47–55. <https://doi.org/10.32923/eedj.v3i2.3938>
- Andini, Y., Hadriana, & Delfi, S. (2022). The correlation between grammar mastery and reading comprehension of the second grade students of SMPN 12 Pekanbaru [publication details to be completed].
- Azar, B. S., & Hagen, S. A. (2016). *Understanding and using English grammar* (5th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Babel, B. (2014). *Exploring second language creative writing* (D. Disney, Ed.). John Benjamins.
- Brown, G. T. L., Glasswell, K., & Harland, D. (2004). Accuracy in the scoring of writing: Studies of reliability and validity using a New Zealand writing assessment system. *Assessing Writing*, 9(2), 105–121. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2004.07.001>
- Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices*. Pearson Longman.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (Ed.). (2001). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed.). Heinle & Heinle.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315158501-17>
- Derewianka, B., & Jones, P. (2022). *Teaching language in context*. Oxford University Press.
- Educational Testing Service. (2012). *Practice test for the TOEFL Junior Standard Test*. <https://www.ets.org/legal>
- Eggs, S. (2004). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics* (2nd ed.). Continuum International Publishing Group. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003315100-1>
- Ghozali, I. (2011). *Aplikasi analisis multivariate dengan program IBM SPSS 19* (Edisi 5). Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.
- Hogue, A., Bixby, J., Butler, L., Oshima, A., Curtis, J., Ravitch, L., & Meyers, A. (2014). *The Longman academic writing series*. Pearson Education.
- Hyland, K. (2022). *Teaching and researching writing* (4th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315833729>
- Iffah, U., Firdaus, N., & Fariqoh, U. (2024). The correlation between students' grammar mastery and writing ability in recount text. *JOEY: Journal of English Ibrahimi*, 3(2), 22–28. <https://doi.org/10.35316/JOEY.2024.v3i2.22-28>
- Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia. (2022). Capaian pembelajaran mata pelajaran Bahasa Inggris fase A–fase F. *Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi*.
- Kementerian Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah. (2025). *Keputusan Kepala Badan Standar, Kurikulum, dan Asesmen Pendidikan Kementerian Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah*

*Nomor 046/H/Kr/2025 tentang capaian pembelajaran pada pendidikan anak usia dini, jenjang pendidikan dasar, dan jenjang pendidikan menengah.*  
<https://www.kemdikbud.go.id>

- Knapp, P., & Watkins, M. (2010). *Genre, text, grammar: Technologies for teaching and assessing writing*. University of New South Wales Press.
- Lipalam, A., Mae Alivio, R. B., Sollano, J. Q., Villarosa, R. T., Tinapay, A. O., & Tirol, S. L. (2023). Grammar checkers to boost students' academic writing proficiency in English. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications (IJMRAP)*, 6(3), 153–159. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/373734344>
- Mega, Ismiyati, Y., & Silfia, E. (2025). An analysis on students' writing skill in descriptive text by using the movie *The School for Good and Evil* by Paul Feig at the second semester of Batanghari University, 9(2). [Journal title to be completed.]
- Meivita, D., Fitri, N., & Munawwaroh, K. (2025). The correlation between grammatical competence and students' ability in writing English text at the eleventh grade of SMAN 9 Kota Jambi. *JELT: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 9.
- Pravitasari, H., & Kamal, R. (2023). A correlation between students' mastery of functional grammar and their achievement in writing recount: A study at an Islamic boarding school. *English Journal*, 17(2), 105–112. <https://doi.org/10.32832/english.v17i2.15013>
- Purba, A., & Indriyani, F. (2021). The correlation between students' grammar mastery and writing ability. *Bilingual: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris*, 3(2), 58–63. <https://doi.org/10.36985/8rvdk346>
- Putra, N., Dharmayanti, P., & Sawitri, N. (2022). The correlation between grammar mastery and writing skill of the tenth grade student of SMK Ratna Wartha Ubud in academic year 2021/2022. *Academic Journal on English Studies*, 2(2).
- Roberts, R., & Kreuz, R. (2018). Aspects of language. In *Becoming fluent* (pp. 33–52). MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/10273.003.0006>
- Sawetsiri, S., & Wudthayagorn, J. (2025). Implementing group dynamic assessment with Thai EFL undergraduate students: A closer look at their academic writing ability. *rEFLECTIONS*, 32(1), 521–549. <https://doi.org/10.61508/refl.v32i1.280408>
- Swan, M. (2002). *Practical English usage* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing writing*. Cambridge University Press.