A. Descriptive Declaration Performance and Professional Allowance

Base on data analysis, the following was obtained: As much as 10.35% of the respondents gave a negative response to Declaration Performance and Professional Allowance Disbursement in the determination the criteria of beneficiaries. This means that the Declaration Performance and Professional Allowance Disbursement in determining the beneficiaries is not fully in accordance with the criteria of beneficiaries who have been determined.

There are teacher professional allowance recipients who do not meet the minimum criteria of teaching hours of the provisions, i.e. 24 hours per week on the same subject, yet they have NUPTK.

There are 11.35% of the respondents gave a negative response to Performance Declaration and Professional Allowance Disbursement in the determination of the annuitant. Thus it can be said that the Declaration Performance and Professional Allowance Disbursement in the determination of beneficiaries is not fully in accordance with predetermined rules.

Moreover, determination of professional allowances is not yet fully in accordance with the applicable rules.
Professional allowances are not fully paid every three month, and are not on time. In other words, the professional allowance does not fully comply with the rules that have been defined.

There are 0.73% of the respondents gave a negative response to professional allowance usefulness that is far below the 10% tolerance limit. This means the Professional Allowance have a positive value for teachers.

There are 1.75% of the respondents gave a negative response to performance Provision of Professional Allowance Declaration in terms of control benefits which were far below the tolerance limit of 10%, and there are not any attributes that negatively elicit responses above the threshold of tolerance of 10%. Thus, the Declaration Performance Professional Allowance in the controlling allowance has been running in accordance with the conditions. 24 hours compulsory teaching subjects felt hard to fulfill because there are schools with the number of class hours less than 24 hours of lessons. There are teachers willing to teach mulok and IT because it is not counted as a teaching load.

B. The Effect of Teacher Professional Allowance on Teacher Performance as an Educator

The result of simple regression analysis of professional allowance decrease (X) on Teacher Performance as an educator (Y1) obtained value $F = 4.319$ with significance $\alpha = 0.039$, smaller than acceptance limit $\alpha = 0.05$. This can be concluded that there is a positive relationship between teacher professional allowance with teacher performance as an educator.

Results of calculation to find regression direction of coefficient $b = 0.074$ from constant $a = 2.92$ thus form regression of variable can be formulated with equation $\hat{Y} = 2.92 + 0.074X$. The direction of the regression equation can be described as follows. The result of SPSS calculation shows the correlation coefficient between professional teacher allowance (X) with teacher performance as an educator (Y1) $r = 0.148$ with coefficient determination 0.022, and it can be concluded that there is a positive relationship between teacher professional allowance with teacher performance as an educator.

C. The Influence of Professional Allowance on Teacher Professionalism

The Result of simple regression analysis of variable of performance of teacher profession allowance (X) to teacher professionalism (Y2) obtained the value of $F = 0.475$ with significance $\alpha = 0.491$. This means that the regression between teacher professional allowance (X) to teacher professionalism (Y2) is not significant at $\alpha = 0.05$. This means that the direction of regression is not linear. Thus the professionalism of teachers cannot be predicted by the influence of teachers’ professional allowance. That is, teacher professional allowance does not affect linearly to the professionalism of teachers.

The result of the calculation shows the correlation coefficient between teacher professional allowance (X) and teacher professionalism (Y2), with a correlation coefficient between teacher professional allowance with teacher professionalism $r = 0.05$ with a coefficient of determination $r^2 = 0.002$. It can be concluded that the relationship between professional allowance and teacher professionalism is very small (less than 1%) and insignificant.

IV. CONCLUSION

The performance of teachers as educators in the category is generally very well. This is reflected in each component that supports the performance of teachers as educators, namely the competence of teachers in preparing to teach, competence in implementing the teaching and learning, and competence in conducting learning evaluation all in the good and very good category. However, the competence of teachers in evaluating learning was in the category 'enough'. Therefore, the policymakers need to pay attention to the improvement of teacher competence in conducting learning evaluation.

The performance of teachers as professionals is very low, mostly in fewer categories. This is reflected in the ability of professional and self-development as educators that are still very low.

The correlation between professional teacher allowance (X) and teacher performance as educator (Y1) is positive, while the correlation between teacher professional allowances (X) with teacher professionalism (Y2) is very small (less than 1%), so the relationship can be considered meaningless.
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