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Abstract
This research aims to find the opinions of preschool teachers on the inclusion of children with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) in kindergartens and how they feel when they have children with ADHD in their class. It is addressed to preschool teachers as they are considered the most appropriate to share their opinions and concerns regarding children with ADHD. The educator, with his knowledge and experience, can communicate situations he has encountered while helping to develop the research. The synthesis of findings in order to present the views of educators is particularly important for the educational community as the presentation of different views wants to sharpen critical thinking and enrich the existing literature. The methodology used in this research was the quantitative method and the sample was collected with electronic questionnaires where a total of forty-one (41) participants who were public and private preschool teachers regardless of age, gender or years of service participated. The following research shows the main results that want preschool teachers ready for the inclusive process, with a very good level of knowledge regarding the assessment and education of children with ADHD.
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1. Introduction

This paper focuses on preschool teachers’ views on the inclusion of children with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) in kindergarten and how they feel when they have children with ADHD in their classrooms. It is addressed to preschool teachers as they are considered quite suitable to share their opinions and concerns regarding children with ADHD. The educator, with his/her knowledge and experience, can communicate situations he/she has encountered while helping to develop the research.

The synthesis of findings in order to present the views of educators is particularly important for the educational community as the presentation of different points of view wants to sharpen critical thinking and enrich the so far limited literature. Little is known about Attention Deficit Disorder in preschool children aged two to five, which prompted the researcher to conduct a more thorough investigation.

Despite this lack of knowledge, ADHD is increasingly being recognized in this population and more and more efforts are being made to deal with it. The presence of behaviors that look like those of ADHD is influenced not only by genetic, prenatal, perinatal and environmental factors, but also by social context factors. A child with ADHD who has not been diagnosed by specialists will often be characterized by parents as the difficult and lively child of the family. Due to this particularity, children have a reduced school performance even though they have a normal or even high IQ percentage.

It is understandable that by researching the subject through the opinions of teachers, opinions will be captured that will contribute to the identification of ADHD in preschool ages and also to the facilitation of these children for their inclusion in the classroom. For the better elaboration of the research, four research questions were created:

1. What are the teachers’ perceptions of the inclusive education of children with ADHD in general education classes?

2. Are there significant relationships between teachers’ individual, demographic characteristics and their perceptions of inclusion?

3. Are there significant relationships between the individual, the demographic characteristics of teachers and their perceptions of the expected benefits of co-education?

4. Are there significant relationships between teachers’ individual, demographic characteristics and their perceptions of inclusive education practices in general classrooms?

This particular research contributes to science by interspersing the indistinct literature. Investigating the issue from the perspective of preschool educators rather than special education teachers creates a new framework for discussion and development on the topic.

As far as the context of this paper is concerned, the basic terms of the subject are presented, the research that has been carried out based on the subject of this
work is analyzed, and any gaps encountered in the literature are also identified. Also, the research methodology is developed, explaining why the quantitative method has been chosen, as well as the tool that was given to the participants. It also mentions the way the research was conducted, its validity and reliability. Ethical issues are mentioned and how the research participants were approached. In addition, there is a chapter indicating the results of the research and the discussion. A comparison of the findings with the existing literature is made. Finally, the main conclusions of the research as well as suggestions for future research are mentioned in the final chapter.

2. Theoretical Framework

Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD) is a lifelong neurobiological disorder characterized by a lack of self-control, hyperactivity and impulsivity, which is inconsistent with the child’s developmental level. It is one of the most common forms of disorder worldwide [1]. Hyperactivity characterizes a person who is more active than normal levels. The hyperactive child is in a constant state of excitement, while he is unable to control his impulses. It is particularly difficult for him to stand in one place, while he rarely approaches the same activity for more than three minutes. Even in situations of rest it is noisy and active [2].

Regarding the incidence of ADHD, the rates vary from 2% to 20% in school-age children, while a small percentage of about 3% to 7% of children is identified in elementary school before puberty. ADHD is more prevalent in boys than in girls, with the ratio ranging from 2 to 1 to as high as 9 to 1 between them. First-degree biological relatives, such as siblings of children with ADHD, are at higher risk of developing this disorder as well as several disorders, including disruptive behavior disorders, anxiety disorders, and depressive disorders. Siblings of children with ADHD are at greater risk compared to the general population to experience learning disorders and school difficulties. Parents of these children have a greater impact on hyperactivity and alcohol use disorders [3].

Research on twins or adopted children proves that there is a hereditary burden. Studies focused on twins find heritability as high as 80%. Monozygotic twins have a higher risk of developing hyperactivity than dizygotic twins, and biological parents of children with ADHD experienced similar problems in their childhood [4]. It is known that the cause of ADHD differs from child to child, which often makes it the subject of scientific research. There are many factors that have been blamed for it, however, the disorder is mainly attributed to genetic, prenatal, perinatal, environmental as well as hereditary and neurological factors [2] [5].

The child should be properly assessed before a diagnosis is reached and treatment begins. If the child requires a more detailed assessment of their cognitive abilities, a psychometric test could provide useful information. This test is performed by school and clinical psychologists. The diagnosis of ADHD is usually documented by a child psychiatrist, taking into account the findings of teachers.
and school psychologists. Clinical assessment should include parental history and observations from the clinic and school, and brief contact can be misleading. The management of ADHD includes educational and/or pharmacological and behavioral therapies. These are not necessary for all children, as each child is treated differently depending on the severity of the disorder [1].

Students with ADHD have reduced school performance even if they have a normal or even high IQ. They face problems in the organization and implementation of their tasks while they do not focus properly during the educational process. These children consume useful time and energy during the process of written expression, looking for the way to hold the pen and the way to write the letters clearly, as a result of which they do not have the ability to give the necessary time to presentation and development of the text they are asked to write. When combined, the thematic development of their texts is limited, almost linear since one thought becomes the trigger for recalling a different idea from their memory. Children with ADHD do not have a clear understanding of the meaning of the paragraph and its features. In addition, they have a limited image of a complete piece of writing and what they need to do to write something similar [6].

In terms of their social functioning, children with ADHD face many difficulties due to their disorder. There are many times when they come into conflict with their classmates who refuse to socialize with them because of their antagonistic, provocative and sometimes delinquent behavior. These children create difficulties in their daily interactions as they often exhibit risky behaviors, something that repels their receivers [7].

The importance of early childhood instruction is associated with a better start to students’ schooling, and can assist them to cope the effects of social disadvantage, alleviate learning difficulties in mathematics and promote all children's school inclusion [8]. Though, it is a difficult task for teacher and requires careful planning. Their successful integration is linked to the positive attitude of the teachers and their readiness to work in inclusive school structures [9]. The teacher must shape the classroom in such a way as to facilitate the child and have him in a place close to him. He must also proceed with the appropriate configuration of the program, while it would be helpful to configure special exercises for children with ADHD. Particularly important is the use of supervisory material (computers, photos, posters) which do not tire all the students and stimulate the interest of the student with ADHD [7] [10] [11].

Investigating teachers’ views on the inclusion of children with ADHD in kindergartens, a limited amount of research that has been carried out in the past was gathered. In the specific surveys, teachers talk about their knowledge of the disorder and how they deal with children with ADHD in their own classroom. Vasiliadou in her research [12] investigates the extent to which preschool teachers come face-to-face on a daily basis within school classes with students with ADHD. Reference is also made to how they work with these children and to what extent it affects them psychologically. To frame this question, she con-
ducted a quantitative survey using questionnaires consisting of closed and open-ended questions, which were anonymously completed by 20 kindergarten teachers. The results of the research show that the teachers understand the difficulties faced by children with ADHD (learning, organization, inattentiveness) and stated that they would shape their teaching methods and the layout of the classroom in order to help these children. They were negative to any form of punishment and stated that they felt affection and lack of anger towards these children. Finally, they believe that personalized teaching would significantly strengthen them.

In continuation of these findings, the research of Papacharalambous [13] is based on the views of kindergarten teachers on educational inclusion and its effectiveness in the education of students with special educational needs. The research she conducted was quantitative, a suitable tool for studying the views, attitudes, thoughts and feelings of kindergarten teachers in order to create generalizations and comparisons. The research instrument was a closed-ended questionnaire and the participants were 234 general and special preschool teachers, of whom 7 (3%) were male and 227 (97%) were female. The results of the survey showed that a large percentage of the participants stated that students with disabilities or SEN learn through imitation social skills demonstrated by students in the general classroom. They also stated that children with disabilities or SEN attending the general classroom do not hinder the academic progress of typical students. Also, the largest percentage stated that they are not troubled by the idea of teaching a child with cognitive deficits. Finally, 95% stated that they are not bothered by modifications to the classroom space to meet the needs of students with SEN.

Continuing the study, the research of Batsiu [14] examines whether the opinions of typical students and teachers seem to influence the smooth integration of students with disabilities or special educational needs. To approach this question, she conducted a mixed research, quantitative for the students using questionnaires and qualitative for the teachers by conducting interviews. In the quantitative research, 90 girls and 89 boys took part, where they filled in closed questionnaires, while in the qualitative research, 12 teachers participated, expressing their opinion about children with special educational needs and disabilities. In conclusion, the quantitative research showed that girls are more willing to help their classmates with disabilities or educational needs and that students whose parents allowed them to have friendly relations with these children had a more positive attitude. Educators through qualitative research emphasized the particularly important role of parents for inclusion. They were positive about having such a student in their class, but not about adjusting their teaching style. However, their views were ambiguous, as they believe that depending on the disability and difficulty of each child, some should be in a special school and others in a general school. Finally, those who had such children in their class expressed positive feelings and great willingness to help them.

Subsequently, research by Schoemaker et al., [15] aimed to discover the inhi-
bitions of clinically diagnosed preschoolers with ADHD, ADD\(^1\), and ADHD + ADD. Participants were 202 children aged 3.5 - 5.5 years, 61 with ADHD alone, 33 with ADHD alone, 52 with comorbid ADHD + ADHD, and 56 typically developing children. Confirmatory factor analysis indicated that the two-factor model (inhibition and working memory) fit the data better than a one-factor model in this clinical sample. Preschool children with ADHD showed inhibition deficits, also after controlling for IQ. Similarly, preschool children with ADD showed impaired inhibition, but when IQ was controlled the differences were mainly mediated by the effect on the task where motivational demands were high (i.e., when tangible rewards were used). This pattern was also found in the interaction between ADHD and ADD. Impaired inhibition in the comorbid group, however, was more severe than in the DBD group. Regarding working memory, few group differences were found. Clinically diagnosed preschoolers with ADHD showed robust inhibition deficits, whereas preschoolers with ADD showed reduced inhibition, especially where motivations were salient. The severity of inhibition disorder in the comorbid group was similar to the ADHD group.

In the longitudinal study by Khushmand Rajendran et al., [16] is examined whether changes in neuropsychological functioning correlate with the trajectory of symptoms associated with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and impairment between preschool and school age. The sample consisted of 3- and 4-year-old children (N = 138) identified as at risk for ADHD based on parent and teacher reports. Neuropsychological functioning was measured annually using the NEPSY at four time points (mean ages, 4, 5, 6, and 7 years). ADHD symptoms and impairment were assessed by bimonthly parent and teacher reports using the ADHD Rating Scale-IV and the Child Problems Checklist at 10 time points (mean ages at baseline and final assessment, 4 and 8 years, respectively). Neuropsychological functioning and ADHD severity and the association of change in neuropsychological functioning with change in ADHD severity over time. Baseline neuropsychological functioning was not significantly associated with the slope of change in ADHD severity. However, the magnitude of change in neuropsychological functioning was linearly related to the trajectory of ADHD symptom severity, such that individuals with greater neuropsychological growth over time had greater reductions in ADHD severity. Thus interventions that enhance neuropsychological functioning at an early age may be beneficial in ameliorating the long-term severity and reduction of ADHD.

Summarizing, through the results of the aforementioned research, it is understood that the majority of teachers understand the difficulties of children with ADHD and have a positive attitude towards them. It is understandable that they have no problem modifying their space and teaching methods to enhance them. Methodologically, some researchers worked through the qualitative method and others through the quantitative method.

\(^1\)ADD: Attention Deficit Disorder.
Based on the research that has been carried out in the past, the experiences of the educators as well as their opinions were the reasons for the research. However, few researches have made a reason for inclusion and how it is achieved with the help of teachers in the classroom. The lack of literature in this context is covered by the proposed research based on its results.

3. Research methodology

3.1. The Methodology

Research is divided into quantitative and qualitative. The proposed will be carried out with the quantitative method with the objective, the objective collection of the data and their conversion into numerical or statistical data so that the comparisons between the variables can be made and the results can be obtained. Quantitative research analyzes the quantitative appearance of the phenomenon being investigated with the aim of showing general symmetries or tendencies that regulate social phenomena, based on the said examination in a number of cases. A rigorous planning is followed before the research is conducted. The data collected must be adjusted and counted to obtain a numerical value. A characteristic advantage of quantitative research is the validity and objectivity of the results. The tools used for the data collection of such research are the experiment, the questionnaire [17] [18] [19] [20].

3.2. Sample—Participants

The sample of the research consists of preschool teachers and directors of preschool educational units of public and private institutions, regardless of their background, age or years of service. It should be noted that the researcher has not chosen the participants and above all she does not know them personally. Each participant has a different perception and the researcher must take this into account, so that the results are carried out correctly. In this particular research, the sample amounts to 42 participants, of which one did not answer any question except the first. The experience of the sample covers a wide range with a minimum of one year of service and a maximum of thirty-six. The largest percentage was women, while there was no leakage or problem during data collection.

3.3. Data Collection Tool

The construction of a questionnaire is worthwhile and some principles should be followed because it provides the research data. Its form is equally important for the type and formulation of the questions it includes. It should be methodical, clear, concise and contain the necessary instructions for those who are asked to complete it. To achieve this, proper planning and control must be done. First of all, the format of the questions is decided, which are of two types, closed and open type. In the closed type, the participant is invited to choose between specific answers, while in the open type, he is free to express his opinion in the empty
field provided. Completing an open-ended questionnaire takes more time and requires writing skills. The choice of its format is achieved based on efficiency and flexibility, as well as thorough processing of its data. The questionnaire must respect the code of ethics and anonymity. Its main advantage is that it is cheaper to conduct and can be addressed to a larger sample. Moreover, it is easy to produce and use, while respondents have the possibility to express themselves freely. The methods of investigating the material are standardized and the researcher cannot influence the responses. Its main disadvantage is that the researcher is not able to clarify open-ended questions [19] [20] [21] [22].

In researches that have been carried out in the past, regarding the views of preschool teachers on the inclusion of children with ADHD in kindergarten, both closed and open-type questionnaires were used, as well as interviews, in the specific—proposed research, closed-type questionnaires will be used addressed to educators of formal and special education. The questionnaires were posted on the internet to be answered by male and female educators of various ages and regardless of experience, with the aim of answering the questions with complete confidentiality and comparing their answers in order to come out with the conclusion of the research.

In more detail, the closed-ended questionnaire will be used in the research: Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practices Scale (TEIP) [23] [24]. In more detail, in the 1st part of the questionnaire, the participants have to answer 6 demographic questions such as gender, age, years of service, etc. In the 2nd part there are 18 closed-ended 6-point Likert type questions (Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Some-what Disagree, Probably Agree, Agree, and Strongly Agree).

Also we used the questionnaire: My Thinking about Inclusion, which was designed by Stoiber, Gettinger and Goetz [25]. This instrument consists of 28 closed-ended questions regarding the inclusion of children with special needs educational needs. His questions were divided into three main axes which are, the teachers’ main assessments (12 questions) based on the claim that all children with special educational needs are entitled to education together with their typically developed peers, the usual benefits of co-education (11 questions), which are identified with the perspectives proposed by students with special educational needs and based on Stoiber and his colleagues [25] directly influence teaching practices and inclusion practices (5 questions), which seek what influence inclusion in classroom dynamics and universal teaching practices [26]. In order to answer the aforementioned scale, participants were asked to indicate to what extent they agree on a five-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral/Undecided, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree).

3.4. Validity and Reliability

The reliability of each research, as well as the proposed one, is an important tool as it indicates stability and consistency. Internal reliability is characterized by the degree to which the data, their sorting and the research results are the same un-
der similar conditions. Whereas, external reliability is defined as the degree to which different researchers can identically apply the same research and obtain the same or similar results. Accordingly, an important role for research is validity, a tool that measures what it was created for. Internal validity is the extent to which scale results can be interpreted accurately and confidently. External validity is the dimension of results that can be generalized to other populations. Another important tool for the reliability of the research is the informed consent of the participants. Freedom and self-determination is the right of every human being. Furthermore, the participant in a research has the right to refuse his contribution or to withdraw after its initiation [27]. Credibility is also sealed by informing the participants about what will be done with the information they provide, who will have access to it and how the data will be destroyed after the end of the research [21].

3.5. Sampling Method

The sampling method that has been used is the avalanche sampling technique. Based on this method, the researcher has access to the sample—she is asked to choose a specific population group that interests her (in this case, preschool teachers). Each sampling unit (participant) of the original sample generates data, therefore also an input to a set of other members of the sample, which in turn are a conduit for another part of the sample.

3.6. SPSS Statistical Program (Version 17)

The results of the survey were analyzed and took the form of percentages through the SPSS program (Statistical Package for Social Sciences, version 17), which is a valid data analysis program that helps the researcher to analyze the response data, through an easy way to that there are no errors and complications in the research data.

3.7. Research Data Collection Process

The survey data was collected from February 15 to March 5, 2022. The data was collected electronically through the online posting of the questionnaire which was completed by preschool teachers of formal and non-formal education, public and private institutions as well as independent schools, age or years of service.

The procedure that preceded the distribution and completion of the questionnaires, as for any research, is that of informed consent. The process was carried out through the consent forms that informed the participants about the aim of the research, the process in which they will be involved (filling in questionnaires), the optional nature of the participation as well as the prospect of their withdrawal at any stage of the research. To ensure the informed consent of the research participants, the researcher wrote a relevant letter, which she incorporated into her research plan. The text was short and referred to the research objective, the context of the research, the duration of employment and the ob-
served ethics. The following fields were also presented in the letter: acceptance of the consenter’s participation, his non-consent, name, signature and date of consent. Therefore, the researcher of the proposed research to implement the informed consent while adhering to the ethical rules, created consent letters which she gave along with the questionnaires to the participants to obtain their consent.

The researcher posted the questionnaire online, which she specified was anonymous, very short, and risk-free.

The statistical analysis methodology used was that of descriptive statistics. The responses given by the survey participants were presented through their frequencies and relative frequencies correctly projecting the views of the participants. Regarding the second, third and fourth research questions, inductive analysis, specifically correlation analysis, was applied, since the correlated variables were ordinal and the coefficient applied was that of Spearman.

The descriptive analysis of the data and the questionnaire as a collection tool were chosen because the results came from a wide range of samples (gender, age, seniority) but also the answers were aggregated. Furthermore, the validity of the research is demonstrated through the literature [28]. The questions of the questionnaire are based on the said literature and the questionnaire is completely secure preserving the anonymity of the participants.

3.8. Educational Research

Educational research is a field of scientific research that is included in the context of social research, since the field of education is generally defined as being part of the general framework of social sciences.

4. Results and Discussion

To the question “I can use a variety of assessment strategies (e.g. student portfolio assessment, modified tests for children with ADHD)”, 4.9% answered that they strongly disagree, 2.4% answered that they disagree, 2.4% probably disagree while 12.2% probably agree. 29.3% answered that they agree and the majority of 48.8% that they completely agree. To the question “I can give an alternative explanation or an example when the students do not understand” 4.9% answered with absolute disagreement, 2.4 answered that they disagreed, 29.3 that they agreed and 61% fully agreed. To the question “I can prepare assignments that meet the individual needs of students with learning difficulties” 4.9% answered that they strongly disagree, 2.4% rather agree, 31.7% agree and 61% strongly agree. In the question “I can accurately assess the level of understanding of my students in what I have taught” 2.4 strongly disagreed, 4.9% that they disagreed and 2.4% that they probably disagreed. 26.8 answered that they probably agree, 53.7% answered that they agree and 9.8% that they completely agree. To the question “I can make my course attractive even to very able students” 4.9% answered that they strongly disagree, 12.2% that they probably agree, 26.8 that they
agree and the majority of 56.1% totally agreed. To the question “I can prevent behavioral problems of my students before they occur”, 4.9% disagreed, 29.3% probably agreed, 63.4% agreed and 2.4% completely agreed. To the question “I can manage behavior problems in the classroom” 4.9% disagreed, 12.2% answered that they probably agree, 65.9% agreed and 17.1% completely agreed.

To the question “I can calm down a student when he creates problems in class or makes a fuss”, 4.9% of the participants disagreed, 9.8% answered that they probably agreed, 68.3% agreed and 17.1% strongly agreed.

To the question “I can convince the children to follow the rules in the classroom”, 4.9% completely disagreed, 7.3% answered that they probably agree, 34.1% agreed and 53.7% completely agreed.

In the question “I can deal with students who show physical aggression”, 4.9% stated that they completely disagree, 17.1% probably agree, 24.4% agree while 51.2% completely agree.

In the question “I can clearly express my expectations for the students’ behavior”, 4.9% of the participants completely disagreed, 14.6% answered that they probably agreed, 29.3% answered that they agreed and 51.2% responded by strongly agreeing.

On the question “I can guide parents to help their children do well in school”, 4.9% strongly disagreed, 7.3% somewhat agreed, 26.8% agreed and 61% strongly agreed.

To the question “I can collaborate with other professionals (e.g. psychologist, occupational therapist) to teach students with special needs in the classroom”, 4.9% answered that they completely disagree, 2.4% answered that they probably disagree, 4.9% answered that they probably agree, 19.5% agree and 68.3% completely agree.

In the question “I can convince the parents of children with special needs to participate in their children’s school activities”, 4.9% disagreed, 14.6% probably agreed while 9.8% totally agreed.

To the question “I can make parents want to come to school”, 2.4% of the participants answered that they completely disagree, 7.3% answered that they disagree, 2.4% answered that they probably disagree, 14.6% that they probably agree, 63.4% that they agree while 9.8% that they completely agree.

In the question “I can collaborate with other professionals (e.g. psychologists or speech therapists) in the design of educational programs for students with ADHD”, 4.9% of participants strongly disagree, 17.1% of them rather agree, 19.5% agree and 58.5% strongly agree.

In the question “I can inform others about the laws and policies of the inclusion of students with ADHD”, 2.4% completely disagree, 4.9% disagree, 7.3% somewhat disagree while, 34.1% probably agree. 34.1% also agree and 17.1% strongly agree.

To the question “I can apply various assessment methods in order to recognize the potential and difficulties of students with ADHD”, 2.4% answered that
they completely disagree, 4.9% that they disagree, 2.4% that they probably disagree and 17.1% probably agree. A maximum of 51.2% of participants agree and 22% strongly agree.

Collectively, the sheet did not correlate with any of the teachers’ perceptions of inclusive education for children with ADHD in kindergarten. A moderate negative correlation was found between age and the view that teachers can provide an alternative explanation for example when students do not understand. So, the younger the participant, they believe they are better able to give alternative examples. Rs (39) = 0.355 p < 0.05. A moderate negative correlation was also found between age and the view that teachers can prepare assignments that meet the individual needs of students with learning difficulties. So the younger the teacher is, the more he manages to prepare assignments to meet the individual needs of students with difficulties. Rs (39) = −0.319, p < 0.05. A negative and moderate relationship was also found between age and teachers’ ability to manage problematic behaviors. The younger the teacher, the better he can manage any problematic behavior. Rs (39) = −0.343, p < 0.05. Also, a negative and moderate relationship was found between age and the teacher’s ability to calm down the student who is making a fuss in the classroom. So the younger the teacher is, the better he manages a rowdy student. Rs (39) = −0.322, p < 0.05.

In the question “Students with special educational needs have the right to be educated in the same class as typically developing students”, 2.4% of the participants disagreed, 9.8% have a neutral attitude, 36.6% agree and 51.2% strongly agreed. On the question “Inclusion is not a desirable practice for educating most typically developing students” 17.1% disagree, 61% are undecided and 22% agree. To the question “It is difficult to maintain discipline in a classroom containing a mixture of children with and without special educational needs” 63.4% disagreed, 2.4% seemed undecided and 34.1% agreed. In the question “Children with special educational needs should be provided with every opportunity to function within an integrated school class” 87.8% agreed and 12.2% completely agreed. To the question “Inclusion can be beneficial for parents of children with special educational needs” 2.4% strongly disagreed, 4.9% disagreed, 9.8% were undecided, 75.6% agreed and 7.3% strongly agreed.

On the question “Parents of children with special educational needs prefer their child to study in a non-inclusive environment”, 2.4% strongly disagreed, 61% disagreed, 19.5% remained neutral and 17.1% agreed. In the question “Most special education teachers do not have the appropriate knowledge to effectively teach typically developing students” 7.3% expressed a strong disagreement, 70.7% disagreed, 4.9% expressed a neutral attitude while, 17.1% agreed. On the question “The special needs of children with disabilities cannot be met by a general education teacher”, 2.4% of the participants strongly disagreed, 48.8% disagreed and 2.4% remained neutral. On the other hand, 43.9% agreed and 2.4% completely disagreed. To the question “We need to learn more about the effectiveness of co-educational classes before they can be implemented on a large scale” 48.8% disagreed, 2.4% strongly disagreed, 70.7% agreed and 4.9% strongly agreed.
scale” 2.4% strongly disagreed, 2.4% also disagreed, 7.3% said they were undecided, 80.5% agreed and 7.3% strongly agreed. To the question “The best way to start teaching children in a co-educational environment is to just do it, as no special training is needed” 17.1% answered absolutely negatively, 70.7% disagreed, 9.8% remains neutral while 2.4% agreed. To the question “Most children with special educational needs do not present behavioral problems in inclusive education classes” 26.8% disagreed, 48.8% answered undecided and 24.4% answered that they agreed.

To the question “Is it possible to teach children with and without special educational needs in the same class”, 2.4% answered that they disagree, 9.8% answered that they are in a neutral position regarding the issue, 82.9% answered that they agree and 4.9% that they completely agree. In the question “Inclusion is socially beneficial for children with special educational needs”, a minimum of 2.4% answered that they disagreed, 4.9% declared an undecided attitude, 39% answered that they agreed and 53.7% that they completely agreed. On the question “Children with special educational needs are likely to develop academic skills faster in a special, separate classroom than in a co-educational classroom” 9.8% disagreed, 17.1% presented a neutral attitude, 65, 9% agreed while 7.3% completely agreed.

To the question “Children with special educational needs are likely to be isolated from typically developing children in mainstream classes”, 14.6% answered that they disagreed, 12.2% answered that they felt undecided, 63.4% answered that they agreed and 9.8% that they completely agree. In the question “The presence of children with special educational needs promotes the acceptance of diversity on the part of typically developing students” 4.9% are neutral, 39% agree and 56.1% completely agree. In the question “Inclusion promotes the social independence of children with special educational needs” 2.4% answered that they disagree, 2.4% answered that they feel undecided, 46.3% answered that they agree while, 48.8% he replied that he completely agreed.

In the question “Inclusion strengthens the self-esteem of students with special educational needs”, 4.9% stated that they have a neutral-undecided attitude, 46.3% answered that they agree and 46.3% answered that they completely agree. To the question “Children with special educational needs are likely to present more challenging behavior in a co-educational class” 24.4% answered that they disagreed, 17.1% declared an undecided-neutral attitude, 51.2% agreed and 7.3% strongly agreed. In the question “Children with special educational needs in co-educational classes develop a better self-concept than in an independent class” 7.3% disagreed, 9.8% declared a neutral attitude, 39% agreed while 43.9% fully agreed.

In the question “The challenge of the general education class promotes the academic development of children with special educational needs”, 2.4% said they disagreed, 14.6% showed an undecided position, 70.7% said they agreed and 12.2% stated that they completely agree. In the question “Studying in a special class before high school does not have a negative effect on the social and emo-
tional development of students” 4.9% disagree, 56.1% are undecided-neutral, 36.6% agree and 2.4% strongly agree. On the question “Typically developing students in inclusive classes are likely to exhibit challenging behavior that they have ‘learned’ from children with special educational needs” 2.4% strongly disagree, 34.1% disagree, 61% are undecided and 2.4% agree. On the question “Children with special educational needs monopolize teachers’ time” (Table 1), 2.4% strongly disagree, 41.5% disagree, 7.3% remain neutral-undecided, 46.3% agree while 2.4% completely agrees.

In the question “The behavior of students with special educational needs requires significantly more attention from the teacher compared to that of typically developing children” (Table 2), 7.3% disagree, 9.8% have a neutral-undecided attitude, 80.5% agree and 2.4% completely agree.

In the question “Parents of children with special educational needs require more support services from teachers compared to parents of typically developing children” (Table 3), 12.2% are undecided-neutral, 85.4% answered that they agree while, 2.4% answered that they completely agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To the question “Parents of children with special educational needs behave in the same way towards the classroom teacher as parents of children without special educational needs” (Table 4), the majority of participants, i.e. 46.3% answered that they disagree, 17.1% answered that they are undecided while 36.6% said they agree.

Finally, to the question “A good approach to managing a co-educational class is to have a special pedagogue who will be responsible for teaching children with special educational needs” (Table 5), 2.4% said they were neutral-undecided, 41.5% answered that agree and 56.1% answered that they completely agree.

Effectively, the sheet is not correlated with any of the perceptions measuring the relationships between teachers’ individual and demographic characteristics and their perceptions of inclusion and the relationships between teachers’ individual and demographic characteristics and their perceptions of expected benefits from inclusive education, except for the view that parents of children with special educational needs prefer their child to study in an inclusive environment. Rs (39) = 0.350, p < 0.05. That is, men tend to agree more with the view that parents of children with special educational needs prefer their child to study in an inclusive environment, compared to women.

Age is moderately and positively associated with the view that inclusion is not a desirable practice for the education of most typically developing students. Rs (39) = 0.427, p < 0.05. Age is not correlated with any other question.

Also, a positive and moderate correlation was found between years of service and the view that inclusion is not a desirable practice for the education of most typically developing students. Rs (39) = 0.358, p < 0.05. In addition, a positive and moderate correlation was found between years of experience and difficulty

### Table 4. Parents of children with special educational needs treat the classroom teacher in the same way as parents of children without special educational needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5. A good approach to managing an inclusive classroom is to have a special educator who will be responsible for teaching children with special educational needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
maintaining discipline in a school classroom. \( R_s (39) = 0.467, \ p < 0.05 \). A positive, moderate relationship between years of service and the belief that children’s special needs cannot be met by general education teachers was also quickly established. \( R_s (39) = 0.379, \ p < 0.05 \). Also, a positive and moderate correlation was found between the years of prior service and the opinion that attending a special class before high school does not have a negative effect on the social and emotional development of students. \( R_s (39) = 0.337, \ p < 0.05 \). In addition, a negative and moderate correlation was found between years of service and the perception that typically developing students in inclusive classrooms are likely to exhibit challenging behavior that they “learned” from children with special educational needs. \( R_s (39) = -0.312, \ p < 0.05 \).

5. Conclusions

In conclusion, the main objective of this research was to investigate the views of preschool teachers on the inclusion of children with ADHD in kindergartens and how they feel when they have children with ADHD in their classrooms. It was addressed to preschool teachers as they are considered the most suitable to share their opinions and concerns regarding children with ADHD. The educator, with his knowledge and experience, can communicate situations he has encountered while helping to develop the research. The synthesis of findings in order to present the views of educators is particularly important for the educational community as the presentation of different views wants to sharpen critical thinking and enrich the existing literature.

In the above research, it appears that most participants have positive and neutral feelings about the students with ADHD in their class. The two most important perceptions regarding the main elements that characterize the successful inclusive approach in kindergarten are the participants’ positive view of the parents’ attitude and their own correct assessment of the abilities of their students with special needs [29] [30] [31] [32]. In addition, the research questions designed for the research are fully answered through the questionnaires as well as the bibliography listed in the work.

6. Research Restrictions

In this particular survey, there were some limitations regarding the sample, due to the Covid-19 pandemic, it was difficult to find many participants, but a sample number of about 60 people were set and finally, 41 participants responded. Regarding the second limitation, it was the time, i.e. the time frame that had been set to get the answers from the participants, which covered 20 days.

7. Future Extensions

This research can be useful to many teachers or students and even to parents, it also constitutes an idea for future research regarding the topic investigated in this one, that is, with the views of preschool teachers on the inclusion of children
with Dissociation Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) in kindergarten. But also with other alternative research proposals concerning children with ADHD and the difficulties or school bullying they may face. The future researcher could use it and collect more responses either from several regions of a country or collect from one city as many as he can.

Also, another proposal is for the participants to have the possibility to answer the demographic data, in which region they work, study or are located, in order to have a generalization in which region the largest percentage of the sample is located. In addition, in order to do such research, the researcher should allocate enough time, not only to compile the results, but to inform and accept such a large sample to be able to collect his questionnaires.

Also, one last suggestion is that the researcher who wants to use the specific research in a different way should, instead of addressing teachers, address undergraduate or postgraduate students who have taught or who will be doing internships. This specific idea could be implemented with a questionnaire as well as with interviews.
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