

Occupational Alienation Among Employees with Special Needs: A Comparative Study Between the Visually Impaired and Those with Physical Disabilities

Oukaci Abderazek ¹

¹ PhD student, Department of Psychology, University of Algiers 2, Algeria
E-mail: Abderazek.oukaci@univ-alger2.dz ; Orcid : 0009-0000-0342-6996

Abstract---This study aims to examine the levels of occupational alienation among employees with special needs (the visually impaired and those with physical disabilities), and to determine whether there are significant differences between the two groups in their degrees of occupational alienation. The sample consisted of 250 employees (122 with visual impairments and 128 with physical disabilities), who were intentionally selected from three Algerian provinces: Algiers, Boumerdes, and Tizi Ouzou. Data were collected and analyzed using the descriptive-analytical method through the Occupational Alienation Scale. The findings revealed that the levels of occupational alienation among employees with special needs (both visually impaired and physically disabled) were not high. Moreover, there were no statistically significant differences in occupational alienation scores between the visually impaired employees and those with physical disabilities.

Keywords---Occupational alienation, employees with special needs, visually impaired, physically disabled.

Introduction

It is a well-established fact that the human element represents the core and most essential component of any organization, serving as its heartbeat and the main driving force behind the achievement of its objectives. The organization's success, distinction, and development primarily depend on the effectiveness of its human resources. Due to the critical importance of this element, organizations strive

How to Cite:

Abderazek, O. (2025). Occupational alienation among employees with special needs: A comparative study between the visually impaired and those with physical disabilities. *The International Tax Journal*, 52(5), 2717–2732. Retrieved from <https://internationaltaxjournal.online/index.php/itj/article/view/278>

The International tax journal ISSN: 0097-7314 E-ISSN: 3066-2370 © 2025

ITJ is open access and licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.

Submitted: 03 January 2025 | Revised: 19 March 2025 | Accepted: 11 July 2025

to invest in it appropriately, recognizing it as a true asset when properly developed and strengthened, as it provides a moral incentive that often exceeds material motivation.

This research falls within this framework, as it aims to examine occupational alienation among employees with special needs by comparing two groups: the visually impaired and those with physical disabilities. According to the joint report of the World Health Organization and the International Labour Organization (2015, p. 8), persons with disabilities constitute about one billion people, representing nearly 15% of the world's population. This makes them a significant segment of society that must be integrated and empowered to become active members, just like other social groups.

Occupational alienation has also drawn the attention of many researchers and specialists due to its growing importance. Modern organizations are replete with indicators and manifestations of this phenomenon, such as loss of job belonging and organizational loyalty, lack of satisfaction, a sense of estrangement at work, limited social interaction within the work environment, and weak interpersonal relationships. Occupational alienation often leads to various psychosomatic disorders in the workplace, including anxiety, loss of identity, personality disintegration, feelings of helplessness, lack of confidence, and a sense of defeat. Many scholars and critics—such as Al-Sarayra (2011), Bousalem (2017), Al-Mutairi (2016), Ben Zaârour (2016), and Al-Hamdani & Al-Sarraf (2012)—attribute these negative feelings to the phenomenon of occupational alienation.

In this paper, we focus on the professional category of persons with special needs, that is, individuals with disabilities engaged in formal, paid professional activities. The study seeks to examine the levels of occupational alienation among them and to identify possible differences between the visually impaired and those with physical disabilities.

Research Problem

Human societies have been familiar with work since ancient times. The modern era in which we live today is, in fact, the outcome of human labor throughout history and the various stages of development it has undergone. According to Georges Friedman (1985), work is a distinctive feature of the human species, as human beings are social creatures primarily occupied with work—despite differences in environmental structures, levels of technological advancement, and structural economic development across societies. Among the social and psychological manifestations in the work environment is the phenomenon known as **occupational alienation**, which is one of the negative conditions that pose a threat to individual well-being and social stability.

In a study conducted by Waitt (1993) on the relationship between the psychological climate and the feeling of occupational alienation among employees at the U.S. Military Research and Development Laboratory, results indicated a negative correlation between the psychological climate and occupational alienation. The term *alienation* refers to a range of relational dimensions—such as an individual's relationship with the self, others, nature, and human labor. Fromm (as cited in Ben Zahi, 2007) argued that alienation denotes an individual's inability to connect with oneself and a sense of separation between what one wishes to become and one's actual sense of self.

According to Vandenberghe (2002, p. 33), **occupational alienation** refers to “the fragility and weakness of the relationship between the individual and the job, and the low degree of psychological, professional, or intellectual integration within the job and the organization.” The intensity of occupational alienation has increased in the modern era due to the growing complexity of political, moral, and religious crises, the spread of information technologies, the erosion of geographical boundaries, and the expansion of globalization.

The concept of alienation has been discussed by psychologists, sociologists, and philosophers, each interpreting it within the framework of their respective disciplines. In the field of management and organizational studies, attention has been directed toward the **functional aspect of alienation**, known as *occupational alienation*—a condition in which an individual feels detached from their work and organization for various reasons, resulting in decreased performance at both the individual and organizational levels. Consequently, interest in studying this phenomenon has increased, especially with the rise of mechanization and the growing complexity of job structures. The present study aims to examine occupational alienation among employees with special needs. Specifically, it seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the levels of occupational alienation among employees with special needs (the visually impaired and those with physical disabilities)?
2. Are there significant differences in occupational alienation scores between visually impaired employees and those with physical disabilities?

Research Hypotheses

To answer the research questions, the following hypotheses were proposed as provisional assumptions:

1. The levels of occupational alienation are high among employees with special needs (the visually impaired and those with physical disabilities).
2. There are significant differences in the degrees of occupational alienation between visually impaired employees and those with physical disabilities.

Research Objectives

The present study aims to:

1. Identify the extent to which occupational alienation is prevalent among employees with special needs (the visually impaired and those with physical disabilities).
2. Examine whether there are differences in occupational alienation according to the type of disability among employees with special needs (the visually impaired and those with physical disabilities).

Significance of the Study

The significance of the current study lies in the following points:

1. Given the scarcity of studies focusing on employees with special needs in relation to the variables addressed in the present research, this study will undoubtedly contribute to enriching the existing literature and advancing research in this field. Moreover, it may assist policymakers in taking appropriate measures based on its findings concerning this professional group.
2. The study also aims to shed light on the psychological condition of employees with special needs.

Theoretical Framework

1. The Concept of Occupational Alienation

Bahr and Abu Sultan (2013, p.183) define *occupational alienation* as “an individual’s feeling of estrangement within the organization in which they work, resulting from poor social interaction with both the organizational structure and the work environment, as well as with the prevailing supervisory style, colleagues, and service recipients. Consequently, the employee perceives the organization as no longer a suitable place for them, leading to decreased levels of belonging and loyalty, which negatively affect concentration, abilities, commitment, and ultimately job performance.”

According to Vijayakumar (2010), it refers to “a worker’s sense of estrangement from someone or something related to them, such as their family, community, or even their own self” (Ali, 2013, p.10).

Johann Clark (1959) defined occupational alienation as “the degree to which an individual experiences meaninglessness, powerlessness, loneliness, and self-estrangement.” His definition focused on the

individual's sense of helplessness regarding their assigned role within an organization or workplace (Al-Shaflou, 2014, p.203).

Salem (2009, p.170) defined it as "an individual's feeling of hardship and discomfort, which manifests in withdrawal or self-alienation from social and cultural participation, accompanied by a sense of non-belonging and a perception of being unwelcome by others."

Similarly, Al-Sultan (2003, p.279) described it as "a worker's detachment from their job and lack of interest or concern for it, feeling that the work they perform is meaningless and devoid of value. This alienation often arises from the repetitive, monotonous nature of the tasks performed."

According to Sabr (2013, p.251), occupational alienation is "a psychological state experienced by workers who feel disconnected from their surrounding reality due to environmental and personal factors that hinder their ability to adapt. This leads to feelings of isolation and insignificance regarding their role in the workplace." It represents a sense of separation from one's work, preventing the fulfillment of psychological and biological needs (Shan, 1992), in addition to feelings of helplessness, psychological estrangement, meaninglessness, and normlessness (Askar et al., 1999, p.29). Moreover, as defined by *BusinessDictionary.com*, it denotes "employees' sense of detachment from their organization, manifesting in weak ties with the workplace and a belief that their job lacks meaning and relevance to other aspects of their lives."

Dimensions of Occupational Alienation

Most studies addressing occupational alienation identify five key dimensions:

1. **Powerlessness**

The lack of control is considered the core of the alienation concept. It reflects the emotions of a worker who feels unable to influence the events occurring at work, perceiving themselves as a passive responder rather than an initiator. As a result, the worker engages in behaviors that do not reflect their true self or inner authenticity.

2. **Meaninglessness**

This dimension refers to an individual's perception of lacking guidance or direction in behavior and beliefs. The alienated worker experiences an inner void due to the absence of meaningful goals that provide purpose in life, guide attitudes, attract efforts, and align with personal interests and aspirations (Sabr, 2013, p.252). According to Abdullah (2008, p.320), meaninglessness is "a worker's inability to reach a decision or determine what to do or believe to direct their behavior and knowledge" (Starch, 1992, p.132). It is, therefore, a condition in which the worker feels that life has lost its meaning (Ali, 2013, p.13).

3. **Social Isolation**

According to Nelson and O'Donohue (2006, p.10), this dimension refers to an individual's sense of estrangement and isolation from those around them, whether inside or outside the organization. Consequently, their sense of group belonging diminishes, reducing their effectiveness in achieving organizational goals (Sabr, 2013, p.252).

4. **Normlessness (Anomie)**

This dimension relates to the individual's perception that social or professional norms have lost their regulatory power and are no longer respected (Sabr, 2013, p.252). The loss of norms is manifested in the breakdown of ethical and procedural standards within the organization—for example, when employees perceive that senior management violates legal procedures or relies on illegitimate means to achieve goals. Such conditions foster a sense of moral disorientation and the collapse of values (Ali, 2013, p.13).

5. **Self-Estrangement (Loss of Self)**

According to Nelson and O'Donohue (2006, p.9), feelings of loneliness and isolation may occupy a central place in workers' emotional lives, rendering them unable to cope with separation. This leads to a loss of personal and social identity and a sense of disconnection between what one wishes to become and what one perceives oneself to be (Ali, 2013, p.13). Self-estrangement thus represents a disjunction between a worker's true self and their reality,

goals, and aspirations—where the worker becomes alienated from their authentic self, detached from their work, and estranged from the meaning of their professional life.

3. The Concept of Disability and the Definition of a Person with Disability

3.1 The Concept of Disability

Disability is a complex concept that encompasses biological, psychological, and social dimensions. According to the **World Health Organization (WHO)**, disability is defined as *“a state in which an individual is unable to meet the requirements of performing their normal role in life, related to their age, gender, and socio-cultural characteristics, due to impairment or dysfunction in physiological or psychological performance”* (Al-Adra, 2016, p. 2014).

The WHO also defines it as *“a condition of deficiency or impairment in physical or mental abilities, resulting from genetic or environmental factors, that prevents the individual from learning certain activities that a normal person of the same age can perform”* (Herdou Center for Digital Expression Support, 2014, p. 8).

In the **International Classification of Impairments, Disabilities, and Handicaps** (1980), disability is described as *“any restriction or lack, resulting from an impairment, of ability to perform an activity in the manner or within the range considered normal for a human being”* (Aisha, 2012, p. 28).

According to **Al-Qamash and Al-Ma’aytah (2007, p. 18)**, disability refers to *“an individual’s inability to respond to or adapt to the environment due to behavioral, physical, or mental problems, and it is the impairment that causes such problems when the individual interacts with the environment.”* Similarly, **Al-Abbas (2007, p. 7)** defines it as *“a sensory, mental, or motor deficiency that affects the individual socially, economically, and psychologically, preventing them from performing cognitive and professional tasks with the same efficiency as a non-disabled person.”*

Canoui et al. (1994) distinguished between three interrelated terms (Ghalem, 2008, p. 48):

- **Impairment:** a disturbance in anatomical, physiological, or psychological structures or functions.
- **Incapacity:** a limitation in the individual’s functional abilities or performance.
- **Disability:** the disadvantage resulting from the gap between societal expectations of the individual and what they can actually accomplish.

According to **Kamel (1998, p. 18)**, disability is *“a defect resulting from impairment that prevents or limits an individual’s ability to perform a normal role according to age, gender, and socio-cultural factors.”* Similarly, **Abd al-Majid (1997, p. 9)** defines it as *“any physical, psychological, mental, or congenital deficiency that hinders the individual from fulfilling their societal duties and makes them less capable than persons without impairments who enjoy sound physical and mental functions.”*

Based on the above definitions, disability can be operationally defined in this study as:

A state of impairment or deficiency affecting one or more of an individual’s physical or mental capacities, caused by genetic or environmental factors, leading to a limitation in physiological or psychological functioning and reducing the person’s ability to respond or adapt to their environment.

3.2 Definition of a Person with Disability

According to **Robert Barker’s Dictionary of Social Work** (as cited in Abu al-Nasr, 2005), a person with a disability is *“any individual suffering from a sensory, physical, mental, psychological, or social impairment that limits their ability to perform normal life or work roles, thereby requiring special care, services, or rehabilitation to enable them to achieve their fullest potential.”*

A **person with special needs** is defined as *“an individual who has one or more impairments that weaken their abilities and make them in need of external assistance, or someone who has lost their capacity to perform their usual work as a result of physical, bodily, or mental deficiency—whether due to an injury, illness, or congenital condition”* (Herdou Center for Digital Expression Support, 2014, p. 8).

Al-Shaybani (1989, p. 14) defines a disabled person as *“any individual who does not have full capacity to perform one or several everyday activities due to an impairment in sensory, intellectual, or motor functions, whether congenital or acquired after birth.”*

According to **Hamdi Abu al-Futuh (Qarshim, 2005, p. 14)**, the disabled person is *“one who suffers from severe impairment or weakness in speech, hearing, or vision; or one who is unable to walk or learn normally; or one who suffers from mental or emotional disorders.”*

Legally, the **United Nations (2015, p. 2)** defines a person with disability as *“any individual suffering from total or partial, permanent impairment in any of their senses or physical, psychological, or mental capacities to an extent that limits their ability to learn, rehabilitate, or work.”*

The **International Labour Organization (ILO)** defines the disabled person as *“someone whose physical or mental impairment restricts their ambitions to obtain suitable employment or to advance in it”* (Aisha, 2012, p. 29).

Hence, for the purposes of this study, a person with disability is operationally defined as:

Any individual who suffers from a physical, sensory, or motor impairment that limits their ability to perform professional or social activities normally, whether the disability is congenital or acquired.

3.3 Types of Disability

Disabilities vary widely according to their causes and nature. However, this study focuses on two main types that are directly related to the research sample: **visual disability** and **motor (physical) disability**.

A. Visual Disability

This refers to any individual who experiences impairment or loss in visual ability that hinders their educational or occupational performance, limits their capacity to interact with environmental and social stimuli, or restricts their mobility.

Visually impaired individuals are classified into two categories (Al-Qamash & Al-Ma'aytah, 2012, p. 339):

- **Low vision:** a person whose visual acuity ranges between 6/60 and 3/60 in the better eye after correction.
- **Blindness:** a person whose visual acuity is less than 3/60 in the better eye after correction or whose visual field is less than 20 degrees.

B. Motor (Physical) Disability

This includes individuals who suffer from impairments in motor ability or physical activity, affecting their cognitive, emotional, and social development, and requiring special education or rehabilitation. Motor disability may result from **paralysis, amputation, congenital deformities, accidents, or illnesses** (Al-Anzi, 2006, p. 23).

According to **Abduh (2002, p. 219)**, physical disability involves deficiencies or dysfunctions in internal bodily organs—either those related to movement or to vital biological processes—that have a lasting impact on the individual's ability to live a normal life, either fully or partially.

4. Research Methodology

4.1 Research Method

This study employed the **descriptive method**, as it is most appropriate for investigating the phenomenon under study.

4.2 Research Population

The research population consists of **all employees with disabilities**, specifically those with **visual impairments (the blind)** and **physical (motor) disabilities**.

4.3 Research Setting

The study was conducted in **three Algerian provinces (wilayas): Algiers, Boumerdes, and Tizi Ouzou**.

4.4 Research Sample

A **purposive sample** of **250 participants** was selected from the research population, representing workers with disabilities (both visually impaired and physically disabled individuals).

Table 01: Distribution of the Research Sample According to Type of Disability

Type of Disability	Frequency	Percentage
Visual Disability (Blind)	122	48.8%
Physical Disability (Motor)	128	51.2%
Total	250	100%

The data in **Table (01)** show that the research sample consisted of **250 individuals** with disabilities, among whom **122 participants (48.8%)** had visual impairments (blind), and **128 participants (51.2%)** had physical disabilities.

4.5 Data Collection Instruments

Data and information relevant to the research phenomenon were collected using the following instruments:

1. **General Information Questionnaire**
2. **Work Alienation Scale**

4.5.1 General Information Questionnaire

This questionnaire included demographic and professional information about the participants, such as: type of disability, age, gender, marital status, type of employment contract, years of service (seniority), and educational level

4.5.2 Work Alienation Scale

After reviewing a number of previous studies on **work alienation**, including those by **Younesi (2012)**; **Sabri (2013)**; **Abu Samra et al. (2014)**; **Ali (2013)**; **Ainouz (1999)**; **Bahr & Abu Sultan (2013)**; **Al-Shaflou (2014)**; **Darwazeh & Al-Qawasmi (2014)**; **Al-Baghili (2013)**; **Shabat (2012)**; **Al-Naili (2014)**; **Na'isa (2012)**; **Abu Ali (2015)**; **Bel'abed (2014)**; **Okasha (2018)**; **Al-Osaimi (2015)**; **Al-Assal (2009)**; **Saeed (2016)**; **Bahri (2009)**; **Helles (2012)**; **Al-Tajouri (2011)**; **Al-Mutrafi (2005)**; and **Ben Zahi (2007)**, the main **dimensions of work alienation** were identified and used as the basis for constructing the research instrument.

A set of items was formulated for each dimension, based on the most relevant aspects identified in the reviewed literature. Upon comparison with previous instruments, it was found that these items closely aligned with those used in **Al-Shaflou's (2014)** study, which was itself based on the **five-dimensional model of work alienation** developed by **Melvin Seeman (1959)**.

These five dimensions are:

- **Powerlessness,**
- **Meaninglessness,**
- **Isolation,**
- **Normlessness,** and
- **Self-estrangement.**

Seeman's scale is among the **most widely used and cited instruments** in the literature on work alienation, and many subsequent studies have adapted it—sometimes modifying its structure to suit different research purposes or contexts, thereby compromising its comprehensiveness. In contrast, the current study aims to maintain the **conceptual integrity and general applicability** of Seeman's original model (Al-Shaflou, 2014, p. 215).

Although efforts were made to obtain the **original version** of Seeman's (1959) scale as cited by Al-Shaflou (2014), it was **not available**. Therefore, the researcher relied on the **psychometric properties** reported by Al-Shaflou (2014), which are presented as follows:

Table (02): Psychometric Properties of the Work Alienation Scale in Al-Shaflou's Study (2014)

Dimensions	Reliability Coefficient	Validity Coefficient
Work Alienation	0.897	0.975
Sense of Powerlessness	0.820	0.901
Sense of Meaninglessness	0.798	0.863
Sense of Isolation	0.816	0.849
Sense of Normlessness	0.673	0.864
Sense of Self-Estrangement	0.591	0.826

The data presented in Table (02) indicate that all coefficients are statistically significant at the **0.01 level**. The overall reliability coefficient of the **Work Alienation Scale** was **0.897**, while the overall validity coefficient reached **0.975**.

The reliability coefficients for the subdimensions ranged between **0.591 and 0.820**, and the validity coefficients ranged between **0.826 and 0.901**, which are statistically acceptable and suitable for scientific research purposes.

Pilot Study

A **pilot study** was conducted during **January and February 2020** on a sample of **150 employees with disabilities** (both visually impaired and physically disabled) in **Algiers**.

The pilot study was essential to gain a deeper understanding of the research field and population and to examine the **psychometric properties** of the instruments used in the study, ensuring their **appropriateness and suitability** for collecting data from individuals with disabilities.

6.3 Psychometric Properties of the Work Alienation Scale

Validity

The scale was administered to a **pilot sample of 41 individuals with disabilities** (visually and physically impaired) to verify the **clarity and comprehensibility** of the items and instructions. The results confirmed that **all items were clear and understandable** to the respondents without exception.

Internal Consistency Validity

To further verify validity, **Pearson's correlation coefficients** were calculated between each item and the total score of its corresponding dimension.

All correlations were statistically significant at the **0.01 level**, ranging from **0.50 to 0.83**. Similarly, the correlations between the **five dimensions of work alienation** and the **overall scale score** were also significant at the **0.01 level**, ranging from **0.69 to 0.85**, indicating a strong internal consistency validity.

Reliability

The reliability of the **Work Alienation Scale** was determined using **Cronbach's Alpha coefficient** for the entire scale and its five dimensions.

The results are presented in Table (03)

Table (03): Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients for the Work Alienation Scale and Its Five Dimensions

Dimensions	Cronbach's Alpha (α)
Work Alienation (Total)	0.74
Sense of Powerlessness	0.78
Sense of Meaninglessness	0.76

Dimensions	Cronbach's Alpha (α)
Sense of Isolation	0.74
Sense of Normlessness	0.81
Sense of Self-Estrangement	0.79

The results in Table (03) show that the overall **Cronbach's Alpha** for the Work Alienation Scale is **0.74**, while the coefficients for its five dimensions range between **0.74** and **0.81**. These reliability coefficients are statistically significant and **acceptable for research purposes**.

Scale Scoring

The responses to the scale items are rated on a **five-point Likert scale** as follows: (Strongly Agree – Agree – Neutral – Disagree – Strongly Disagree). Scoring is conducted according to the **Likert method**, as shown in Table (04).

Table (04): Scoring Distribution for Positive and Negative Items on the Likert Scale

Item Direction	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Positive Items	1	2	3	4	5
Negative Items	5	4	3	2	1

Accordingly, the **maximum possible score** a respondent can obtain is **100 points**, while the **minimum score** is **20 points**.

The scale is scored in the direction of **work alienation**—that is, **the higher the total score, the greater the individual's feeling of work alienation**, and vice versa.

1. Presentation of Research Results

1.2 Levels of Work Alienation among Employees with Special Needs

Table (05): Levels of Work Alienation and Its Dimensions among Employees with Special Needs (Visually Impaired and Physically Disabled)

Variables	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Sense of Powerlessness	04	17	8.93	2.66
Sense of Meaninglessness	04	18	8.74	2.43
Social Isolation	05	17	10.08	2.44
Normlessness	04	20	9.44	3.39
Sense of Self-Estrangement	04	18	9.11	2.62
Work Alienation (Total)	26	81	46.32	10.34

As shown in **Table (05)**, the **overall mean score** of work alienation among employees with special needs was **46.32**, with a **standard deviation of 10.34**, which is **lower than the theoretical mean of the scale**.

The mean scores of the five dimensions are ranked as follows:

- **First**, *Social Isolation* recorded the highest mean ($M = 10.08$, $SD = 2.44$).
- **Second**, *Normlessness* ($M = 9.44$, $SD = 3.39$).
- **Third**, *Self-Estrangement* ($M = 9.11$, $SD = 2.62$).
- **Fourth**, *Powerlessness* ($M = 8.93$, $SD = 2.66$).
- **Fifth**, *Meaninglessness* ($M = 8.74$, $SD = 2.43$).

The results indicate that **four dimensions of work alienation** — namely *Powerlessness*, *Meaninglessness*, *Normlessness*, and *Self-Estrangement*, as well as the **overall work alienation score**, were **below the theoretical mean of the scale**.

Only the *Social Isolation* dimension recorded a **slightly higher mean**, exceeding the theoretical mean by **0.08 points**, which is a negligible difference.

Accordingly, the **first research hypothesis** stating that:

“Levels of work alienation are high among employees with special needs (the visually impaired and the physically disabled)”

was not confirmed.

1.8.1 Difference in the Sense of Powerlessness between Employees with Visual and Physical Disabilities

Table (06): Statistical Significance of Differences in the Sense of Powerlessness According to Type of Disability

Type of Disability	Sample Size (N)	Mean	Standard Deviation	t (Equal Variances)	t (Unequal Variances)	Significance Level (p)	Significance
Visual Disability	122	8.56	2.39	-2.165	-2.174	0.031	Significant
Physical Disability	128	9.28	2.85	—	—	—	—

The results presented in **Table (06)** show that the **mean score** of the *sense of powerlessness* dimension among employees with **visual disabilities (the blind)** was **8.56** with a **standard deviation of 2.39**, for a sample size of **122** individuals.

In contrast, the mean score for employees with **physical disabilities** was **9.28** with a **standard deviation of 2.85**, for a sample size of **128** individuals.

As shown in the table, the calculated **t-value** was **-2.165** under the assumption of **equal variances**, and **-2.174** under **unequal variances**. The **significance level (p = 0.031)** in both cases is **less than 0.05**, which is generally accepted in **social and human sciences** as an indicator of statistical significance.

Therefore, these results indicate that **there are statistically significant differences** in the *sense of powerlessness* between employees with **visual disabilities** and those with **physical disabilities**.

1.8.2 Difference in the Sense of Meaninglessness between Employees with Visual and Physical Disabilities

Table (07): Statistical Significance of Differences in the Sense of Meaninglessness According to Type of Disability

Type of Disability	Sample Size (N)	Mean	Standard Deviation	t (Equal Variances)	t (Unequal Variances)	Significance Level (p)	Significance
Visual Disability	122	8.95	2.75	1.338	1.329	0.182	Not significant
Physical Disability	128	8.53	2.08	—	—	0.185	Not significant

The results presented in **Table (07)** indicate that the **mean score** for the *sense of meaninglessness* dimension among employees with **visual disabilities (the blind)** was **8.95**, with a **standard deviation of 2.75**, for a sample of **122** participants.

In comparison, the **mean score** for employees with **physical disabilities** was **8.53**, with a **standard deviation of 2.08**, for a sample of **128** participants.

As shown in the table, the calculated **t-value** was **1.338** assuming **equal variances**, and **1.329** assuming **unequal variances**. The corresponding **p-values** were **0.182** and **0.185**, respectively. Since both values

are **greater than 0.05**, the differences are **not statistically significant** according to the conventional threshold used in **social and human sciences**.

Therefore, these findings indicate that **there are no significant differences** in the *sense of meaningfulness* between employees with **visual disabilities** and those with **physical disabilities**.

1.8.3 Difference in the Sense of Isolation between Employees with Visual and Physical Disabilities

Table (08): Statistical Significance of Differences in the Sense of Isolation According to Type of Disability

Type of Disability	Sample Size (N)	Mean	Standard Deviation	t (Equal Variances)	t (Unequal Variances)	Significance Level (p)	Significance
Visual Disability	122	10.18	2.67	0.660	0.657	0.510	Not significant
Physical Disability	128	9.98	2.20	—	—	0.512	Not significant

The results presented in **Table (08)** indicate that the **mean score** for the *sense of isolation* dimension among employees with **visual disabilities (the blind)** was **10.18**, with a **standard deviation of 2.67**, for a sample of **122 participants**.

In comparison, the **mean score** for employees with **physical disabilities** was **9.98**, with a **standard deviation of 2.20**, for a sample of **128 participants**.

As shown in the table, the calculated **t-value** was **0.660** assuming **equal variances**, and **0.657** assuming **unequal variances**. The corresponding **p-values** were **0.510** and **0.512**, respectively. Since both values are **greater than 0.05**, the differences are **not statistically significant** according to the conventional threshold used in **social and human sciences**.

Therefore, these findings indicate that **there are no significant differences** in the *sense of social isolation* between employees with **visual disabilities** and those with **physical disabilities**.

1.8.4 Difference in the Sense of Anomie between Employees with Visual and Physical Disabilities

Table (09): Statistical Significance of Differences in the Sense of Anomie According to Type of Disability

Type of Disability	Sample Size (N)	Mean	Standard Deviation	t (Equal Variances)	t (Unequal Variances)	Significance Level (p)	Significance
Visual Disability	122	10.07	3.56	2.902	2.893	0.04	Significant
Physical Disability	128	8.84	3.13	—	—	0.04	Significant

The results presented in **Table (09)** indicate that the **mean score** for the *sense of anomie* dimension among employees with **visual disabilities (the blind)** was **10.07**, with a **standard deviation of 3.56**, for a sample of **122 participants**.

Meanwhile, the **mean score** for employees with **physical disabilities** was **8.84**, with a **standard deviation of 3.13**, for a sample of **128 participants**.

As shown in the table, the calculated **t-value** was **2.902** assuming **equal variances**, and **2.893** assuming **unequal variances**. The corresponding **p-values** were **0.04** in both cases. Since these values are **less than 0.05**, the differences are considered **statistically significant** at the **0.05 level**, which is an acceptable threshold in **social and human sciences**.

Therefore, these results indicate that **there are statistically significant differences** in the *sense of anomie* between employees with **visual disabilities** and those with **physical disabilities**, in favor of the **visually impaired group**.

1.8.5 Difference in the Sense of Self-Estrangement between Employees with Visual and Physical Disabilities

Table (10): Statistical Significance of Differences in the Sense of Self-Estrangement According to Type of Disability

Type of Disability	Sample Size (N)	Mean	Standard Deviation	t (Equal Variances)	t (Unequal Variances)	Significance Level (p)	Significance
Visual Disability	122	9.38	2.80	1.589	1.584	0.113 / 0.115	Not significant
Physical Disability	128	8.85	2.42	—	—	—	—

The results presented in **Table (10)** show that the **mean score** for the *sense of self-estrangement* among employees with **visual disabilities (the blind)** was **9.38**, with a **standard deviation of 2.80**, for a sample of **122 individuals**.

Meanwhile, the **mean score** for employees with **physical disabilities** was **8.85**, with a **standard deviation of 2.42**, for a sample of **128 individuals**.

As indicated in the table, the **calculated t-value** was **1.589** assuming **equal variances**, and **1.584** assuming **unequal variances**. The corresponding **p-values** were **0.113** and **0.115**, respectively. Since these values are **greater than 0.05**, the difference is **not statistically significant**, which means that the result is **not acceptable** within the **social and human sciences** significance threshold.

Therefore, it can be concluded that **there are no significant differences** in the *sense of self-estrangement* between employees with **visual disabilities** and those with **physical disabilities**.

1.8.6 Differences in Overall Job Alienation between Employees with Visual and Physical Disabilities

Table (11): Statistical Significance of Differences in Overall Job Alienation According to Type of Disability

Type of Disability	Sample Size (N)	Mean	Standard Deviation	t (Equal Variances)	t (Unequal Variances)	Significance Level (p)	Significance
Visual Disability	122	47.16	11.16	1.261	1.256	0.208 / 0.210	Not significant
Physical Disability	128	45.51	9.46	—	—	—	—

The results presented in **Table (11)** indicate that the **mean score** of overall job alienation among employees with **visual disabilities (the blind)** was **47.16**, with a **standard deviation of 11.16**, for a sample of **122 participants**.

In contrast, the **mean score** of overall job alienation among employees with **physical disabilities** was **45.51**, with a **standard deviation of 9.46**, for a sample of **128 participants**.

As shown in the table, the **calculated t-value** was **1.261** assuming **equal variances**, and **1.256** assuming **unequal variances**. The corresponding **p-values** were **0.208** and **0.210**, respectively. Since these values are **greater than the 0.05 significance level**, the differences are **not statistically significant**, and thus not acceptable according to the conventional thresholds in **social and human sciences**.

Therefore, it can be concluded that **there are no significant differences in overall job alienation** between employees with **visual disabilities** and those with **physical disabilities**.

General Discussion of Results

The statistical analysis of the first hypothesis revealed that the overall level of job alienation among workers with disabilities was not high. The overall mean score for job alienation was lower than the theoretical mean, as were the mean scores for four of its dimensions: **powerlessness**, **meaninglessness**, **normlessness**, and **self-estrangement**. Only **social isolation** slightly exceeded the theoretical mean by a negligible margin (0.08). Consequently, the first hypothesis of the study was not supported, indicating that workers with disabilities—both the visually impaired and those with physical disabilities—do not experience high levels of job alienation.

Although previous studies directly addressing this topic are scarce, the present finding can be interpreted within the context of Algerian cultural and social values. The society tends to show strong empathy and solidarity toward individuals with disabilities, expressed through positive interpersonal treatment, social respect, and institutional support. Culturally and religiously, compassion and care for individuals with special needs are moral imperatives, reinforced by collective awareness that anyone may become disabled due to unforeseen accidents or health crises. Such attitudes likely contribute to mitigating feelings of alienation among workers with disabilities.

The **absence of powerlessness** may be attributed to the successful integration of workers with disabilities into the workplace. They appear to perceive a degree of control and influence over work-related events, despite their limitations.

Similarly, the **absence of meaninglessness** suggests that these workers possess clear goals and motivations that provide purpose and direction in their professional and personal lives. Many occupy vital social and economic roles within their families and communities. Notably, nearly half of the sample (48.4%) were married, which may strengthen their sense of responsibility, purpose, and engagement in work.

The slightly elevated score for **social isolation** may be related to the nature of certain disabilities—particularly visual impairments—which can restrict mobility and limit social interaction compared to non-disabled peers. However, the difference remains minimal and does not indicate a high level of alienation.

The low level of **normlessness** indicates that most participants respect organizational and legal norms and believe that legitimate means are sufficient to achieve their goals. This may stem from the structured and lawful environment of institutions employing workers with disabilities, which typically operate under clear regulatory frameworks ensuring fairness and transparency.

Finally, the relatively low level of **self-estrangement** reflects positive psychological integration and a sense of belonging within the work environment. Consistent with Karen Horney's conceptualization, self-estrangement represents the most severe form of alienation, in which individuals lose touch with their authentic selves. Given the low levels of alienation across all other dimensions, this finding appears logically consistent.

Comparable findings were reported in previous studies. For example, **Qureinat and Bahi (2016)** found that the challenges faced by individuals with physical disabilities were primarily health-related, followed by social and psychological difficulties. Similarly, **Seidel and Vaughn (1994)** observed that students with disabilities who dropped out of school exhibited greater alienation from teachers and peers compared to those who remained enrolled.

Discussion of the Second Hypothesis

The statistical analysis for the second hypothesis revealed **significant differences in the dimension of powerlessness**, indicating that feelings of powerlessness vary according to the type of disability. Powerlessness reflects an individual's perceived inability to control or influence work events, often accompanied by withdrawal and a sense of weakness. In this study, such differences may be linked to the varying degrees of physical and environmental barriers faced by each group.

However, **no significant differences were found in the dimensions of meaninglessness or social isolation** between the two groups. Both the visually impaired and the physically disabled workers appeared to share similar perceptions of purpose and social connectedness within their work environments.

The results did, however, indicate **a significant difference in normlessness**, favoring workers with physical disabilities. This suggests that physically disabled workers were more likely to perceive a breakdown in moral and social standards within the workplace. They may believe that unethical means are sometimes necessary to achieve objectives, or that previously unacceptable behaviors are now tolerated. Such perceptions could arise from direct exposure to these behaviors in the work context. In contrast, visually impaired workers, who do not visually witness such acts, may retain stronger adherence to professional norms and organizational values.

No significant differences were found in **self-estrangement**, indicating that both groups experience similar levels of connection to their true selves and identities despite the challenges of disability.

Finally, the analysis revealed **no significant difference in overall job alienation** between the visually impaired and physically disabled workers. This finding supports the general conclusion that job alienation levels are low among both groups. It may also reflect the influence of cultural, social, and religious values that promote humane treatment, solidarity, and respect toward individuals with disabilities, regardless of the nature of their impairment.

General Conclusion

After examining job alienation among workers with special needs (the visually impaired and those with physical disabilities), and through data analysis and interpretation, the following results were reached:

- The **first hypothesis**, which stated that levels of job alienation are high among workers with disabilities (the visually impaired and physically disabled), **was not confirmed**.
- The **second hypothesis**, which proposed that there are differences in the levels of job alienation between visually impaired workers and those with physical disabilities, **was also not supported**.

Conclusion

The primary objective of this study was to examine **job alienation among workers with special needs**, specifically those with **visual and physical disabilities**. After analyzing and enriching the theoretical framework and applying the research instruments to a sample of **250 workers with disabilities**—including **122 visually impaired** and **128 physically disabled** participants—the findings revealed that:

- There is **no significant experience of job alienation** among workers with disabilities, whether visually impaired or physically disabled.

These findings suggest that workers with disabilities generally experience **positive integration within the workplace**, likely due to social, cultural, and organizational factors that support inclusion and recognition of their abilities.

Recommendations and Suggestions

In light of the study's findings, several recommendations can be proposed:

- **Conduct further field studies** to explore the relationships and differences among the study variables, in order to confirm, refine, or challenge the current results.
- **Undertake additional research** on workers with special needs, considering the findings in developing corrective and supportive measures to reduce or eliminate workplace difficulties faced by this group.
- **Provide full family support** and organize training programs for families on how to care for and socially integrate individuals with disabilities, given that the family is the primary unit of socialization and care.
- **Encourage scientific research** focusing on people with disabilities to better understand their realities, needs, and the causes and prevention of disability.
- **Offer equal employment opportunities** to individuals with special needs and **adapt job positions** according to the type and degree of disability.
- **Modify specific job tasks** in various institutions to create accessible and appropriate roles for workers with disabilities.
- **Apply ergonomic design principles** in workplaces and ensure preventive measures to avoid occupational accidents among this group.
- **Provide designated spaces and necessary facilities** suited to different types of disabilities to enable workers to perform comfortably and efficiently.
- **Raise awareness and promote inclusion**, encouraging people with disabilities to become active and contributing members of society.
- **Consider the specific characteristics of individuals with disabilities** in urban planning, building design, roads, and sidewalks to facilitate their use of public facilities and infrastructure.
- **Establish specialized centers** for the care and support of individuals with disabilities, ensuring that they receive adequate social and professional assistance.

References

1. United Nations. (2015). *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities: Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, Fourteenth Session – Consideration of reports submitted by States parties under article 35 of the Convention*.
2. Al-Sultan, M. S. A. (2003). *Organizational Behavior*. New University Publishing, Alexandria, Egypt.
3. Al-Abbas, A. S. T., & Ruqayya. (2007). *Programs for Students with Special Needs in School Reform in Sudan*. United Arab Emirates University, UAE.
4. Al-Shafloou, A. R. H. (2014). *The Relationship Between Job Alienation and the Quality of Banking Services: An Applied Study on the North Africa Bank – Qasr Al-Akhhbar Branch*. *Al-Asmarya University Journal*, (29), Libya.
5. Al-Shaibani, O. T. (1989). *Cultural Care for the Disabled*. Arab Book House, Tripoli, Libya.
6. Al-Adra, I. A. (2016). *Challenges Facing Students with Disabilities at the University of Jordan: A Field Study*. *Dirasat: Human and Social Sciences Journal*, 43(Suppl. 5), University of Jordan, Jordan.
7. Al-Anzi, K. H. H. (2016). *Psychological Alienation and Its Relationship with the Level of Aspiration Among University Students*. *Journal of Education and Psychology Message*, (55), Dar Al-Manzuma, Saudi Arabia.
8. Al-Qamash, M. N., & Al-Ma'aytah, K. A. R. (2012). *Fundamentals of Vocational Rehabilitation and Care for Persons with Special Needs* (1st ed.). Al-Thaqafiya Publishing and Distribution, Amman, Jordan.
9. Al-Qamash, M. N., & Al-Ma'aytah, K. A. R. (2007). *Psychology of Children with Special Needs: An Introduction to Special Education* (1st ed.). Al-Maysara Publishing and Distribution, Amman, Jordan.
10. Bahr, Y. A., & Abu Sultan, M. S. M. (2013). *Job Alienation and Its Relationship to Job Performance Among Employees in the Ministry of Education and Higher Education in the Gaza Strip*. *Palestine University Journal for Research and Studies*, (5), Palestine.

11. Bin Zahi, M. (2007). *Job Alienation and Its Relationship with Achievement Motivation Among Middle-Level Managers in the Hydrocarbons Sector: A Field Study at Sonatrach Company in Southern Algeria*. Doctoral Dissertation, Mentouri University of Constantine, Algeria.
12. Salem, M. (2009). *Organizational Power* (1st ed.). Ithraa Publishing and Distribution, Jordan.
13. Sabr, R. N. (2013). *The Impact of Job Stress Sources on the Level of Job Alienation: An Analytical Study of the Opinions of a Sample of Nurses at Al-Yarmonk Teaching Hospital*. Baghdad College of Economic Sciences University Journal, (37), Baghdad, Iraq.
14. Abdullah, A. Y., & Al-Duweiri, F. (2013). *Attitudes of Irbid National University Students Toward Persons with Disabilities and the Impact of an Islamic Education-Based Training Program on Developing These Attitudes*. Irbid National University, Jordan.
15. Abdul-Majid, A. R. (1997). *Development of Disabled Children*. Gharib Publishing and Distribution, Cairo, Egypt.
16. Abduh, B. K. (2002). *Disability in the Context of Social Work: A Study on Strengthening the Value System of Groups of Disabled Persons*. Scientific Office, Alexandria, Egypt.
17. Askar, A., Hamdi, Y., & Al-Moussawi, H. (1999). *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Between Theory and Practice* (1st ed.). Modern Book House, Kuwait.
18. Ali, H. H. (2013). *Testing the Relationship Between Organizational Justice and Job Alienation: An Exploratory Study of the Opinions of a Sample of Workers in Kufa Cement Factory*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Kufa, Iraq.
19. Aisha, B. M. (2012). *Cultural Rights of Persons with Disabilities*. Publications of the Islamic Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (ISESCO), Rabat, Morocco.
20. Ghalem, F. (2008). *Evaluation of Teaching Competencies Among Teachers of Students with Special Needs (Intellectually Disabled – Mild and Moderate Cases)*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Kasdi Merbah University, Ouargla, Algeria.
21. Friedman, G., & Naville, P. (1985). *A Treatise on the Sociology of Work* (R. Emmanuel, Trans.). Awidat Publications, Lebanon.
22. Kamel, M. L. (1998). *Intellectual Disabilities and Developmental Disorders*. Victor Caires Printing Press, Cairo, Egypt.
23. Herdo Center for Digital Expression. (2014). *Rights of Persons with Special Needs*. Herdo Center for Digital Expression, Cairo, Egypt.
24. International Labour Organization. (2015). *Media Coverage Guidelines on Persons with Disabilities* (Trans. Qadiroun Business and Disability Network). Qadiroun Business and Disability Network, Saudi Arabia.
25. Qarasham, A. I. M. (2005). *A Proposed Program in Light of Modern Technologies for Treating Difficulties in Learning Mathematics and Arabic Among Middle School Students in Taif City, Saudi Arabia*. *Journal of Qualitative Education Research*.