The author, James Challenger, argues that the downsizing of organizations may cause their employees to feel insecure and to no longer trust the companies that they work for, which affects employee morale within the organization. Doublespeak in the workplace only adds to the insecurity that workers may face. Often employees of these organizations view doublespeak as dehumanizing and depersonalizing. Also, firms use government-type gobbledygook terms: decombined, reduction of imbalanced skills, corporate anorexia, resource reallocation and disconnected economy. The author states that while use of doublespeak intends to ease employee emotions, it often has the opposite effect as it dehumanizes and downplays the situation. Challenger also states "the words are getting mechanical to the point of being derogatory in nature" (67). He argues that companies should not want to make their employees feel "labeled and escort [them] out the door along with hundreds or...thousands of others" (67). Sometimes organizations use doublespeak to keep it "at arm's length from what really is happening to the individual and purportedly to help soften the blow of the bad news" (68). Challenger states that employees will appreciate the honesty, while maintaining their dignity. Van Buren's article, Layoff Lingo: Corporations Sugarcoat Mass Firings, presents many of the same ideas, mainly that corporations should utilize openness and honesty. Both Coe and Lutz state that doublespeak appears to communicate while only deceiving. These organizations fire people and lead them out the door, instead of explaining the situation. The study by McGlone and Batchelor expands on the idea that people tend to use euphemisms when confronted or confronting face to face. Job Description Jargon and the Average Joe expands on this article to include the problems a person faces trying to find a new job.