



Prifysgol Cymru
Y Drindod Dewi Sant
University of Wales
Trinity Saint David

Module LCLM5006_LON

Developing Emotional Intelligence

Assignment: Final Report -
Emotional Intelligence and Mindfulness

STUDENT

Julissa Granados Estanol

ID: 2417153

LECTURER

Nishi Ramsurrun

EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND MINDFULNESS FOR OPTIMAL ORGANISATIONAL EFFICACY..... 3

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Task 1: Emotional Intelligence in the Workplace.....	3
2.1 Explanation of the Emotional Intelligence Models.....	3
2.2 How Employees Can Use EI to Improve Performance.....	5
2.3 How EI Improves Communication and Collaboration.....	5
2.4 How EI Supports Employee Well-being.....	6
2.5 Critical Evaluation of the Topic.....	6
2.6 Conclusion of Task 1.....	7
3. Task 2: Managing a Multigenerational Workforce.....	8
3.1 Understanding the Multigenerational Landscape.....	8
3.2 Generational Profiles, Values, and Workplace Expectations.....	8
Generation X (b. 1965–1980).....	8
Generation Y / Millennials (b. 1981–1996).....	9
Generation Z (b. 1997–2012).....	9
3.3 Comparative Analysis and Organisational Impact.....	10
3.4 Strategic Interventions: Leveraging EI and Mindfulness for Inclusion.....	11
Recruitment Strategies.....	11
Management and Retention Through Adaptive Leadership.....	11
The Role of Mindfulness in Reducing Bias.....	12
Knowledge Retention via Two-Way Mentoring.....	12
4. Conclusion: Summary Report.....	12
References.....	14

EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND MINDFULNESS FOR OPTIMAL ORGANISATIONAL EFFICACY

1. Introduction

Emotional intelligence (EI) is scholarly conceptualised as the faculty to discern, comprehend, regulate, and apply emotional data to facilitate cognitive processes and behavioral orientation (Salovey and Mayer 1990). Within the contemporary paradigm of volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA) environments, the cultivation of EI has transitioned from a peripheral soft skill to a fundamental necessity for navigating intricate interpersonal dynamics, mitigating psychosocial stressors, and augmenting collective productivity (Goleman 1998). For the professional Office Coordinator, the management of heterogeneous administrative exigencies and cross-functional communications necessitates a robust emotional foundation to ensure uninterrupted operational continuity. This analytical exposition evaluates the strategic implementation of EI frameworks to enhance organisational performance, critically assessing three seminal models: Goleman's Mixed Model, Mayer and Salovey's Ability Model, and Bar-On's Emotional-Social Intelligence Model. Furthermore, this discourse investigates how these theoretical constructs, alongside secular mindfulness interventions, can be deployed to synchronise a modern, multigenerational workforce.

2. Task 1: Emotional Intelligence in the Workplace

2.1 Explanation of the Emotional Intelligence Models

The efficacy of EI in professional environments is predicated upon a rigorous understanding of its constituent theoretical frameworks. Daniel Goleman's Mixed Model posits EI as a synthesis of cognitive faculties, personality attributes, and behavioral competencies (Goleman 1995). This quaternary framework—comprising self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management—posits that organisational success is derived from the translation of internal affective reflection into quantifiable workplace behaviors, such as the maintenance of emotional equilibrium during operational crises (Cherniss and Goleman 2001).

In juxtaposition, the Ability Model proposed by Mayer and Salovey delineates EI strictly as a discrete cognitive capacity or mental intelligence (Mayer and Salovey 1997). This model is structured into four cognitive branches: the accurate perception of emotion, the utilisation of emotion to facilitate thought, the comprehension of complex emotional nuances, and the regulation of emotion to foster personal and professional evolution. Diverging from

trait-based theories, this model emphasizes the logical processing of emotional data, enabling practitioners to objectively interpret affective shifts within professional settings and calibrate communication strategies accordingly (Mayer, Salovey and Caruso 2004).

Complementing these is Bar-On's Emotional-Social Intelligence Model, which defines EI as a constellation of interrelated emotional and social competencies that facilitate effective self-understanding and environmental adaptation (Bar-On 1997). Built upon five meta-factors—intrapersonal, interpersonal, stress management, adaptability, and general mood—this framework prioritizes psychological well-being and resilience as primary drivers for coping with organisational transformations (Bar-On 2006).

EI Framework	Primary Analytical Focus
Goleman's Mixed Model	Behavioral competencies, leadership performance, and trait-based application.
Mayer & Salovey's Ability Model	Strict cognitive processing, mental intelligence, and objective affective data analysis.
Bar-On's Social-Emotional Model	Psychological resilience, stress-coping mechanisms, and socio-emotional adaptation.

When comparing these models, Goleman's framework focuses on leadership performance, while Bar-On's focuses on emotional well-being and adaptation. Meanwhile, Mayer and Salovey's model stands apart by completely avoiding personality traits, focusing entirely on measurable cognitive skills (Brackett et al. 2006). Together, these distinct perspectives provide managers with a well-rounded toolset to address both individual task performance and broader workplace health.

2.2 How Employees Can Use EI to Improve Performance

The strategic application of EI protocols correlates positively with individual task performance and macro-level organisational productivity. Self-awareness facilitates the recognition of professional limitations and cognitive biases, permitting more effective management of human capital (Goleman 1995). For instance, an Office Coordinator exhibiting high self-awareness can identify the onset of cognitive overload during complex scheduling phases and preemptively deploy delegation or technological solutions. Such meta-cognitive awareness mitigates administrative errors and optimises operational workflows (Boyatzis, Goleman and Rhee 2000).

Furthermore, self-regulation empowers personnel to maintain cognitive focus and suppress disruptive impulses during high-pressure scenarios (Cherniss and Goleman 2001). In instances of systemic failure, a self-regulated individual bypasses affective reactivity to conduct a rational situational assessment. Concurrently, intrinsic motivation serves as a catalyst for productivity by aligning individual objectives with organisational goals through internal satisfaction rather than extrinsic rewards (Goleman 1998). This fosters sustained engagement, ensuring the rigorous attainment of departmental standards despite resource constraints.

2.3 How EI Improves Communication and Collaboration

Emotional intelligence functions as the bedrock for sophisticated communication and synergistic collaboration. Empathy enables the comprehension of heterogeneous perspectives and underlying motivations (Salovey and Mayer 1990). In a central coordination role, the application of active empathy facilitates the navigation of competing departmental priorities, enabling collaborative resource optimisation.

Input	Mechanism	Outcome	<i>Systemic Result</i>
Active Empathy	Social Skills	Conflict De-escalation	Team Synergy

Furthermore, developed social skills support team building by creating a shared environment of transparency and trust (Goleman 1998). Employees with high interpersonal skills articulate goals clearly and make their colleagues feel valued, which strengthens cross-departmental relationships. This dynamic is especially useful for managing workplace conflicts. Rather than avoiding disagreements or resorting to rigid mandates, emotionally intelligent staff address disputes openly and calmly (Urlick et al. 2017). By actively listening to opposing arguments during scheduling or logistical disagreements, they help teams reach compromise, turning potential friction into productive collaboration.

2.4 How EI Supports Employee Well-being

The systematic institutionalisation of EI protocols is positively correlated with augmented occupational well-being and longitudinal personnel retention. Proficiency in affective discernment enables individuals to monitor nascent indices of mental fatigue, thereby facilitating the modulation of negative affect prior to its culmination in deleterious occupational burnout (Bar-On 1997). Through the deployment of strategic self-management interventions, personnel are empowered to establish sustainable professional boundaries

and maintain homeostatic mental equilibrium amidst escalating administrative demands (Cherniss and Goleman 2001).

Furthermore, EI cultivates robust professional resilience, which functions as a critical mechanism for facilitating seamless adaptation to volatile structural shifts (Bar-On 2006). In environments characterised by rapid organizational transitions, resilient practitioners conceptualise such transformations as manageable cognitive challenges rather than existential threats to professional stability. This psychological flexibility fundamentally enhances job satisfaction, as employees perceive a heightened sense of agency in managing operational volatility (Mayer, Salovey and Caruso 2004). Consequently, these sophisticated emotional coping mechanisms serve to mitigate interpersonal friction, fostering a supportive, stable, and cognitively inclusive organisational climate.

2.5 Critical Evaluation of the Topic

While EI frameworks offer clear benefits, a balanced academic analysis must examine their theoretical limitations. A primary critique of Goleman's and Bar-On's mixed models is that they define EI too broadly, combining established personality traits like extraversion and locus of control with actual emotional skills (Mayer, Salovey and Caruso 2004). This broad approach makes it difficult for researchers to measure EI objectively, leading critics to argue that mixed models are too reliant on subjective self-report surveys, which can be easily manipulated by candidates during hiring processes (Brackett et al. 2006). Conversely, while Mayer and Salovey's Ability Model avoids this issue by using objective performance tests, it is often criticized for being too academic and difficult to translate into practical, day-to-day corporate training programs (Cherniss and Goleman 2001).

Furthermore, high emotional intelligence does not always guarantee positive organizational outcomes. Academics warn against the "dark side" of emotional intelligence, noting that individuals with high EI can use their empathy and social skills to manipulate colleagues, hide strategic flaws, or advance their personal corporate agendas (Twenge 2014). For example, a charismatic manager might use their understanding of group dynamics to smooth over systemic issues or silence constructive criticism, creating an artificial sense of harmony. Therefore, organisations must not treat EI as a universal solution for corporate health; it must be supported by transparent accountability and strong ethical values to ensure it is used constructively (Van Rossem 2019).

2.6 Conclusion of Task 1

In summary, emotional intelligence is a vital capability built on self-awareness, cognitive emotional processing, and social adaptation (Salovey and Mayer 1990). The models developed by Goleman, Mayer and Salovey, and Bar-On show that while EI can be viewed

as either a behavioral trait or a cognitive skill, its practical application is essential for improving task performance, communication, and employee well-being (Cherniss and Goleman 2001). Despite measurement challenges and the potential for interpersonal manipulation, EI remains highly valuable for contemporary organisations. Cultivating these emotional skills allows businesses to replace defensive workplace reactions with thoughtful, deliberate communication, creating a resilient, collaborative corporate culture that can effectively adapt to shifting commercial demands.

3. Task 2: Managing a Multigenerational Workforce

3.1 Understanding the Multigenerational Landscape

A multigenerational workforce refers to an organizational environment where employees from distinct age cohorts work alongside one another within the same corporate structure (Costanza et al. 2012). In 2026, corporate teams are frequently composed of three primary generations: Generation X (born 1965–1980), Generation Y or Millennials (born 1981–1996), and Generation Z (born 1997–2012). Each group has been deeply shaped by different historical events, economic climates, and technological shifts during their formative years (Twenge 2014). Managing these diverse viewpoints requires an understanding of how each cohort approaches work, so that leaders can turn demographic differences into a collaborative advantage rather than an operational bottleneck.

Generational Cohort	Birth Years	Defining Values	Work	Technological Orientation
Generation X	1965 – 1980	Self-reliance, autonomy, and work-life balance.		Digital Immigrants
Millennials (Gen Y)	1981 – 1996	Purpose-driven, collaborative, and growth-oriented.		Digital Natives
Generation Z	1997 – 2012	Stability-focused, authenticity, and mental health support.		AI / Cloud Native

3.2 Generational Profiles, Values, and Workplace Expectations

Generation X (b. 1965–1980)

Generation X entered the corporate world during times of economic downsizing and industrial restructuring, which fostered a strong sense of self-reliance, independence, and skepticism toward traditional corporate hierarchies (Costanza et al. 2012). They highly value operational autonomy, functional work-life balance, and clear performance rewards. In their communication, Gen X employees generally prefer direct, efficient, and practical channels, typically leaning toward concise emails or brief face-to-face meetings to resolve issues quickly.

When it comes to motivation, they are driven by the freedom to manage their own schedules and projects without micromanagement (Urlick et al. 2017). As digital immigrants, they adopted technology later in their careers; they are highly competent with digital tools but view them strictly as utilitarian systems to complete tasks rather than the foundation of their social lives. An Office Coordinator working with Gen X colleagues should respect their autonomy by providing clear, high-level logistical objectives and avoiding unnecessary check-ins.

Generation Y / Millennials (b. 1981–1996)

Millennials grew up during the rapid expansion of the internet and globalization, which shaped a corporate viewpoint focused on purpose, personal growth, inclusivity, and collaboration (Twenge 2014). They expect regular feedback, flat organizational structures, and clear career progression pathways. Their communication style is highly collaborative and team-oriented, preferring structured check-ins, collaborative workshops, and instant messaging platforms like Slack or Microsoft Teams.

Millennials are intrinsically motivated by meaningful work that aligns with their personal values, alongside continuous opportunities for professional development (Van Rossem 2019). Having grown up alongside the transition to mobile technology, they are digital natives who seamlessly integrate cloud-based tools into their workflows. To effectively engage Millennials, coordinators should explain the broader purpose behind administrative changes, showing them how their work contributes to the organization's overarching strategy.

Generation Z (b. 1997–2012)

Generation Z entered the workforce during a time of global pandemics, climate concerns, and economic instability. As a result, they place a high value on financial security, authenticity, transparent management, and active mental health support (Twenge 2014). They expect corporate social responsibility, diverse teams, and an environment that

prioritizes psychological safety. Their communication style is instantaneous and highly visual, preferring short video messages, interactive platforms, and real-time collaboration tools.

Gen Z is motivated by stability, fair compensation, and a workplace culture that actively prevents burnout (Urick et al. 2017). As mobile-first and AI-native individuals, they expect automated, intuitive, and modern tech ecosystems at work, and can quickly become frustrated by legacy administrative processes. In the office, a coordinator can support Gen Z workers by streamlining manual paperwork through digital automation and maintaining transparent, real-time updates on operational changes.

3.3 Comparative Analysis and Organisational Impact

When these diverse generations collaborate within the same department without active guidance, their contrasting values and communication styles can impact organizational effectiveness. For example, a direct, concise email from a Gen X manager can easily be misread by a Millennial or Gen Z employee as cold, unsupportive, or passive-aggressive. Conversely, a younger employee's regular requests for performance feedback can be misinterpreted by older colleagues as a lack of confidence or a need for constant validation (Costanza et al. 2012).

Cohort Group	Perceptual Conflict / Friction Point	Potential Mitigation
Generation X Management	Misinterpretation of frequent feedback requests as indications of professional dependency or insufficient autonomy.	Implement structured, scheduled feedback sessions to provide clarity without micromanaging.
Gen Z & Millennial Personnel	Misperception of autonomous, hands-off leadership as emotional detachment or lack of professional support.	Adopt an "open-door" communication policy and provide clear, high-level logistical objectives to establish support.

Technology usage can also create operational friction. Gen Z's preference for instant digital communication can clash with Gen X's reliance on structured emails and formal documentation. If left unmanaged, these minor misalignments can create distinct ingroup/outgroup dynamics, leading to siloed departments, lower team morale, and unnecessary delays (Van Rossem 2019). Therefore, organisations must proactively build shared communication norms to preserve team cohesion and ensure operational efficiency.

3.4 Strategic Interventions: Leveraging EI and Mindfulness for Inclusion

To bridge these generational divides and build a productive, inclusive workplace, managers can strategically deploy Goleman's emotional intelligence framework alongside structured mindfulness practices.

Recruitment Strategies

Using empathy and social awareness allows HR teams to build recruitment processes that resonate across different cohorts (Goleman 1998). Hiring messages should be adapted to highlight the distinct factors that matter most to each generation.

For Generation Z, recruitment campaigns should explicitly highlight the organization's verified commitments to mental well-being, diversity, and clear ethical guidelines. For Generation X, talent sourcing should emphasize role autonomy, flexible working arrangements, and clear, performance-linked compensation models. This targeted approach ensures the organization attracts top talent from all age groups.

Management and Retention Through Adaptive Leadership

Managers must use relationship management skills to adapt their leadership style to the motivational drivers of each employee (Cherniss and Goleman 2001):

- When leading Gen X staff, managers should focus on providing high-level operational goals, granting full autonomy, and evaluating performance on actual outputs rather than face-time.
- When managing Millennials, leaders should connect daily projects to the firm's wider social purpose and provide regular, constructive career development check-ins.
- When supporting Gen Z employees, managers need to offer clear professional reassurance, transparent workflows, and easy access to mental health resources.

The Role of Mindfulness in Reducing Bias

Workplace mindfulness functions as a practical mental exercise focused on paying attention to the present moment intentionally and without judgment (Salovey and Mayer 1990). Implementing short mindfulness practices—such as a mandatory two-minute silent focus before starting cross-generational project meetings—helps ground the team and lowers immediate stress.

This mental pause helps managers interrupt automatic, biased reactions when a younger or older colleague communicates differently. It prevents them from falling back on unhelpful stereotypes, such as labeling a coworker as "entitled" or "rigid." Instead, it encourages

objective, non-judgmental active listening, helping teams focus on shared organizational goals.

Stimulus	Intervention	Cognitive <i>Shift</i>	<i>Response</i>
Generational Trigger	Mindful Pause	Bias Interruption	Objective Response

Knowledge Retention via Two-Way Mentoring

Finally, leaders can use their interpersonal relationship skills to set up reciprocal mentoring frameworks (Urlick et al. 2017). In this structure, senior Gen X employees provide long-term institutional knowledge, strategic insights, and commercial guidance to younger team members. In return, Gen Z and Millennial employees help older staff adopt emerging AI platforms, digital workflows, and changing consumer trends. This collaborative approach removes generational barriers, validates the unique strengths of every age group, and turns demographic diversity into a clear competitive advantage.

4. Conclusion: Summary Report

This strategic report demonstrates that emotional intelligence and mindfulness are essential capabilities for navigating the modern, multigenerational corporate landscape. By applying Goleman's domains of self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management, leaders can transform potential workplace friction into high performance, clear communication, and improved well-being (Goleman 1995). Understanding the distinct values and expectations of Generation X, Millennials, and Generation Z allows the organization to build inclusive recruitment, management, and retention frameworks (Costanza et al. 2012). Furthermore, integrating structured mindfulness practices helps reduce implicit demographic biases, encouraging collaborative, objective problem-solving (Salovey and Mayer 1990).

To embed these capabilities ahead of the September 2026 strategic meeting, it is recommended that the Senior Management Team:

1. Roll out targeted emotional intelligence training programs across all leadership levels to build consistent management practices.
2. Formally implement reciprocal, multigenerational mentoring frameworks to improve collaboration and knowledge sharing across departments.

3. Integrate brief, secular mindfulness practices into standard team routines to support resilience and reduce employee burnout.

By implementing these evidence-based strategies, the Senior Management Team will build an inclusive, adaptive, and highly sustainable organization capable of thriving in an increasingly complex commercial environment.

References

- Bar-On, R., 1997. *The Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i): A measure of emotional intelligence*. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.
- Bar-On, R., 2006. The Bar-On model of emotional-social intelligence (ESI). *Psicothema*, 18(1), 13-25.
- Boyatzis, R.E., Goleman, D. and Rhee, K., 2000. Clustering competence in emotional intelligence: Insights from the Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI). *Handbook of Emotional Intelligence*, 343-362.
- Brackett, M.A., Rivers, S.E., Shiffman, S., Lerner, N. and Salovey, P., 2006. Relating emotional abilities to social functioning: A comparison of self-report and performance measures of emotional intelligence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91(4), 780-795.
- Cherniss, C. and Goleman, D. eds., 2001. *The emotionally intelligent workplace: How to select for, measure, and improve emotional intelligence in individuals, groups, and organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Costanza, D.P., Badger, J.M., Fraser, R.L., Severt, J.B. and Gade, P.A., 2012. Generational differences in work-related attitudes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 27(4), 375-394.
- Goleman, D., 1995. *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D., 1998. What makes a leader? *Harvard Business Review*, 76(6), 93-102.
- Mayer, J.D. and Salovey, P., 1997. What is emotional intelligence? In: P. Salovey and D.J. Sluyter, eds. *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational implications*. New York: Basic Books, 3-31.
- Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P. and Caruso, D.R., 2004. Emotional intelligence: Theory, findings, and implications. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15(3), 197-215.
- Salovey, P. and Mayer, J.D., 1990. Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9(3), 185-211.
- Twenge, J.M., 2014. *Generation me: Why today's young Americans are more confident, assertive, entitled—and more miserable than ever before*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Urick, M.J., Hollensbe, E.C., Masterson, S.S. and Lyons, S.T., 2017. Understanding and managing intergenerational conflict: An examination of influences and strategies. *Work, Aging and Retirement*, 3(2), 166-185.
- Van Rossem, A., 2019. Generations as social categories: An exploratory cognitive study of generational identity and stereotypes in a multigenerational workforce. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 40(4), 434-455.