IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 2, October 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

Office Task and Employee Workload Management Systems: A Review of Workload Theory, Task Allocation Algorithms, and Web-Based Monitoring Architectures

Sarthak Anand Joshi[1], Ayush Shirsat[2], Abhinav More[3], Avinash Kohle[4], Deepika Thakre[5]
Students, Department of Computer Engineering[1-4]
Lecturer, Department of Computer Engineering[5]
Guru Gobind Singh Polytechnic, Nashik, Maharashtra, India

Abstract: *Efficient distribution of tasks and balanced control of employee workload are central to office productivity, yet many small and medium offices still depend on verbal instructions, paper registers, spreadsheets, and messaging groups. These practices give managers no reliable view of who is overloaded, which deadlines are at risk, or how work is progressing. The Office Task and Employee Workload Management System addresses this coordination failure by providing a centralized web-based platform in which managers assign tasks, employees update progress, and the system computes workload indicators automatically. This review paper analyzes the theoretical foundations of workload and job demands, task prioritization methods, scheduling and assignment algorithms, and web-based system design practices that underpin such systems. We synthesize eighteen representative publications spanning occupational psychology (job demand–control and job demands–resources models, burnout), workload measurement (NASA-TLX), flow-based and agile methods (Kanban, Scrum, Little's Law), scheduling (Critical Path Method, Earliest Deadline First, the assignment problem), semantic skill matching (Sentence-BERT), role-based access control, REST architecture, and usability evaluation (SUS). Through comparative synthesis, we categorize existing methodologies, evaluate their trade-offs, and identify research gaps concerning quantitative workload balancing, skill-aware task assignment, early overload detection, and lightweight deployment in small offices. Finally, we formulate an integrated architectural framework tailored for office and institutional deployments, offering actionable guidelines for engineering workload-aware task management systems*

Keywords: Task Management, Workload Management, Employee Productivity, Task Allocation, Scheduling, Role-Based Access Control, Kanban, Web Application, Office Automation.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background

In contemporary offices, ranging from government departments and educational institutions to small and medium enterprises, daily operations depend on the timely completion of many parallel tasks such as report preparation, document approvals, client requests, inspections, and maintenance activities [7], [8]. As the volume and diversity of these tasks grow, managers must continually decide who should perform each task, in what order, and by what deadline. Occupational psychology has long established that the amount and structure of work assigned to an individual influence not only output but also stress, engagement, and long-term well-being [1], [2], [3]. Project management and agile literature, in turn, offers structured techniques for planning, prioritizing, and visualizing work [7], [8], [10]. Together, these bodies of knowledge indicate that effective office management requires both a sound task-coordination

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 2, October 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

mechanism and a measurable understanding of employee workload. Web-based information systems provide a practical means of combining the two by centralizing task data, automating calculations, and giving every stakeholder a consistent view of progress [15].

B. Problem Context

Despite this knowledge, many offices still assign work through verbal instructions, paper registers, telephone calls, or informal messaging groups. In such settings there is no single record of who has been assigned what, deadlines are tracked from memory, and managers have little objective evidence of how heavily each employee is loaded. Consequently, some employees accumulate excessive tasks while others remain under-utilized, urgent work is discovered late, and performance reviews rely on impressions rather than data. Excessive and poorly structured workload is associated with reduced well-being and burnout [1], [3], and frequent interruptions from ad hoc requests increase stress and effort [6]. A persistent coordination failure therefore exists: managers cannot systematically see and balance workload, and employees cannot clearly see their priorities and expectations [5], [6].

C. Existing Situation

Presently, task coordination in many offices relies on fragmented mechanisms, including paper files, spreadsheets, e-mail threads, and messaging applications. While these tools enable basic communication, they lack role-based access, automated reminders, workload calculation, and consolidated reporting. Generic to-do applications support personal task lists but offer little managerial oversight, whereas full-featured project management suites are typically designed for software or project teams and may be complex or costly to adopt in a small office. Methodologies such as Scrum and Kanban provide proven discipline, but they describe working practices rather than a complete, ready-to-deploy information system for routine office work [7], [8].

D. Limitations of Existing Approaches

A critical synthesis of the reviewed literature and prevailing office practice reveals four primary limitations:

1) Lack of Centralized Visibility and Traceability: Informal channels scatter task information, making status, history, and accountability difficult to establish [7], [15].

2) Unquantified and Subjective Workload Assessment: Workload is usually judged by impression. Validated instruments such as NASA-TLX quantify perceived workload but depend on self-reports [4], and psychological models describe demands qualitatively [1], [2].

3) Skill-Blind and Static Task Allocation: Assignment is typically made by availability or habit, without systematically weighing current load, skills, and deadlines, although formal assignment and matching methods exist [11], [12], [18].

4) Reactive Monitoring and Weak Early Warning: Overload and deadline risk are noticed only after delays occur, whereas flow and scheduling theory show that bottlenecks and critical tasks can be identified in advance [9], [10], [13].

E. Motivation

Addressing these challenges necessitates moving from informal, memory-based task coordination to a centralized, data-driven management system. By treating each employee as a resource with finite capacity and each task as a unit of demand with a priority, a deadline, and required skills, an office can balance work more fairly and detect problems earlier [4], [9], [11]. Investigating the computational and organizational foundations, specifically workload quantification, prioritization and assignment algorithms, secure role-based access, and usability evaluation, is vital for building a system that managers and employees will actually adopt [5], [16], [17].

F. Proposed Research Direction

This paper investigates the theoretical, algorithmic, and architectural frameworks required to construct a robust Office Task and Employee Workload Management System. We synthesize the literature across four core pillars: workload

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 2, October 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

theory and measurement, task management methodology and flow control, scheduling and assignment algorithms, and secure, usable web architecture. Rather than providing an isolated software specification, this study establishes an evidence-based literature foundation to guide the engineering of the proposed system.

G. Objectives

The primary objectives of this review are: (1) to analyze the theoretical paradigms of workload, job demands, and employee well-being relevant to office task management; (2) to evaluate task management methodologies, prioritization techniques, and flow-control principles such as Kanban, Scrum, and Little's Law; (3) to examine scheduling, assignment, and semantic matching algorithms for allocating tasks to employees; (4) to conduct a structured comparative analysis of the reviewed studies; and (5) to synthesize explicit research gaps and delineate an integrated architectural blueprint for the proposed system.

H. Scope

This survey examines foundational and applied technical literature published between 1955 and 2020, covering workload theory and measurement, task management methodologies, scheduling and assignment algorithms, web-based system architecture, access control, and usability evaluation. The study is oriented toward office environments such as small and medium organizations, government offices, and educational institutions.

I. ORGANIZATION OF THE PAPER

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section II presents a thematic literature review divided into four conceptual subsections, followed by a comparative analysis table and an explicit delineation of identified research gaps. Section III concludes the paper by synthesizing key insights, discussing implementation implications, and outlining future research directions. The IEEE-style reference list follows the conclusion.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review is organized thematically into four investigative dimensions: (A) Theoretical Foundations of Workload, Performance, and Well-Being; (B) Task Management Methodologies and Flow Control; (C) Scheduling, Assignment, and Skill-Matching Algorithms; and (D) System Architecture, Access Control, and Usability. These sections are followed by a structured comparative analysis and an explicit formulation of identified research gaps.

A. Theoretical Foundations of Workload, Performance, and Well-Being

The relationship between workload and employee strain is central to workload management. Karasek [1] proposed the job demand–control model, in which strain is greatest when high job demands coincide with low decision latitude, implying that managing workload concerns both the volume of tasks and the control employees have over them. Bakker and Demerouti [2] extended this view through the Job Demands–Resources model, which holds that demands deplete energy while resources such as support, feedback, and autonomy sustain motivation and engagement. Maslach, Schaufeli, and Leiter [3] reviewed the burnout literature and identified workload as one of the major areas of work life in which a mismatch between person and job contributes to burnout. These studies justify treating workload balance as an organizational design requirement rather than a matter of individual endurance.

For measurement, Hart and Staveland [4] developed the NASA Task Load Index (NASA-TLX), a multidimensional rating procedure with six subscales: mental demand, physical demand, temporal demand, performance, effort, and frustration. Although it originated in human factors research, it is widely used to quantify perceived workload and offers a template for combining several demand dimensions into a single score. Its dependence on self-reporting, however, makes it unsuitable as the only source of continuous monitoring in an office system.

Task-level motivation and interruptions are also relevant. Locke and Latham [5] summarized evidence that specific, challenging goals combined with feedback lead to higher performance than vague goals, supporting the need for explicit deadlines, clear task descriptions, and progress feedback. Mark, Gudith, and Klocke [6] showed that interrupted

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 2, October 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

work tends to be completed faster but at the cost of higher stress, frustration, time pressure, and effort, which suggests that uncontrolled ad hoc assignment carries a hidden cost.

B. Task Management Methodologies and Flow Control

Kanban, described by Anderson [7], visualizes work on a board whose columns represent workflow states and limits work in progress (WIP) so that bottlenecks become visible. Its relevance to office work lies in its simplicity: tasks move from To Do through In Progress to Completed, and overload is exposed when too many items accumulate in one stage. Scrum [8] adds time-boxed iterations, a prioritized backlog, and regular review, which provide a rhythm for planning and feedback but were designed for product-development teams and may carry more ceremony than routine office duties require.

The quantitative basis for WIP control is given by Little's Law [9], which states that in a stable system the average number of items in the system equals the average arrival rate multiplied by the average time an item spends in the system. For an office, this implies that assigning more concurrent tasks to an employee without increasing capacity lengthens completion time, giving a theoretical reason to cap concurrent assignments. For prioritization, the urgent–important matrix popularized by Covey [14] classifies tasks into four quadrants, offering a simple, human-understandable basis for ranking that can be encoded as a priority field combined with a due date.

C. Scheduling, Assignment, and Skill-Matching Algorithms

Scheduling theory supplies formal methods for ordering and assigning work. Kelley and Walker [10] introduced the Critical Path Method (CPM), which models a project as a network of dependent activities and identifies the critical path whose delay delays the whole project; this supports dependency-aware deadlines and early warning for critical tasks. Liu and Layland [13] analyzed priority-driven scheduling for real-time systems and showed that Earliest Deadline First (EDF) can schedule a set of periodic preemptible tasks whenever total utilization does not exceed 100%. Although employees are not processors, the utilization idea transfers naturally to a workload percentage, and deadline-first ordering is a practical default for task queues. Pinedo [12] gives a comprehensive treatment of scheduling models, including resource allocation and assignment formulations, that can be adapted to office settings.

For allocation, the assignment problem seeks the minimum-cost matching of workers to jobs. Kuhn [11] presented the Hungarian method, which solves this problem optimally in polynomial time and can be applied when the cost of an employee–task pair combines current load, skill mismatch, and deadline pressure. Because office tasks are described in free text and employee skills are recorded in varied wording, semantic matching can improve assignment. Reimers and Gurevych [18] proposed Sentence-BERT (SBERT), which produces fixed-size sentence embeddings that can be compared using cosine similarity, dramatically reducing the cost of large-scale semantic comparison relative to cross-encoding with BERT. This makes it possible to match a task description with employee skill profiles even when wording differs (for example, "prepare tender document" and "draft procurement paperwork").

D. System Architecture, Access Control, and Usability

A web-based task management system must expose its functions to multiple client types in a scalable and maintainable manner. Fielding [15] defined the Representational State Transfer (REST) architectural style, which emphasizes stateless interactions, a uniform interface, and resource-oriented design; it underpins most modern web APIs and allows the same back end to serve browsers and future mobile clients. Because offices contain distinct authority levels such as administrator, manager, and employee, access control is essential. Sandhu et al. [16] formalized Role-Based Access Control (RBAC), in which permissions are assigned to roles and users acquire permissions through role membership, simplifying administration and supporting the principle of least privilege. In this context, only managers would assign tasks and view team workload, while employees would see only their own assignments.

Finally, adoption depends on usability. Brooke [17] introduced the System Usability Scale (SUS), a ten-item questionnaire that yields a score from 0 to 100 and is widely used as a quick, low-cost usability measure. SUS is an

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 2, October 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

appropriate evaluation instrument for a small-office prototype and complements functional testing. The comparison of these reviewed studies is systematically summarized in Table I.

TABLE I: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF REVIEWED RESEARCH STUDIES IN TASK MANAGEMENT, WORKLOAD MODELING, AND SYSTEM DESIGN

Ref.	Year	Approach / Technology	Main Contribution	Key Finding	Limitation
[1]	1979	Job demand–control model (Admin. Sci. Q.)	Strain model linking job demands to decision latitude	High demands combined with low control produce the greatest strain	Conceptual and survey-based; offers no task-level allocation mechanism.
[2]	2007	Job Demands–Resources model (J. Managerial Psychol.)	Integrates demands and resources as predictors of burnout and engagement	Demands deplete energy while resources sustain motivation; both must be balanced	Qualitative constructs; not converted into operational workload metrics.
[3]	2001	Burnout research review (Annu. Rev. Psychol.)	Review of burnout, treating workload as one of the main areas of work life	Person–job mismatch, including workload, contributes to burnout	Does not prescribe monitoring or allocation tools.
[4]	1988	NASA-TLX, six weighted subscales	Multidimensional rating procedure for perceived workload	Subscale ratings combine into one workload score	Self-reported; needs user input; originated in human-factors settings.
[5]	2002	Goal-setting theory (Am. Psychol.)	Synthesis of evidence on goals, feedback, and task motivation	Specific, challenging goals with feedback raise performance	Does not address allocating competing goals among staff.
[6]	2008	Field and experimental study (ACM CHI)	Study of the cost of interrupted work	Interrupted work is faster but more stressful and effortful	Observational; no system or tool proposed.
[7]	2010	Kanban boards, WIP limits (book)	Visual workflow management with limits on work in progress	Limiting WIP exposes bottlenecks and improves flow	Team-level view; does not quantify individual capacity.
[8]	2020	Scrum framework (Scrum Guide)	Time-boxed iterations, backlog, defined roles	Regular planning and review improve transparency	Designed for product teams; heavy for routine office work.
[9]	1961	Queueing result, L = lambda x W (Oper. Res.)	Proof linking WIP, arrival rate, and time in system	More concurrent work lengthens completion time at fixed capacity	Assumes a stable, steady-state system.
[10]	1959	Critical Path Method (Eastern Joint Computer Conf.)	Network model of dependent activities	Identifies tasks whose delay delays the whole project	Assumes known durations; limited treatment of staff workload.
[11]	1955	Hungarian method (Naval Res. Logist. Q.)	Optimal minimum-cost assignment of workers to jobs	Solves assignment optimally in polynomial time	Static, one-to-one; ignores dynamic arrivals and multitasking.
[13]	1973	Priority scheduling, EDF (J. ACM)	Analysis of fixed-priority and deadline-driven scheduling	EDF is feasible when total utilization does not exceed 100%	Assumes periodic, preemptible machine tasks.

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 6, Issue 2, October 2026 Impact Factor: 8.2

[15]	2000	REST architectural style (Ph.D. dissertation)	Architectural principles for network-based software	Stateless, uniform interfaces support scalability	Architectural guidance only; no workload logic.
[16]	1996	Role-Based Access Control (IEEE Computer)	Permissions assigned to roles rather than individuals	Simplifies authorization management and least privilege	Does not define task workflow semantics.
[17]	1996	System Usability Scale (book chapter)	Ten-item questionnaire for perceived usability	Quick, low-cost 0 to 100 usability score	Gives overall score, not detailed diagnosis of problems.
[18]	2019	Siamese BERT networks (EMNLP)	Efficient sentence embeddings compared by cosine similarity	Fast semantic matching of short texts	General-purpose; may need tuning to office vocabulary.

E. Identified Research Gaps

Synthesizing the reviewed body of literature reveals four substantial research gaps that the surveyed work leaves unresolved when applied to office task and workload management:

1) What existing research has achieved: The literature has established the psychological basis for managing workload [1]–[3], produced validated measures of perceived workload [4], supplied disciplined task management methods [7], [8], formalized flow, scheduling, and assignment results [9]–[13], and provided mature architectural, access-control, usability, and semantic-matching tools [15]–[18].

2) What remains insufficient: Despite these advances, the reviewed work exhibits four failures of integration:

• Gap 1 (Qualitative Theory versus Operational Workload Metrics): Psychological models [1]–[3] describe demands conceptually, and NASA-TLX [4] relies on self-report. None converts assigned tasks, estimated effort, priority, and available capacity into a continuously computed workload figure for each employee.

• Gap 2 (Task-Centric Scheduling versus Employee-Centric Balancing): CPM, EDF, and Kanban [7], [10], [13] focus on the order and flow of tasks, not on fairness of distribution across people. Employee capacity is rarely a first-class input to the allocation decision.

• Gap 3 (Skill-Blind and Static Allocation): Assignment algorithms [11], [12] and semantic matching [18] exist but are seldom combined with live workload and deadline data in a single, lightweight tool for routine office work.

• Gap 4 (Reactive Monitoring and Adoption Barriers): Methods such as Scrum [8] describe practices rather than offering early overload warnings, automatic reminders, and consolidated reports, and heavyweight tools may be impractical for small offices, which weakens adoption despite the usability evidence in [17].

3) Why that limitation matters: Without quantified workload, managers cannot detect imbalance until delays or complaints appear, and sustained overload is linked to stress and burnout [1]–[3]. Without balanced and skill-aware allocation, capable staff are overburdened while others are idle. Without early warning and traceable records, deadlines are missed, accountability is unclear, and performance appraisal rests on impressions rather than evidence.

4) How the proposed Office Task and Employee Workload Management System addresses these gaps: The proposed system adopts an integrated, four-tier framework: (a) a task and role management tier that records tasks with description, priority, deadline, and status through a REST-style interface [15], with RBAC separating administrator, manager, and employee permissions [16]; (b) a workload quantification tier that computes a Workload Index for each employee in a planning window, informed by the multidimensional view of [4] and the WIP principle of [9]; (c) an allocation and prioritization tier that ranks tasks using an urgent–important classification [14] and deadline-first ordering [13], and suggests assignees by minimizing a cost combining current load, skill similarity [18], and deadline pressure through assignment methods [11]; and (d) a monitoring and feedback tier providing dashboards, overload alerts, reminders, status tracking, and reports, with goal-oriented progress feedback [5] and usability assessed through SUS [17]. The proposed Workload Index is defined as:

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 6, Issue 2, October 2026 Impact Factor: 8.2

$WIi = [\Sigma t (ht \times pt)] / Ci \times 100\%$

where ht is the estimated effort of task t in hours, pt is a priority weight, and Ci is the available capacity of employee i in the window. Index values above 100% would flag overload. This formulation is a design proposal of this study and not a result taken from the cited works.

III. CONCLUSION

This literature review has analyzed the theoretical foundations, algorithmic paradigms, and system architectures required to construct a practical Office Task and Employee Workload Management System. Many offices continue to coordinate work through informal channels that provide no visibility of workload, no objective basis for allocation, and no early warning of overload or missed deadlines. A centralized, role-based web system offers a compelling alternative by making tasks, deadlines, and workload visible to the right people at the right time.

The review synthesized eighteen foundational and recent publications spanning occupational psychology, workload measurement, agile and flow-based methods, scheduling and assignment theory, semantic text matching, access control, web architecture, and usability evaluation. The comparative analysis demonstrated that, while each strand is individually mature, the literature remains fragmented: workload theory is rarely converted into operational metrics, task scheduling seldom accounts for employee capacity, assignment ignores skills and live load, and monitoring is largely reactive.

The proposed system addresses this gap by integrating role-based task management, a quantitative Workload Index, priority- and skill-aware allocation support, and dashboards with alerts and reports into a cohesive, lightweight architecture. By doing so, it aims to improve fairness of work distribution, reduce missed deadlines, strengthen accountability, and support employee well-being.

Future research directions should focus on three promising avenues: (1) Data-Driven Effort Estimation: using historical completion times to learn more accurate task effort and capacity estimates; (2) Semantic Task-Skill Matching: adopting SBERT-style embeddings [18] to recommend assignees from free-text task descriptions and employee skill profiles; and (3) Predictive Overload and Well-Being Analytics: combining system logs with periodic self-reported workload instruments such as NASA-TLX [4] to anticipate overload before it affects performance and well-being.

REFERENCES

[1] R. A. Karasek, “Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign,” Admin. Sci. Quart., vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 285–308, 1979, doi: 10.2307/2392498.

[2] A. B. Bakker and E. Demerouti, “The job demands-resources model: State of the art,” J. Managerial Psychol., vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 309–328, 2007, doi: 10.1108/02683940710733115.

[3] C. Maslach, W. B. Schaufeli, and M. P. Leiter, “Job burnout,” Annu. Rev. Psychol., vol. 52, pp. 397–422, 2001, doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397.

[4] S. G. Hart and L. E. Staveland, “Development of NASA-TLX (Task Load Index): Results of empirical and theoretical research,” in Human Mental Workload, P. A. Hancock and N. Meshkati, Eds. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: North-Holland, 1988, pp. 139–183, doi: 10.1016/S0166-4115(08)62386-9.

[5] E. A. Locke and G. P. Latham, “Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey,” Amer. Psychologist, vol. 57, no. 9, pp. 705–717, 2002, doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.57.9.705.

[6] G. Mark, D. Gudith, and U. Klocke, “The cost of interrupted work: More speed and stress,” in Proc. SIGCHI Conf. Human Factors Comput. Syst. (CHI ’08), Florence, Italy, 2008, pp. 107–110, doi: 10.1145/1357054.1357072.

[7] D. J. Anderson, Kanban: Successful Evolutionary Change for Your Technology Business. Sequim, WA, USA: Blue Hole Press, 2010.

[8] K. Schwaber and J. Sutherland, The Scrum Guide: The Definitive Guide to Scrum: The Rules of the Game, 2020. [Online]. Available: https://scrumguides.org

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 2, October 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

[9] J. D. C. Little, "A proof for the queuing formula: L = λW," Oper. Res., vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 383–387, 1961, doi: 10.1287/opre.9.3.383.
[10] J. E. Kelley Jr. and M. R. Walker, "Critical-path planning and scheduling," in Proc. Eastern Joint Comput. Conf., Boston, MA, USA, 1959, pp. 160–173.
[11] H. W. Kuhn, "The Hungarian method for the assignment problem," Naval Res. Logist. Quart., vol. 2, no. 1–2, pp. 83–97, 1955, doi: 10.1002/nav.3800020109.
[12] M. L. Pinedo, Scheduling: Theory, Algorithms, and Systems, 5th ed. New York, NY, USA: Springer, 2016.
[13] C. L. Liu and J. W. Layland, "Scheduling algorithms for multiprogramming in a hard-real-time environment," J. ACM, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 46–61, 1973, doi: 10.1145/321738.321743.
[14] S. R. Covey, The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People. New York, NY, USA: Free Press, 1989.
[15] R. T. Fielding, "Architectural styles and the design of network-based software architectures," Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. Inf. Comput. Sci., Univ. California, Irvine, CA, USA, 2000.
[16] R. S. Sandhu, E. J. Coyne, H. L. Feinstein, and C. E. Youman, "Role-based access control models," Computer, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 38–47, Feb. 1996, doi: 10.1109/2.485845.
[17] J. Brooke, "SUS: A quick and dirty usability scale," in Usability Evaluation in Industry, P. W. Jordan, B. Thomas, B. A. Weerdmeester, and I.
L. McClelland, Eds. London, U.K.: Taylor & Francis, 1996, pp. 189–194.
[18] N. Reimers and I. Gurevych, "Sentence-BERT: Sentence embeddings using Siamese BERT-networks," in Proc. 2019 Conf. Empirical Methods Natural Lang. Process. 9th Int. Joint Conf. Natural Lang. Process. (EMNLP-IJCNLP), Hong Kong, China, 2019, pp. 3982–3992, doi: 10.18653/v1/D19-1410.