

The Skill-Task Matching Model: Mechanism, Model Form, and Implications

By DA XIE AND WEIGUO YANG*

We distinguish between the projected and actual profit of a firm. We propose that, beyond maximizing profit, a firm's goal also encompasses minimizing the gap between projected and actual profit. Firms strive to enhance their capability to transform projects into reality through a process of trial and error, evident as a cyclical iterative optimization process. To characterize this iterative mechanism, we developed the Skill-Task Matching Model, extending the task approach in both multidimensional and iterative manners. We vectorized jobs and labor into task and skill vector spaces, respectively, while treating production techniques as a skill-task matching matrix and business strategy as a task value vector. The process of stabilizing production techniques and optimizing business strategies corresponds to the recalibration of parameters within the skill-task alignment matrix and the task value vector in our model. We constructed a feed-forward neural network algorithm to implement this model and demonstrate how it can augment operational efficiency.

Keywords: the Skill-Task Matching Model, profit maximization, iteration mechanism, task approach, AI revolution

* Xie: the School of labor and Human Resources, Renmin University of China, No.59 Zhongguancundajie, Haidian District,


Beijing, China, 100086 (xd379349576@ruc.edu.cn). Yang (corresponding author): the School of labor and Human Resources,

Renmin University of China (weiguoyang@ruc.edu.cn). The authors declare that they have no relevant or material financial interests relating to the research described in this paper.

1. Introduction And Related Literature

For an extended period, the profit maximization postulate has been foundational to economic analyses. Through evaluating the marginal returns of specific input variables, predominantly labor and capital, firms delineate optimal input-output configurations for maximal profit. Cobb and Douglas (1928) introduced the Cobb-Douglas production function, modeling this mechanism from empirical input-output data derived from manufacturing firms. The econometric elegance and general applicability of Cobb-Douglas function have made it become a staple in Econ-101 textbook.


However, the Cobb-Douglas production function has drawbacks. Primarily, it accentuates the correlation between inputs and outputs, rendering a firm's operation process as a black box, yet falls short of offering a comprehensive understanding of the intricate decision process. Additionally, its genesis in the context of the Second Industrial Revolution, renders it somewhat anachronistic given the subsequent digital technology revolution. The advent of AI algorithms, including Supportive Vector Machine, Convolutional Neural Networks, and Large Language Models, has markedly enhanced the computational and analytical capacities of Computer. While economists have lauded these AI algorithms as formidable data processing instruments, underscoring the transformative potential of AI, the Cobb-Douglas function, rooted in an earlier industrial milieu, exhibits incongruence with these contemporary algorithmic frameworks.



Firm Goal: Maximizing Profit

FIGURE 1: FIRM'S DECISION-MAKING BASED ON MARGINAL RETURNS

In response to these limitations, we propose a new framework for elucidating firms' producing processes: the Iterative Mechanism. **We suggest that firms do not engage in production decisions haphazardly, akin to a lottery game; nor do they operate the firm in a singular producing temporal interval, ceasing thereafter.** Upon discerning a blank in market demand, entrepreneurs initially delineate a projected profit target. Subsequently, they disaggregate the production into distinct tasks and allocate the requisite resources to fulfill these tasks and attain the aforementioned objective continuously.



Firm Goal 1: Maximizing Profit

Firm Goal 2: Minimizing the gap between projected profit (max profit) and actual profit

FIGURE 2: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE MARGINAL RETURNS AND ITERATION MECHANISMS

Comparing with Figure 1, Figure 2 introduces the Iterative Mechanism to reveal the black box of the decision process. Both maximizing profit and minimizing the gap projected-actual profit are pivotal in a firm's longitudinal aspirations. Conventionally,

the profit forecasted in a given iteration corresponds to the zenith of profitability as determined by calculating the marginal cost and revenue.

Notwithstanding an entrepreneur's capacity to ascertain the optimal factor inputs aligned with desired outputs by calculating marginal returns, the ability to flawlessly transform these optimal inputs into outputs is not innate. Moreover, fluctuations in technology, market, and political environments necessitate a swift response in production planning. Consequently, a gap often exists between projected and realized production outcomes. Entrepreneurs, therefore, continuously recalibrate production parameters through trial and error to minimize this gap incrementally. This ongoing refinement of production techniques and business strategies, honed through experiential adjustments, is defined as the Iterative Mechanism.¹

The iteration of a firm's decision process is illustrated in Figure 3.




FIGURE 3: ITERATION OF THE PRODUCING PROCESS

Throughout the firms' operational lifespan, entrepreneurs continually recalibrate techniques and strategic approaches to enhance the abilities of executing the

¹ A quintessential illustration is SpaceX's Falcon 9 Heavy rocket. Elon Musk find a market gap of reusable rockets. Then he allocated resources, engaged in iterative experimentation and refined production techniques until the actual output aligned with projections.

production blueprint. As temporal progression ensues, the entrepreneurs garner experiential knowledge via iterative adjustments, incrementally refining and solidifying its production techniques and operational strategies until it achieves operational maturity.

We develop the Skill-Task Matching Model to illustrate the iteration mechanism, by extending the task approach (Autor et al., 2003; Autor and Handel, 2013; Lise and Postel-Vinay, 2020) into a multidimensional and iterated form. Autor et al. (2003) proposed a task approach that analyzed the impact of new technology on the labor market from a task perspective. The task approach innovatively considers capital as a substitute for labors engaged in routine tasks and analyzes the relationships between the employment and wage levels of employees engaged in different tasks. It is the first model that deviated from the Cobb-Douglas production function to illustrate how the producing process was done. Economists have extended the production function in different forms based on the task approach to explain the impact of technological change on the labor market (Autor et al., 2006; Spitz-Oener, 2006; Acemoglu and Autor, 2011; Autor and Dorn, 2013; Autor and Handel, 2013; Goos et al., 2014; Acemoglu and Restrepo, 2017; Deming, 2017; Frey and Osborne, 2017; Lise and Postel-Vinay, 2020; Acemoglu et al., 2022).

Our model is most related to the studies of Autor and Handel (2013) and Lise and Postel-Vinay (2020). As shown in Table 1:

Table 1: The extension of task approach related to the Skill-Task Matching Model

Production Function	Description	Author	Title	Year
$Y = AK^\alpha L^{1-\alpha}$	Y - output; A - technology; K - capital; L - labor; α - output elasticity of capital and labor.	Cobb, C.W. & Douglas, P.	A Theory of Production	1928

$Y = (L_R + C)^{1-\beta} L_N^\beta$	<p>Y - output; y_j - output of task j; C - computer capital; L_R, r_j - labor input of routine task; L_N, n_j - labor input of non-routine task.</p>	<p>Autor, D.H., Levy, F. & Murnane, R.J.</p>	<p>The Skill Content of Recent Technological Change: An Empirical Exploration</p>	<p>2003</p>
$Y_{ij} = e^{\alpha_j + \sum_K \lambda_{jk} \phi_{ik} + \mu_i}$	<p>α_j - threshold of position j; λ_{jk} - task k in position j; ϕ_{jk} - endowment that labor i possesses for task k.</p>	<p>Autor, D.H. & Handel, M.J.</p>	<p>Putting Tasks to the Test: Human Capital, Job Tasks, and Wages</p>	<p>2013</p>
$f(x, y) = x_T \times [\alpha_T + \sum_{k=C,M,I} (\alpha_k y_k - \kappa_k^u \min\{x_k - y_k, 0\}^2 + \alpha_{kk} x_k y_k)]$	<p>\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} - vectors of labor skills supply and position skills demand; T, C, M, I - generic, cognitive, manual, and interpersonal skills; α_k - production efficiency of task k; κ_k^u - output loss when the labor's skill level and the position's skill demand do not match.</p>	<p>Lise, J & Postel-Vinay, F.</p>	<p>Multidimensional Skills, Sorting, and Human Capital Accumulation</p>	<p>2020</p>

The first column of Table 1 delineates the various forms of the production function. The forms in the first two rows and the last two rows of this column are distinctly different. The first two rows are predicated on the Cobb-Douglas function, while the latter two models have undergone transformation into different forms. In these scenarios, labor and capital are substituted by skills and tasks, reflecting a finer granularity. Our study follows this formation, and we prove that matching in skill and task level is more efficiency.

The structure of this paper is delineated as follows: The second section expounds upon the definition and structure of the Skill-Task Matching Model. The third section illustrates the model by the form of a feedforward neural network

algorithm. The fourth section proves that how the model improves the firms' operation efficiency. The last section is conclusion.

2. The Skill-Task Matching Model

2.1. Definition

Definitions 1 and 2 are based on those given by Acemoglu and Autor (2011, pp.19).

- Definition 1: A task is the smallest unit in the process of production activity. For any task y_j , $y_j \in Y$, \mathbf{y}_j is a j-dimensional row vector, and Y is the vector space of all tasks.

By definition, tasks are inseparable during the production process. This means that each task is completely complementary, and the elasticity of substitution is 0.²

- Definition 2: A skill is the endowment of the ability to perform tasks. For any skill x_i , $x_i \in X$, \mathbf{x}_i is an i-dimensional row vector, and X is the vector space of all skills.

A consensus within the economists posits that work can be conceptualized as an aggregate of tasks, and labor analogously as a composite of skills (Wong and Campion, 1991; Autor et al., 2006; Acemoglu and Autor, 2011; Marcolin et al., 2016; Ranganathan, 2023).

Contrary to traditional perspectives on skill, the conception of "skill" as outlined in Definition 2 is more aligned with the task than with the human kind. In this framework, when an organization hires personnel for a particular task, "skill" becomes synonymous with human capital, with remuneration reflecting the individual's contribution in terms of human capital. In contrast, when computational

² A task is the smallest process unit that transforms inputs into outputs or intermediate outputs. Therefore, if there is a substitution relationship between the two kinds of tasks, it means that these two kinds of tasks have room to be separated and are not the smallest units of production.

systems can perform the same task and yield revenue, a corresponding return on the computer capital investment arises.³ When skill x_i is provided by the laborer, it is denoted x_{il} , and when it is provided by the machine, it is denoted x_{ik} .

- Definition 3: Defining the mapping relationship $f : Y \rightarrow X$, y_j as the image of x_i , $y_j = f(x_i)$. f is the relationship between the skills required to complete a task.

In Definition 3, the mapping f represents the matching relationship between the skills and tasks. By definition, f is a surjection, which means that every element in set Y has a corresponding pre-image in set X .⁴

Define:

$$\text{matrix } A = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & \dots & a_{1j} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots \\ a_{i1} & \dots & a_{ij} \end{bmatrix}, \text{ where}$$

$$x_i \cdot A = [\sum_{u=1}^i x_u a_{u1}, \sum_{u=1}^i x_u a_{u2}, \dots, \sum_{u=1}^i x_u a_{uj}] = [1, 1, \dots, 1], 0 \leq a_{ij}, a_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^+.$$

Matrix A is a linear transformation from skill to task, represents the mapping relationship f . That is, the demand for different skills to complete a unit of task vector. Matrix A is an invertible $i \times j$ matrix.

Definitions 1, 2, and 3 dissect the production processes. Any product's production process can be broken down into a variable number of independent tasks. These tasks aren't inherently automated; they necessitate diverse types and magnitudes of skills for completion. These requisite skills can be sourced from employees, computers, or other machinery. It's noteworthy that a single task might

³ With the development of technologies, machines can accomplish an increasing number of tasks. Knowledge-based areas like finance, accounting, and translation, and creative tasks such as writing and painting, which were traditionally considered to be exclusively human activities, can now be completed by AI machines (Huang and Rust, 2018). Subsequently, the boundary between human and machine capabilities has become increasingly blurred, and machines also possess "human capita".

⁴ According to Definition 1, a task is the smallest unit of production process. Therefore, it must be a real activity occurring in reality and have practical meaning in business production. Tasks that are currently impossible or still in laboratory conditions like "time traveling" or "human organ cloning" are not within the scope of our research.

demand multiple skills, and conversely, a particular skill can be relevant to several tasks. The matrix delineates the degree of correlation between the skills and the tasks

Technically, the matching matrix A can be seen as the transformation path of two given vectors in vector spaces X and Y . \mathbf{y}_j can be seen as the vectorization form of occupation and \mathbf{x}_i is the vectorization form of employees. By applying the linear transformation A_{ij} to \mathbf{x}_i , vector \mathbf{x}_i is transformed into vector \mathbf{y}_j . Conceptualizing production as a combination of skills and tasks in the form of vectors and matrices helps formalize the expression of the production process.

2.2. Model structure

Given these definitions, we discuss the form of the Skill-Task Matching Model that illustrates a firm's decision-making process.

Supposing firm η produces product P in time period t by the expected quantity of Q^{tE} . Let $\mathbf{y}_j^{t\eta} = [y_1^{t\eta}, y_2^{t\eta}, \dots, y_j^{t\eta}]$ represent the task vector, which is decomposed from the work activities for producing Q^{tE} . When the firm considers that a certain

task v is not essential, $y_v^{t\eta} = 0$. Matrix $A_{ij}^{t\eta} = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11}^{t\eta} & \dots & a_{1j}^{t\eta} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots \\ a_{i1}^{t\eta} & \dots & a_{ij}^{t\eta} \end{bmatrix}$ represents the

mapping relationship between skills and tasks adopted by firm η in time period t . Different firms, even those producing the same product in the same quantity, have different production techniques. These differences manifest in the form of varying task quantity and structure and skill-task matching levels among firms in different time periods. Let $\mathbf{x}_i^{t\eta} = [x_1^{t\eta}, x_2^{t\eta}, \dots, x_i^{t\eta}]$ represent the input skills of firm η in

period t . If skill u is not in use, $x_u^{t\eta} = 0$. Then, the firm's actual output is $Q^t = x_i^{t\eta} \cdot$

$A_{ij}^{t\eta}$.⁵

Assumption1 :The expected and actual quantities of the production are usually not equal; that is, $y_j^{t\eta} \neq x_i^{t\eta} \cdot A_{ij}^{t\eta}$.

Theoretically, in time period t , there is an ideal matching matrix $A_{ij}^{t*\eta}$ that makes $y_j^{t\eta} = x_i^{t\eta} \cdot A_{ij}^{t*\eta}$. However, in reality, a firm has no power to know exactly how well each skill and task matches. What makes it more complicated is that the task vector $y_j^{t\eta}$ changes in each time period because of the effects of exogenous factors like weather, politics, or market fluctuations. Therefore, the firm must constantly recalibrates skill-task matching parameters that reflect the effect of environment on production techniques.

Hiring laborers or purchasing machines to acquire skills incur different costs. Define $x_{ik}^{t\eta}$ represent the skills provided by machines and $x_{il}^{t\eta}$ represent the skills provided by laborers. The cost of fixed investment can be expressed as a function of the $x_{ik}^{t\eta}$, denoted as $F(x_{ik}^{t\eta})$. In period t , the operating cost is the sum of the machine cost d_i^t and the labor cost w_i^t , the interest rate is r , and the depreciation rate is δ , r and δ are exogenous factors. The cost function of product P produced by firm η in period t is $C^{t\eta} = d_i^t x_{ik}^{t\eta} + w_i^t x_{il}^{t\eta} + \frac{F(x_{ik}^{t\eta})}{(1+r)^\delta}$.

Suppose that firm η produces only one product and the average price in period t is p^t . Let $\lambda_j^{t\eta}$ represents the value weights assigned by the firm η to different tasks

⁵ It is necessary to distinguish between the concepts of “variable has a value of 0” and “variable is not existing”. The fact that a firm does not require a certain task or does not adopt a certain skill in the production process does not mean that the task or skill does not exist. With the changing exogenous environment, a task or a skill that currently has a value of 0 may potentially become positive in value.

in period t , $\lambda_j^{t\eta} = [\lambda_1^{t\eta}, \lambda_2^{t\eta}, \dots, \lambda_j^{t\eta}]$, $\lambda_j^{t\eta} \in R$.⁶ That is, $p^t \cdot Q^{tE} = \lambda_j^{t\eta} \cdot y_j^{t\eta}$, and $p^t \cdot Q^t = \lambda_j^{t\eta} \cdot (x_i^{t\eta} \cdot A_{ij}^{t\eta})$.

Assumption 2: Supposing that tasks $y_j^{t\eta}$, skills $x_i^{t\eta}$, and total cost $C^{t\eta}$ corresponding to the expected output Q^{tE} are decided at the beginning of the period, whereas the actual output $Q^t = x_i^{t\eta} \cdot A_{ij}^{t\eta}$ can only be seen at the end of period t .

The expected profit π^{tE} from product P by firm η in period t is: $\pi^{tE} = p^t \cdot Q^{tE} - C^{t\eta}$. The actual profit is: $\pi^t = p^t \cdot Q^t - C^{t\eta}$, and the gap between expected profit and real profit is: $\pi^{tE} - \pi^t = p^t \cdot (Q^{tE} - Q^t)$.

Then, we can decompose the gap into tasks:

$$R_j^{t\eta} = [r_1^{t\eta}, r_2^{t\eta}, \dots, r_j^{t\eta}] = \pi_j^{tE} - \pi_j^t = \lambda_j^{t\eta} (y_j^{t\eta} - x_i^{t\eta} \cdot A_{ij}^{t\eta}) \quad (1)$$

Equation (1) illustrates the gap between expected and actual profits at the task level, where $r_j^{t\eta} = y_j^{t\eta} - \sum_{u=1}^i x_u^{t\eta} a_{uj}^{t\eta}$ represents the gap between expected profit and real profit brought by task j in period t . If $r_j^{t\eta} > 0$ indicates that the real profits are lower than expected, and if $r_j^{t\eta} < 0$ means that the real profits are higher than expected. In either case, the firm sets $t = t + 1$, recalibrates the parameters, and continues its production process.

Assumption 3: Firms improve the production techniques and business strategies by random experiment.

That is, when $r_j^{t\eta} \neq 0$, the firm will set a trial to try to have better execution.

The trial leads to a trim of $A_{ij}^{t\eta}$ and $\lambda_j^{t\eta}$. Suppose $\mathbf{a}_{j,\varepsilon}^{t\eta} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_{\mathbf{a}_j})$ and

⁶ Different firms have different business strategies such as operating policies, advertising styles and company cultures. These differences were illustrated as different $\lambda_j^{t\eta}$.

$\lambda_{j,\varepsilon}^{t\eta} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_{\lambda_j})$ represent the distribution of experiment result, $A_{ij,\varepsilon}^{t\eta} = (\mathbf{a}_{\cdot 1,\varepsilon}^{t\eta}, \mathbf{a}_{\cdot 2,\varepsilon}^{t\eta}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{\cdot j,\varepsilon}^{t\eta})$.

Statement 1: If $R_j^{t\eta} \neq \mathbf{0}$, then $\mathbf{a}_{\cdot j}^{t+1,\eta} = \mathbf{a}_{\cdot j}^{t\eta} + \mathbf{a}_{\cdot j,\varepsilon}^{t\eta}$, $\lambda_j^{t+1,\eta} = \lambda_j^{t\eta} + \lambda_{j,\varepsilon}^{t\eta}$, firms would assign $A_{ij}^{t+1,\eta}$ to $A_{ij}^{t,\eta}$, assign $\lambda_j^{t+1,\eta}$ to $\lambda_j^{t,\eta}$, $t = t + 1$, where $A_{ij}^{t+1,\eta} = A_{ij}^{t\eta} + A_{ij,\varepsilon}^{t\eta} = (\mathbf{a}_{\cdot 1}^{t+1,\eta}, \mathbf{a}_{\cdot 2}^{t+1,\eta}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{\cdot j}^{t+1,\eta})$.

Statement 1 is the core of iteration mechanism. It could be shown as a flow chart in Figure 4:




FIGURE 4: FLOW CHART OF ITERATION

Technically, entrepreneurs will set an initial values for a matching matrix and a value vector, and incorporating anticipated output-related task vectors and the proposed skill vectors as inputs when $t = 0$. As long as there is a gap between the expected and actual profit, entrepreneurs will locate the task and recalibrate the parameters by random experiment. The iteration process will keep going on until mastering the production techniques and business strategies associated with that task. At this juncture, the production parameters for that task are rendered as fixed.

3. Setting AI algorithms of the process of recalibrating parameters

Modern algorithms offer insights into the cognitive processes of the human brain. To make the Iterative Mechanism feasible in practice and to explore a way for applying algorithmic integration into economic analyze, we build a feedforward neural network algorithm to simulate the Statement 1. The recalibrating of production parameters can be divided into two steps: first, recalibrating $A_{ij}^{t\eta}$ to $A_{ij}^{t^*\eta}$ to the point where the number of skills input converges to the number of tasks output; second, recalibrating $\lambda_j^{t\eta}$ to $\lambda_j^{t^*\eta}$ to the point where the value of task output is close to actual income. Figure 5 illustrates the first step of this feedforward neural network:




FIGURE 5: USING FEEDFORWARD NEURAL NETWORK TO OBTAIN $A_{ij}^{t\eta}$

Suppose that the bias term is zero and the activation function is 1. The training set is $S_A = \{(x_i^{1\eta}, y_j^{1\eta}), (x_i^{2\eta}, y_j^{2\eta}), \dots, (x_i^{t\eta}, y_j^{t\eta})\}$. For the t-th training sample, the inputs are $x_i^{t\eta}$ and $y_j^{t\eta}$. The neural network output is $\hat{y}_j^{t\eta} = (\hat{y}_1^{t\eta}, \hat{y}_2^{t\eta}, \dots, \hat{y}_j^{t\eta})$, where $\hat{y}_j^{t\eta} = \sum_{k=1}^i x_k^{t\eta} a_{kj}^{t\eta}$. The loss function is defined as $E_A^{t\eta} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s=1}^j (\hat{y}_s^{t\eta} - y_s^{t\eta})^2$.

The learning rate is $\theta_A, \theta_A \in (0,1)$.⁷ Then, the updated estimation formula for the parameters $a_{ij}^{t\eta}$ is $a_{ij}^{t\eta} \leftarrow a_{ij}^{t\eta} + \Delta a_{ij}^{t\eta}$, where:

$$\Delta a_{ij}^{t\eta} = \theta_A \cdot \frac{\partial E_A^{t\eta}}{\partial a_{ij}^{t\eta}} = \theta_A \cdot \frac{\partial E_A^{t\eta}}{\partial \hat{y}_j^{t\eta}} \cdot \frac{\partial \hat{y}_j^{t\eta}}{\partial a_{ij}^{t\eta}} = \theta_A \cdot (\hat{y}_j^{t\eta} - y_j^{t\eta}) \cdot x_i^{t\eta} \quad (2)$$

The content of the algorithms is:

Import: training set $S_A = \{(x_i^{v\eta}, y_j^{v\eta})\}_{v=1}^t$;

Given learning rate θ_A .

Process:

1. Initializing the numbers in $A_{ij}^{v\eta}$
2. Repeat:
3. For all $(x_i^{v\eta}, y_j^{v\eta}) \in S_A$, do
4. Calculating the output $\hat{y}_j^{v\eta}$ of the current sample
5. Refreshing the weighting matrix $A_{ij}^{v\eta}$ by equation (2)
6. End for
7. Reaching the stop condition

The second step is illustrated in Figure 6:




FIGURE 6: USING FEEDFORWARD NEURAL NETWORK TO OBTAIN $\lambda_j^{t\eta}$

⁷ The learning rate represents how "fuzzy" the iteration process is, the bigger, the fuzzier.

AI Algorithms for acquiring $\lambda_j^{t^*\eta}$ is easier than for $A_{ij}^{t^*\eta}$. The assumptions and import sets remain unchanged. Define $I^{t\eta}$ represents the income for the t-th period for the t-th training sample $(\mathbf{y}_j^{t\eta}, I^{t\eta})$, the input is $\mathbf{y}_j^{t\eta}$ and $I^{t\eta}$. The neural network output is $\hat{I}^{t\eta} = \sum_{u=1}^j y_u^{t\eta} \lambda_u^{t\eta}$. The loss function is defined as $E_\lambda^{t\eta} = \frac{1}{2}(\hat{I}^{t\eta} - I^{t\eta})^2$. Learning rate is $\theta_\lambda, \theta_\lambda \in (0,1)$. The updated estimation formula for the parameters $\lambda_j^{t\eta}$ is $\lambda_j^{t\eta} \leftarrow \lambda_j^{t\eta} + \Delta\lambda_j^{t\eta}$, where:

$$\Delta\lambda_j^{t\eta} = \theta_\lambda \cdot \frac{\partial E_\lambda^{t\eta}}{\partial \lambda_j^{t\eta}} = \theta_\lambda \cdot \frac{\partial E_\lambda^{t\eta}}{\partial \hat{I}^{t\eta}} \cdot \frac{\partial \hat{I}^{t\eta}}{\partial \lambda_j^{t\eta}} = \theta_\lambda \cdot y_j^{t\eta} \quad (3)$$

The content of algorithms is:

Import: training set $S_\lambda = \left\{ \mathbf{y}_j^{t\eta}, I^{t\eta} \right\}_{v=1}^t$;

Given learning rate θ_λ .

Process:

1. Initializing the numbers in $\lambda_j^{t\eta}$
2. Repeat:
3. For all $(\mathbf{y}_j^{t\eta}, I^{t\eta}) \in S_\lambda$, do
4. Calculating the output $\hat{I}^{t\eta}$ of the current sample
5. Refreshing the weighting vector $\lambda_j^{t\eta}$ by equation (3)
6. End for
7. Reaching the stop condition

These two steps show how to apply neural network algorithms on acquiring optimal production parameters. The outputs, $A_{ij}^{t^*\eta}$ and $\lambda_j^{t^*\eta}$, could be used to calculate the expected profits and actual profits of each task. Guiding by the Skill-Task Matching Model, we reveal the decision-making logic of producing black box, and explore a method to apply AI to economic analyses.

4. How the model improve the operation efficiency

Historically, technological limitations impeded the granular decomposition of work into distinct tasks (Lazear, 1995). Given the situation, the calibration of parameters to realize anticipated profits was predominantly contingent upon the matching level of occupation and employee. In the wake of the AI revolution, emergent recognition and computational tools have empowered firms to dissect work at an intricate task level, improve the operating efficiency by matching skills and tasks.

4.1 Improving matching efficiency

Proposition 1. Applying the Skii-Task Matching Model could enhance the firm's matching efficiency.

Proof: Denoting the composition of tasks within the occupation Q is $\mathbf{y}_Q^{t\eta} = [y_1^{t\eta}, y_2^{t\eta}, \dots, y_q^{t\eta}]$, the skill structure of the employee L is $\mathbf{L}_i^t = [x_1^{tl}, x_2^{tl}, \dots, x_i^{tl}]$, and the Skill - Task matching matrix established by the firm is $\mathbf{A}_{iQ}^{t\eta}$:

$$\mathbf{A}_{iQ}^{t\eta} = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11}^{t\eta} & \dots & a_{1q}^{t\eta} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots \\ a_{i1}^{t\eta} & \dots & a_{iq}^{t\eta} \end{bmatrix}$$

Assuming the occupation output is P_Q , the task value weight vector is $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_Q^{t\eta} = [\lambda_1^{t\eta}, \lambda_2^{t\eta}, \dots, \lambda_q^{t\eta}]$. The skill levels and workforce structure are regarded as constant during one time interval.⁸ Subsequently, the level of matching between workers and occupation is determined as $\mathbf{R}_Q^{lQ} = [r_1^{lQ}, r_2^{lQ}, \dots, r_q^{lQ}] =$

$$\mathbf{y}_Q^{t\eta} - \mathbf{L}_i^t \cdot \mathbf{A}_{iQ}^{t\eta} = [y_1^{t\eta} - \sum_{u=1}^i x_u^{tl} a_{u1}^{t\eta}, y_2^{t\eta} - \sum_{u=1}^i x_u^{tl} a_{u2}^{t\eta}, \dots, y_q^{t\eta} - \sum_{u=1}^i x_u^{tl} a_{uq}^{t\eta}].$$

Assuming that $\mathbf{r}_Q^{lQ} = \max[0, \mathbf{y}_Q^{t\eta} - \sum_{u=1}^i x_u^{tl} a_{uq}^{t\eta}]$, which means when workers' skill

⁸ In other words, the accumulation of human capital acquired by workers through learning on the job is treated as a discrete function of time, with t as the smallest time interval.

levels surpass the requisites of their tasks, the task output cannot be further enhanced.

Case 1. All The employees' skills meet every task's requirement

In this scenario, $R_Q^{lQ} \geq \mathbf{0}$, implies that the employee could execute all tasks without any decrease in output, leading to the realization of the maximum output, P_Q . There's no difference between matching by occupations and tasks. However, the competencies of laborers in intricate undertakings remain underutilized, leading to overeducation and the squandering of human resources.

Case 2. The employee's skills meet only part of tasks' requirements

In more common cases, employees are specialize in specific skills pertinent to particular occupation functions. It means that there are misalignments between task structures and the employees' skills (Autor and Handel, 2013). If employee L's skills do not meet the prerequisites of task u , $r_u^{lQ} < 0$, the actual output of the occupation is $\sum_{v=1}^q (\sum_{u=1}^i x_u^{tl} a_{uv}^{t\eta} \cdot \lambda_v^{t\eta})$.⁹ Assuming L's payments correlates directly with the tangible output. Before AI revolution, the allocation of workforce into production is based on occupation and employee, the objective function of firm η is:

$$\max \sum_{v=1}^q (\sum_{u=1}^i x_u^{tl} a_{uv}^{t\eta} \cdot \lambda_v^{t\eta})$$

Nowadays, firms are capable of matching employee's skills and tasks in smaller granularity, the objective function firm η is:

$$q \cdot [\max(x_u^{tl} a_{uv}^{t\eta} \cdot \lambda_v^{t\eta})]$$

Obviously:

$$q \cdot [\max(x_u^{tl} a_{uv}^{t\eta} \cdot \lambda_v^{t\eta})] \geq \max \sum_{v=1}^q (\sum_{u=1}^i x_u^{tl} a_{uv}^{t\eta} \cdot \lambda_v^{t\eta}) \quad (4)$$

⁹ $\sum_{u=1}^i x_u^{tl} a_{uv}^{t\eta}$ denotes the actual output of task v , $\lambda_v^{t\eta}$ denotes the value of task v , $\sum_{v=1}^q (\sum_{u=1}^i x_u^{tl} a_{uv}^{t\eta} \cdot \lambda_v^{t\eta})$ denotes the actual output value of all tasks in occupation Q .

Given a set of variables, the summation of their individual maxima is always greater than or equal to the maximal of sum total. As evidenced by equation (4), by applying the Skill-Task Matching Model, a firm could enhance the matching efficiency.

4.2 Improving iterating efficiency

From producing standpoint, shortening the iteration cycle aids in adapting environmental fluctuation more swiftly. The duration of an iteration cycle is contingent on the time required to complete occupations and the firm's parallel management capabilities.

Proposition 3. Applying the Skill-Task Matching Model could enhance the iteration efficiency.

Proof: Suppose that the number of the position Q in the enterprise in period t is $D_Q^{t\eta}$, task vector of Q is $\mathbf{y}_Q^{t\eta} = [y_{Q1}^{t\eta}, y_{Q2}^{t\eta}, \dots, y_{Qq}^{t\eta}]$, Suppose that the time required to complete $y_{Qq}^{t\eta}$ is $w_{Qq}^{t\eta}$, $w_{Qq}^{t\eta} \in \mathbb{R}^+$, then the time required to complete the position Q is given by:

$$w_Q^{t\eta} \in (\max(w_{Q1}^{t\eta} \cdot y_{Q1}^{t\eta}, w_{Q2}^{t\eta} \cdot y_{Q2}^{t\eta}, \dots, w_{Qq}^{t\eta} \cdot y_{Qq}^{t\eta}), \sum_{m=1}^q w_{Qm}^{t\eta} \cdot y_{Qm}^{t\eta}) \quad (5)$$

Equation (5) denotes that the time spending on a occupation falls between the time taken by the longest task and the sum of all tasks. Suppose the firm sets up n occupations, then the iteration cycle t of the enterprise n to complete the production of the product G is:

$$t \in (\max(w_1^{t\eta} \cdot D_1^{t\eta}, w_2^{t\eta} \cdot D_2^{t\eta}, \dots, w_n^{t\eta} \cdot D_n^{t\eta}), \sum_{k=1}^n w_k^{t\eta} \cdot D_k^{t\eta}).$$

That is, the duration of a production iteration cycle is between the time taken by the occupation with the longest time and the sum of all occupations.

Assume the firm has J tasks in total, the type and total number of tasks remain unchanged, it means that $J = \sum_{s=1}^n \sum_{z=1}^{sq} y_{sz}^{t\eta} \cdot D_s^{t\eta}$. The iteration period of the

production product G is:

$$t \in (\max(w_1^{t\eta} \cdot y_1^{t\eta}, w_2^{t\eta} \cdot y_2^{t\eta}, \dots, w_J^{t\eta} \cdot y_J^{t\eta}), \sum_{v=1}^J w_v^{t\eta} \cdot y_v^{t\eta}).$$

Since the type and total number of tasks remain unchanged, we can obtain by combining Equation (5):

$$\sum_{k=1}^n w_k^{t\eta} \cdot D_k^{t\eta} \geq \sum_{u=1}^k \sum_{m=1}^q w_{um}^{t\eta} \cdot y_{um}^{t\eta} = \sum_{v=1}^J w_v^{t\eta} \cdot y_v^{t\eta} \quad (6)$$

$$\max(w_1^{t\eta} \cdot D_1^{t\eta}, w_2^{t\eta} \cdot D_2^{t\eta}, \dots, w_n^{t\eta} \cdot D_n^{t\eta}) \geq \max(w_1^{t\eta} \cdot y_1^{t\eta}, w_2^{t\eta} \cdot y_2^{t\eta}, \dots, w_J^{t\eta} \cdot y_J^{t\eta}) \quad (7)$$

Equations (6) and (7) indicates that **the iteration period in skill-task level is always shorter than or equal to that in employee-occupation level**. Firms with shorter iteration cycles can adapt to environmental changes more effectively and adjust their strategies with greater flexibility.

5. Conclusion

We propose the iteration mechanism to illustrate a firm's efforts to bridge the gap between projected and actual profit. We build the Skill-Task Matching Model, which extends the task approach iteratively and multi-dimensionally, to depict this mechanism. We vectorize work into a task vector space and labor into a skills vector space. We suppose that the production process reaches fruition when there's an alignment between tasks and their requisite skills. The matching matrix between skills and tasks quantificat the firm's production methodologies, while the task value vector quantificat the firm's business strategies. Through accumulating positive random experiment results, a firm's production techniques and strategies are facilitated by the process of recalibrating the parameters of matching matrix and task value vectors iteratively. Through successive iterations, a firm's production process evolves from approximations to precision, and actual profits incrementally align with its expected profits. We build a feedforward neural network program to illustrate the

model, and prove that applying the model will enhance the operation efficiency of the firm.

The model we propose reveal the black box of a firm's production, and introduce AI algorithms into economic model, exploring a way to remedy the limitations of the Cobb-Douglas production function. By recognizing more tasks and skills and accumulating more data, further research could be conducted by using AI techniques to analyze the relationship between certain tasks and skills, returns of skills or skills bundles, firms' decision makings, market status, and other topics in economics.

References:

- Acemoglu, Daron, David H. Autor, Jonathon Hazell, and Pascual Restrepo.** 2022. "Artificial Intelligence and Jobs: Evidence from Online Vacancies". *Journal of Labor Economics*, 40: 293-340.
- Acemoglu, Daron, and David H. Autor.** 2011. Skills, Tasks and Technologies: Implications for Employment and Earnings *Handbook of Labor Economics*. Elsevier Science Ltd.
- Acemoglu, Daron, and Pascual Restrepo.** 2017. "Robots and Jobs: Evidence from US Labor Markets". *Journal of Political Economy*, 128: 2188-2244.
- Autor, David H., Frank Levy, and Richard J. Murnane.** 2003. "The Skill Content of Recent Technological Change: An Empirical Exploration". *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 118(4): 1279-1333.
- Autor, David H., Lawrence F. Katz, and Melissa S. Kearney.** 2006. "The Polarization of the U.S. Labor Market. ". *American Economic Review*, 2(96): 189-194.
- Autor, David H., and David Dorn.** 2013. "The Growth of Low-Skill Service Jobs and the Polarization of the US Labor Market". *American Economic Review*, 5(103): 1553-1597.
- Autor, David H., and Michael J. Handel.** 2013. "Putting Tasks to the Test: Human Capital, Job Tasks, and Wages". *Journal of Labor Economics*, 31(S1): S59-S96.
- Deming, David J.** 2017. "The Growing Importance of Social Skills in the Labor Market". *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 132(4): 1593-1640.
- Frey, Carl Benedikt, and Michael A. Osborne.** 2017. "The Future of Employment: How Susceptible Are Jobs to Computerisation?". *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 114: 254-280.
- Goos, Maarten, Alan Manning, and Anna Salomons.** 2014. "Explaining Job Polarization: Routine-Biased Technological Change and Offshoring". *American Economic Review*, 104(8): 2509-2526.

- Huang, Ming-Hui, and Roland T. Rust.** 2018. "Artificial Intelligence in Service". *Journal of Service Research*, 21(2): 155-172.
- Lazear, E. P.** 1995. *Personnel Economics* . MIT press.
- Lise, Jeremy, and Fabien Postel-Vinay.** 2020. "Multidimensional Skills, Sorting, and Human Capital Accumulation". *American Economic Review*, 110(8): 2328-2376.
- Marcolin, Luca, Sébastien Miroudot, and Mariagrazia Squicciarini.** 2016. *The Routine Content of Occupations: New Cross-Country Measures Based on PIAACOED* Science, Technology and Industry Working Papers, 2016/02, OECD, Paris.
- Ranganathan, Aruna.** 2023. "When the Tasks Line Up: How the Nature of Supplementary Tasks Affects Worker Productivity". *Ilr Review*, 76: 556-585.
- Spitz-Oener, A.** 2006. "Technical Change, Job tasks, and Rising Educational Demands: Looking Outside the Wage Structure". *Journal of Labor Economics*, 2(24): 235-270.
- Wong, Chi-Sum, and Michael A. Campion.** 1991. "Development and Test of a Task Level Model of Motivational Job Design". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76: 825-837.