

Low-Skilled Occupations Face the Highest Upskilling Pressure

Authors: Di Tong¹, Lingfei Wu², James A. Evans^{3,4*}

Affiliations:

¹ Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02142.

² School of Computing and Information, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260.

³ Department of Sociology, University of Chicago, 1126 E 59th St, Chicago, IL 60637.

⁴ Knowledge Lab, University of Chicago, 5735 South Ellis Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637.

*Corresponding author. E-mail: jevans@uchicago.edu (J.E.)

Substantial scholarship has estimated the susceptibility of jobs to automation, but little has examined how job contents evolve in the information age as new technologies substitute for tasks, shifting required skills rather than eliminating entire jobs. Here we explore patterns and consequences of changes in occupational skill and characterize occupations and workers subject to the greatest re-skilling pressure. Recent work found that changing skill requirements are greatest for STEM occupations. Nevertheless, analyzing 167 million online job posts covering 727 occupations over the last decade, we find that re-skilling pressure is greatest for low-skilled occupations when accounting for distance between skills. We further investigate the differences in skill change across employer and market size, as well as social demographic groups, and find that these differences tend to widen the economic divide. Jobs from large employers and markets experienced less change relative to small employers and markets, and non-white workers in low-skill jobs are most demographically vulnerable. We conclude by showcasing our model's potential to precisely chart job evolution towards machine-interface integration using skill embedding spaces.

Main

With rapid advances in automation, computerization, and Artificial Intelligence (AI) technologies, substantial scholarship and public debate has focused on estimating the susceptibility of jobs to full or partial automation and the employment consequences that follow¹⁻⁸. By contrast, relatively little work has examined how job contents evolve. New technologies often substitute for some skills within jobs while simultaneously creating new ones, which alter job skill demands and impose re-skilling pressure on workers⁹⁻¹². Here we focus on the future of work not in terms of job elimination and displacement, but job transformation^{11,13}.

Measuring job transformation by skill change is a relatively recent and emerging research program. The bulk of prior empirical studies focus on analyzing specific jobs, skills and industrial forces of change^{9,11,14-17}. This work demonstrates the importance of compositional skill change, but lacks quantification of the similarity between skills within jobs. This makes it difficult to systematically compare jobs and understand which group of workers faces more re-skilling challenges amid economic and social change. The major challenge for quantifying systemic job skill change lies in obtaining datasets that accurately represent job skill requirements¹³. Recent research has shifted from inferring skill change indirectly from shifts in relative wages and the supply of highly-educated labor¹⁸, to direct measurement of skill composition. Still, this work relies on static, coarse skill taxonomies such as the Dictionary of Occupational Titles¹⁴, the Occupational Information Network Database (O*NET)^{13,19}, or job titles from Census coding volumes¹⁰. Most recently, Deming and Noray (2020)²⁰ developed the first direct, dynamic and precise measurement of job skill change using high-quality job advertisement data. They quantify skill changes for a job over time by adding up the adjustments in the frequency or emphasis of all skills, including those that became outdated and new ones that were required. For the detailed equation, see the Supplementary Information section 2.1.

The limitation of this quantification, however, lies in its inadequate consideration of the graduated relationship between different skills. This oversight results in a skewed perspective, inducing an upward bias for technology-intensive and specialized occupations that possess many more listed “skills” than occupations with less specialization. For these high-skilled and specialized occupations, when old skills are replaced by new ones, they are usually quite similar and not too difficult to learn, similar to how learning a new programming language is more straightforward for someone who already knows several. That measurement approach to skill change also exhibits downward bias for low-skilled occupations, where new skills needed are fewer yet substantially different and more challenging to acquire. To overcome these limitations, we propose to investigate and quantify the “distance” between skills within the underlying space of complex human capital²¹. Some skills are closer to one another, creating local, accessible transition paths. As illustrated by Fig.1a-b, the marginal effort required for a computer programmer to adapt to a shift in demand within the “Programming” skill cluster from one coding language to another is smaller than the required shift for a food batchmaker who manufactures large quantities of food for packaging and distribution to their first coding language. The shift in predicted re-educational cost (see Methods and Results sections) for the two occupations involved an increase for food batchmakers, who move from the center of the skill cluster for “Health, Medical Care” (food preparation) and towards “Programming”

(database administration), requiring approximately five times the educational advance required for programmers (51 vs. 11 days of advanced schooling).

Given this concern, we advocate for an alternative quantification of skill change that uses embedding distance to model the space between skills. Deming and Noray (2020) suggested that high-skilled STEM and technology-intensive occupations experienced the most skill content change from 2007 to 2019²⁰. Here we use the same dataset as Deming and Noray²⁰, but present a dramatically different observation when accounting for distance between skills: low-skilled occupations changed *much* more than high-skilled occupations, suggesting very different employment and skilling policies. Using the skill probability change measure as suggested by Deming and Noray²⁰, computer programmers change 175% more than food batchmaker (7.453 vs 2.708) (Fig.1c). After modeling skill distance using skill vectors learned from direct and indirect co-occurrences of skills in job ads with word embedding²², however, the assessment of who faces the higher re-skilling pressure is reversed—food batchmaker changes 144% more than computer programmer (0.082 vs. 0.017 in cosine distance; Fig.1d). As we show below, precise skill change measurements also allow us to understand how these changes distribute across many dimensions of the U.S. economy and manifest a correspondence with the educational cost required for skill acquisition (see Fig.2d). We note that an intermediate version of Deming and Noray’s (2020) measure, formally equivalent to their original metric²⁰ but using data-driven clusters also reverses their assessment (see Supplementary Information section 2.4).

The Methods section explains how we quantify skill change by recovering skill distance with a machine learning model²² that embeds skills in a high-resolution skill space. In the Methods section, we also empirically validate the association between marginal skill changes and the educational cost of upskilling (see Fig.2d). To our knowledge, this represents the first validation of educational cost derived from accurately pinpointing the marginal skills between two job ads within the same occupation. Based on this improved measurement, we analyze skill requirements from 727 occupations across 167 million job ads, which cover the near-universe of the U.S. labor market in the past decade. Our findings confirm that occupations categorized as low-skilled encounter the most significant up-skilling pressure. This holds true regardless of the criteria used for distinguishing between low and high-skill roles, whether by skill number, pay level, or educational degree (Fig.2). To better understand the unevenness of skill change beyond low and high skill jobs, we further distinguish between jobs across employer and market size, as well as social demographic groups. Our evidence suggests that small labor markets and small employers change more relative to their larger counterparts as they upgrade their skills and converge to the skill demand of large markets and employers²³ (Fig.3). Non-white workers in low-skilled jobs are the most vulnerable to up-skilling requirements (Fig.3). We conclude by discussing the broad potential of our skill space model, with a demonstrated application to illuminate job evolution towards skills at the machine-interface (Fig.S3).

Results

Low-Skilled Occupations Face the Highest Upskilling Pressure

Across the analyzed 727 occupations, low-skilled occupations experience more skill change than high-skilled occupations during 2010-2018; no matter how we distinguish between low and high skill occupations—whether by the average number of core skills across years (Fig.2a), the annual

median pay for the occupation (Fig.2b), or the average education requirement (Fig.2c). In other words, re-skilling pressure is higher for workers in occupations requiring low skill complexity and low education with low compensation. The only exception is that jobs requiring master's or doctorate degrees change more than those requiring bachelor's degrees, but both change markedly less than jobs requiring only an associate or high school degree. In Fig.2e, we sorted twenty-two 2-digit SOC occupation categories by decreasing skill change to obtain the face validity of the distinction between low and high-skill occupations. Occupations related to farming, fishing, and forestry, construction and extraction, and transportation and materials moving change most; while occupations related to management, business and financial operations, and computer and mathematical change least. In Supplementary Information Table S4, we present OLS regression models of occupational skill change on skill number, education level, and pay level, showing that the effect of skill level is substantial and consistent. We also show that this pattern still holds when average occupation-level employer concentration is controlled, or when O*NET job zones, which reflect not only formal schooling but also informal experience and training, are used to measure job skill level (see Supplementary Information section 3.1 and 3.6).

Does the shift in required skills—measured in embedding distance—actually lead to increased educational costs, potentially creating undue pressure on low-skill workers? We show in Supplementary Information Fig.S5 that the substantial shift in skills observed within low-skilled occupations signifies an upskilling trend rather than a deskilling one. The skill gap between high- and low-skilled occupations has narrowed from 2010 to 2018, indicating marked transformations in low-skilled occupations that have aligned them more closely with their high-skilled counterparts. Furthermore, we examine educational costs by identifying job ad pairs that reveal precise marginal skill differences within the same occupation and year. We select job pairs based on the criterion that the two are the same occupation (e.g., “Programmer”), and that the second job ad must encompass the skills of the first, with more in addition. We then calculate the difference in required years of education between the two ads (see Methods section for specification of the analytical sample). Consider, for example, data from January 2010, which includes two ads for Administrative Assistant positions at entry and senior levels. Both ads require basic administrative skills, such as communication and administrative support, as well as proficiency in Microsoft Office tools like Excel, Word, and PowerPoint. The senior position, however, also requires specialized skills in customer management, such as Siebel CRM, Portal Tools, Customer Information Control System (CICS), Direct Mail, and Newsletters. Here, the skill distance between the two ads is 0.17, yielding a z -score of -1.13, and the senior role requires an additional 2 years of education compared to the entry-level role (16 vs. 14 years). This illustration, along with an additional exemplary comparison within the nursing profession (see Supplementary Information Table S2), reveals a clear link between skill distance between a pair of jobs, which reflect incremental skill upgrades between the two positions, and the extra years of education required to attain those new skills. In all examined occupations, we observe a significant and positive correlation (see Fig. 2d, $\rho = 0.15$, $p < 0.001$). Regressing education year differences on the z -score, we find that one standard deviation increase in skill distance is associated with 2 months of additional schooling. Regressing it on raw cosine distance in skill space, where a unit represents the distance from the same job (e.g., distance = 0) to an unrelated one (distance = 1) is associated with an average of nearly 2 years (1.84) of focused schooling (see Supplementary Information Table S3). We use the latter coefficient to predict different

retraining costs for high- and low-skilled occupations. For example, the skill requirement change from 2010 to 2018 in jobs with pay in the bottom 25% of the compensation distribution or requiring less than college education predict 50% more schooling than those in the top 25% of pay distribution or requiring at least college degree. This analysis, further described in the Methods section and Supplementary Information section 3.4, provides the first empirical validation of the link between incremental skill changes and the educational costs of upskilling, as derived from large-scale job advertisement data.

Outsized Skill Upgrades Required in Small Businesses and Labor Markets

Insofar as skill upgrading is essential, particularly for low-skilled jobs, we now turn to explore a crucial question regarding the organizational and ecological environment of skill change: do jobs at smaller or larger employers and local labor markets face greater pressure for upskilling? On one hand, research suggests that job roles in large firms and markets may change faster. These entities are often leading their fields at the skill frontier and possess the resources to attract and retain highly skilled workers²⁴⁻³⁰. These attributes may require large firms and markets to engage in continuous learning that results in a faster pace of change in job skill requirements compared with smaller companies and markets. On the other hand, smaller firms and markets could experience more significant skill upgrading to catch up with their larger counterparts. Theories of ecological inertia^{31,32} and skill premia³³ also suggest that job roles in large companies and markets may change more slowly. As companies grow, they develop increased bureaucratization and structural inertia³⁴. Moreover, with greater size and density of complementary skills, tasks, and occupations in large organizations and markets, ecological resilience may arise from the scale of network dependencies. This process may increase the ability of large companies and markets to manage uncertainty from their environment^{31,32} and reduce the pressure for rapid shifts in job tasks³⁵⁻³⁸.

To evaluate these dueling hypotheses, our study focuses on two aspects: first, how the same occupation evolves within small versus large companies and markets over an eight-year observation period between 2010 and 2018; second, development of the skill gap between large and small employers and markets for the same occupations during this period. For the company-level analysis, we classify large employers as those with more than ten annual job postings in both starting and ending years of our analysis, placing them in the top 10% and distinguishing them from 90% of smaller employers. We computed two vector representations for the same occupation for each year, 2010-2018, based on the different skill requirements specified in large and small employers' job posts. This approach captures variations in core skill requirements from both employer size and time. With these vectors, we calculated the level of skill change for a given group of employers (e.g., large employers) as the average distance between their 2010 and 2018 occupation vectors. Additionally, we measured the skill demand gap between the large and small employers in a given year (e.g., 2010) as the average distance between the vectors representing the same occupations but constructed from large and small employers' job ads, respectively.

For the market-level analysis, we categorized job postings into large and small markets. We define local labor markets as commuting zones using 2010 data constructed by Penn State University based on the method developed by the Economic Research Service (ERS) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture^{39,40}. Mapping the longitude and latitude locations of job posts to

commuting zones, we classify a commuting zone as a large market if its annual job postings ranked within the top 10% among all 652 commuting zones in 2010 and 2018; otherwise, we considered it a small market. As in the firm-level analysis, we construct occupational skill vectors for large and small markets at different timepoints separately based on their different skill requirements for the same occupation in 2010 and 2018. With the same approach as for the small and large company comparison, we computed the average occupational skill change for large and small markets, as well as average occupational skill distance between large and small markets in 2010 and 2018, with very similar findings.

Occupational skill change and the occupational skill gap between small and large companies and markets reveals a strong “skill convergence” effect. Occupations in larger companies and markets exhibit less skill change compared to their smaller counterparts over time (Fig. 3a, c) and the skill gap between small and large companies and markets is narrowing (Fig. 3b, d). This finding suggests that between 2010 and 2018, a significant portion of skill change involved upgrading skills in smaller firms and markets with initially lower skill demands, resulting in small companies and markets undergoing more change and progressively resembling their larger counterparts. Jobs in small businesses and markets have undergone markedly more punctuated skill upgrades. In Fig. 3e, we graph variation in average occupational skill change on a U.S. map for large and small markets, highlighting that upskilling pressures are notably higher in rural regions compared to densely populated coastal states and urban areas. Table S5 in the Supplementary Information demonstrates that the more significant skill change in small markets and employers is robust after controlling for employer concentration using fixed-effect regressions.

Who Faces the Most Upskilling Pressure?

To understand the implication of skill change on workers, we associate occupational skill change with worker demographics, leveraging statistics from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) based on the 2018 Current Population Survey (CPS). We group occupations by skill level and corresponding workers’ dominant gender and race/ethnicity, then calculate average levels of skill change across occupations from the same group. In determining occupations’ “dominant” demographic characteristics, we link an occupation to a social group if this group is 1.5 times or more likely to be employed in the focal occupation, compared to its fraction in the U.S. labor force according to the 2018 CPS. For example, according to the BLS, approximately 80% of registered nurses are female, and females account for roughly 50% of the worker population, giving them a dominant score of 1.6 (80% divided by 50%). A single occupation may exhibit overrepresentation across multiple, intersecting social groups; for instance, there is a disproportion in the percentage of male (score 1.5, or 75% divided by 50%) and Hispanic (score 1.5, or 25% divided by 17%) workers in the construction industry. Our methodology enables us to link demographics with skill change, and our finding, illustrated by the heatmap in Fig.3f, reveals that low-skilled, nonwhite, male workers experience the greatest up-skilling pressure.

Discussion

Much recent work seeks to build a deeper empirical science of skills and job change through modeling skill distances. The expanding literature includes studies that derive skill vectors to calculate skill distance and predict worker mobility^{41–43}. Nevertheless, such studies often consider

skills as independent from one another. To overcome this limitation, others have constructed skill networks to model skill interdependencies^{21,37,44,45}, but networks do not yield straightforward or continuous distances between skills or jobs, as many paths may connect them. Our work builds atop this work by seeking improved skill representations. Using large-scale job advertisement data, coupled with widely validated manifold learning methods from machine learning and artificial intelligence^{22,46,47}, our work advances the state of science on how skills are represented and learned. Specifically, by introducing continuous geometry to supplant network topology, our model both captures skill interdependencies and generates vectors that permit efficient and dependable calculation of distance between skills and jobs.

We develop a skill embedding model—skill2vec—to represent occupational skill content and reveal hidden inequities in up-skilling biased against low-skill workers. Our model encodes skill proximity learned from massive-scale job posts and represents it as distance in a high-dimensional space that captures the complex system of human capital with minimal distortion. This continuous model allows for better quantification of up-skilling pressure than discrete models at the occupational level²⁰ and allows us to explore up-skilling consequences for workers across markets, employers, and demographic groups. Our embedding distance empirically reflects the direct and indirect skill overlaps in jobs across the economy. Because jobs are held by skilled persons, and education and training is tuned to help persons obtain jobs, we conceptualize this skill distance in terms of the amount of cognitive and embodied expertise that must be altered for persons to shift from effectiveness in one job to another. In this way, skill distance reflects the *training* required to perform new skills and jobs. In this paper, we validate this interpretation of skill embedding distance in terms of the educational time required to transition across skill space and use this to analyze the relative burden of upskilling.

We demonstrate that this methodological advancement overturns recent, high-profile findings regarding the burden of skill change in the U.S. economy²⁰. Low-skill, less educated, and minority workers who work in small companies and labor markets bear the greatest burden of upskilling with job change. They do not necessarily need to learn more new skills than their high-skilled counterparts, but the new skills they must acquire to retain employment are much more different from their initial skill set, and require more time, expense, and effort in retraining. In this way, we advance the charge leveled in recent perspectives on the important role of new data and methods for identifying key micro-level processes that drive the impact of AI and automation on the future of work^{13,48}.

Our analysis also adds new insight regarding the role of technological shifts in job change. By revealing the direction of movement for each occupation, our skill embedding traces the rise of jobs at the machine-interface and the decline of those at the human-interface (see Supplementary Information section 2.5, Fig. S3). To illustrate this, we distill skill “atoms” as near-orthogonal anchors of the skill space. Fig.S3a displays these skill atoms and Fig.S3b shows two exemplary occupations, gaming card dealers and management analysts, and their most dramatically altered atoms, 2010 to 2018. During this period card dealers needed to add big data processing to their skills in hospitality, while management analysts added web analytics to their web development skill set. Prior literature on skill-biased technological change argues that technology shocks, especially from recent computer advances, complement demand for high-skill workers, but substitute for low-skill workers, increasing inequality in opportunity and income. More recently,

scholars have demonstrated the empirical limitation of this perspective^{49,50}, demonstrating that workers in routine jobs upgrade their occupations rather than becoming unemployed.⁵¹ Our findings contribute to this perspective by demonstrating considerable demand for upgraded versions of low-skilled jobs. This suggests complementarity between changing skill demands and the lower end of the skill distribution, but at substantial personal cost to those required to upgrade.

In addition to technological change as a contributing explanation for occupational skill shifts, other critical forces also drive change, including the business cycle. Prior studies have shown that employers demand higher levels of education and experience when hiring during economic recessions and lower their skill demands during tight labor markets⁵²⁻⁵⁴. In Supplementary Information section 3.5 and Fig. S7, we show evidence consistent with prior research that lower employment rates are associated with smaller yearly average upskilling change, 2010 to 2018.

The focus and limitations of this study suggest directions for future research. First, our model of skill change focuses on revealing previously unmeasured distances between skills using only demand-side data, which captures the evolving landscape of work opportunity. This ignores the success or failure of labor demand to attract desired workers, and the change in supply of human capital. Our model cannot account for heterogeneity in individual aptitude or preparation that might moderate workers' capacity or agility to traverse the skill space faster or slower. Furthermore, our validation of re-educational costs associated with skill change do not account for re-training beyond formal schooling. Future work should consider direct and comprehensive measures of up-skilling pressure by learning costs in time, money, and psychological stress that individual workers may be more or less prepared to pay. Additionally, we did not include worker mobility across regions in our analysis or the transportation and moving costs required for continued employment. Job skill change may not translate into up-skilling pressure if workers can move to nearby regions supplying similar job opportunities⁵⁵. More fundamentally, our approach can only reflect relative skill shifts between jobs, and cannot reflect the absolute distance between a job and someone with no (employable) skills, a position not reflected within job ad data and not trained into the embedding. Finally, with the increasing dominance of teamwork in the workplace, occupations should not be the only unit of analysis assessed in skill change. Our finding about the comparatively lower level of upskilling in large employers and markets points to future research that should more closely examine skill complementarity within teams, companies, cities, and nations to characterize how economic change and technological advance combine to reshape the work and lives of individuals.

Despite these limitations, our findings identify systemic inequities in the need for re-skilling to secure continued employment, disproportionately affecting individuals who are economically disadvantaged, less-educated, people of color, and situated in rural labor markets and small companies. These findings should inform the structuring of regional and national education, skilling and employment policies to address these disparities.

Methods

Data

We analyzed a dataset of more than 167 million job ads from 2010 to 2018 provided by Burning Glass Technologies (BG). Using a proprietary classification system based on natural-language processing technology and other AI tools, along with dedicated in-house experts, BG extracted multiple variables from each job ad, including job title, 6-digit Standard Occupational Classification (SOC), location of latitude and longitude values, skill requirements, education requirement, salary, employer name, and more. BG collects information from more than 40,000 job boards and company websites to create the largest dataset of the U.S. labor market¹⁶. Admittedly, not all new jobs appear online, but online recruitment represents an increasing share of labor market search, even for jobs historically associated with informal and offline recruitment. A 2013 study estimated 60-70% jobs were posted online⁵⁶. Recent research suggested 85%⁵⁷. To verify the representativeness of BG data on the U.S. job market, we calculated occupational demand, pay level, and education requirements using BG data and found that these values are highly correlated with BLS statistics in 2010 and 2018 (see Supplementary Information section 1), justifying the overall consistency and credibility of BG data during the time period of our analysis, despite coverage limitations¹⁶. Prior work based on BG data have also conducted various validation exercises that compare BG data with the Job Opening and Labor Turnover Survey (JOLTS), CPS, Occupational Employment Statistics (OES), American Community Survey (ACS), and O*NET in terms of SOC occupation level job demand, employment, education, experience, and skill requirements^{16,58}.

Training Skill Vectors

We apply the skip-gram word2vec model²² to obtain the skill vector representations of jobs. Word2vec learns vector representation of words within a large-scale corpus such that two words frequently occurring in the same direct or indirect linguistic contexts remain close to one another within the latent space, often measured by cosine distance of the angle separating them along the surface²² and suggesting semantic and/or syntactic correspondence. Using the 167 million job posts describing a set of required skills as instances of training context, we obtain a 200-dimensional vector for BG's 15,182 unique skills. This embedding space encodes the similarity and distance between skills inferred from their direct and indirect co-presence across jobs.

Validating Skill Vectors with Worker Mobility

We first validate the relationship between skill distance by analyzing its ability to predict worker mobility. To do this, we extracted data on the number of transitions between 1,990 pairs of 6-digit SOC occupations in 2018 from CPS data⁵⁹, where individuals reported their occupation from the current and previous year. To assess the skill similarity between each pair of occupations, we calculated the cosine similarity using occupational skill vectors from our 2018 dataset. The Pearson correlation coefficient between skill similarity and logged worker mobility is 0.283 ($p < 0.001$), suggesting that when workers shift jobs, they require similar skills. Second, we regress worker mobility against a baseline prediction based on occupation popularity (i.e., the logarithm of the product of employment in the two occupations using 2018 BLS data.) This was done both before and after accounting for skill vector distance in the regression. Our findings indicate that including skill similarity significantly enhances the baseline model, with the R-squared value increasing by 130% from 0.06 to 0.14.

Quantifying the Magnitude of Occupational Skill Change

We calculate the vector of a 6-digit SOC occupation o at a given year t by averaging the vectors of m core skills required by o in t . To derive reliable estimates, we focus on 727 active occupations with 100 or more job ads every year and analyze their 5% most frequently required skills in each year, referred to as “core skills”. In the Supplementary Information section 3.7, we demonstrate that our findings presented in the main text are robust to alternative definitions of skill content, including expansion of core skills to include all skills and a consideration of skill frequencies as weights. As core skills change over time, the same occupation may manifest evolving vector representations across years even though each skill has only a fixed, globally trained vector. In this way, we focus on occupational skill content change caused by the substitution of core skills²². Specifically, we use one minus the Cosine distance between vectors of the same occupation in 2010 and 2018 as the skill change score. We calculate job skill change for all 727 occupations between 2010 and 2018. Calculated scores vary from 0.002 to 0.340, with a median of 0.027. As occupation vectors encode skill distance, this measurement of skill change reflects more precise efforts needed for re-skilling than prior work²⁰, as illustrated in Fig. 1.

Note that the re-skilling cost inferred from an occupational skill change relative to that same occupation at a previous time point is a second-order measurement. This is fundamentally different from important first-order metrics that capture the absolute training cost required to qualify for an occupation from the position of no relevant skill, such as an occupation's: educational requirement, O*NET job zone, or skill number. Our main empirical analysis examines how second-order re-skilling costs vary among occupations with different first-order skill levels (Fig. 2).

Finally, we explored an alternative measurement to characterize occupational skill change as its most significant distance of skill transition in Supplementary Information section 3.2. This approach aims to correct the potential underestimation of skill change for high-skilled vs. low-skilled jobs under the scenario where a high- and low-skilled occupation both add the same number of new skills in 2018 that are extremely dissimilar to their 2010 skills, yet the high-skilled occupation also adds many more similar skills that end up “diluting” the average change associated with the addition of dissimilar skills. With this alternative measurement, we examine individual skill transitions and focus on the largest skill transitions to rule out this possible bias. With this measurement, our conclusion—that lower-skilled jobs are more susceptible to change—remained consistent (see Table S1).

Validating the Re-skilling Costs Reflected by Occupational Skill Change

We further validate the inference of re-skilling costs from our occupational skill change measurement by demonstrating that distance in the skill space correlates with the amount of costly re-education required for workers to move from one distribution of skills to another. To draw comparison between jobs with marginal skill differences, we undertake the following analysis:

1. We randomly select a 10% sample from all 2010 job posts, and identify among them pairs of job posts, x and y , from the same occupation, where post y encompasses all skills listed in post x , but also possesses additional skills.
2. Using the sample selected in step 1, we further select pairs where y requires more education years than x .
3. Using this subsample, we plot the distribution of the number of additional skills in y compared with x (which typically follows a unimodal distribution, see Fig. S6), and identify the peak of that distribution m_o . This peak is more likely than other numbers in the distribution to correspond to a regularly-added combination of skills, typically obtained through more advanced education.
4. Next, we analyze a subset of 6,585,524 job post pairs from the Step 1 sample where x and y belong to the same occupation o , and y requires m_o , $m_o - 1$, or $m_o + 1$ more skills beyond the common skill set shared with x . Because our data do not allow a comprehensive measurement of all sorts of re-training for skill acquisition and there are only a few levels of education degrees, we apply step 4 to upweight cases where formal education requirements differ between job posts within the same occupation. Note that in the analytical sample built in this step, job post y may add m_o skills but does not require a higher degree than x because either those skills are not necessarily the regularly-added combination of skills, or could be obtained without a new formal degree. We aim to test whether larger skill distances predict degree requirement changes and more substantial education year differences by comparing a range of cases, encompassing those with no meaningful degree changes, those with such changes, and variations in the magnitude of change between them.
5. Because job posts pairs within each occupation tend to present similar pattern, we aggregate the data to the occupation level by calculating for each the average required education year difference and skill distance based on three groups of job posts pairs: pairs with m_o , $m_o - 1$, or $m_o + 1$ skill additions, respectively, resulting in 1257 data points.

Fig. 2d and the statistics reported in the Results section are based on this aggregated analysis and show that skill distance effectively predicts educational difference. We also show in Supplementary Information section 3.4 that results are similar when the analytical unit is raw job post pairs, and when analysis is based on 6 different random samples drawn from 2010 data. We note that this measured shift in educational *level* does not account for the necessary shift in educational *type*. For example, shifting from a data analyst job in a media company to that in a biotech company may not require a higher level of education (e.g., a Bachelor degree), but is more likely to require a degree with a different major as distance in the skill space increases.




Fig. 1: Measuring occupational skill content change without considering skill proximity induces biases in estimating re-skilling pressure. **a**, Food Batchmakers have fewer new 2018 core skills (with top 5% occurrence) than computer programmers, but the new skills are located much further from 2010 core skills. We illustrate the proximity and distance between skills by representing them in 6 well-formed clusters detected from a skill co-occurrence network (see Supplementary Information section 2.2 for method details). Each dot represents the location of a skill in this network representation. Each new core skill (red dot) of food batchmakers is linked to its nearest 2010 old skill (blue dot), with the length of link proportional to the distance associated with skill transition. Compared with panel b, there are many fewer red dots in panel a, but the distance between the red dots and their nearest blue dots are typically larger. **b**, Computer programmers have many new core skills in 2018 not among their 2010 core skills, but 2018 and 2010 skills are very similar. **c**, Without considering skill distance, computer programmers are assessed as experiencing substantially higher skill change than food batchmakers, 2010 to 2018. Each unit of the x axis corresponds to a skill ranked from highest to lowest in terms of skill probability change. The y axis denotes skill probability change for each skill (see Supplementary Information section 2.3 for method details). The area under the orange and blue curves sum up the job-level skill change for food batchmaker and computer programmer, respectively (sums are reported in the annotation text within the plot). **d**, After controlling for skill distance, food batchmakers are associated with much larger skill change than programmers. Each unit of the x-axis corresponds to a core skill ranked from highest to lowest in terms of their contribution to the job-level skill embedding distance change. The y-axis denotes skill embedding distance change attributed to each skill (see Supplementary Information section 2.3 for method details).




Fig. 2: Low-skilled occupations face higher re-skilling pressure 2010-2018 when skill distance is accounted for. **a**, Occupations with lower skill complexity have higher average skill content change. Each bar denotes the average skill vector change for a group of jobs whose core skill number falls within the range labeled on the x-axis. **b**, Occupations with lower pay have higher average skill vector change. Each bar denotes the average skill vector change for a group of jobs whose average annual median pay falls within the range labeled on the x-axis. **c**, Except for graduate degrees, occupations with lower education requirements change more; jobs requiring masters or doctorate degrees change more than those requiring bachelor degrees. Each bar denotes the average skill vector change for a group of jobs whose average entry education requirement falls within the range labeled on the x-axis. **d**, Skill vector distance between jobs corresponds to the amount of re-education cost required for workers to move from one distribution of skills to another. The three bars represent the average required education year difference for pairs of job posts with different levels of skill vector distances: the first bar consists of pairs with skill vector distances less than 1 standard deviation below the mean, the second bar on pairs with skill vector distances from 1 standard deviation below the mean to one above the mean, and the third bar includes pairs with skill vector distance larger than 1 standard deviation above the mean. **e**, The skill vector change distribution for 6-digit SOC occupations among each 2-digit SOC occupation category. Bins are ordered from the group with the largest median change to the one with the lowest median change.




Fig. 3: Variation in re-skilling pressure for different organizations, local labor markets, and social groups. **a**, Small firms have a higher level of occupational skill change than large firms, 2010 to 2018. Bars denote average skill vector change for the same group of occupations in large and small firms. **b**, Small firms upgrade skill requirements and converge to large firm skill demands, 2010 to 2018. Bars denote average occupational skill vector distance between large and small firms, 2010 and 2018. **c**, Small markets have a higher level of occupational skill change than large firms, 2010 to 2018. **d**, Small markets upgrade skill requirements and converge to large firm skill demands, 2010 to 2018. **e**, Mapping occupational skill change in U.S. regions. States and commuting zones are grouped into three quantiles in terms of their average occupational skill change from low to high, labeled as “slight”, “moderate”, and “large change”. **f**, Low-skilled nonwhite male workers face the highest re-skilling pressure compared with other social groups. Each cell presents the average occupational skill change for occupations of different skill-levels and with an over-representation of employees from specified social groups. Occupations are classified into five skill types according to their percentile in the skill number distribution for all occupations.

References

1. Acemoglu, D. & Autor, D. Skills, tasks and technologies: Implications for employment and earnings. in *Handbook of labor economics* vol. 4 1043–1171 (Elsevier, 2011).
2. Acemoglu, D. & Restrepo, P. Robots and Jobs: Evidence from US Labor Markets. *J. Polit. Econ.* **128**, 2188–2244 (2020).
3. Acemoglu, D. & Restrepo, P. Automation and New Tasks: How Technology Displaces and Reinstates Labor. *J. Econ. Perspect.* **33**, 3–30 (2019).
4. Arntz, M., Gregory, T. & Zierahn, U. Revisiting the risk of automation. *Econ. Lett.* **159**, 157–160 (2017).
5. Autor, D. H. Why Are There Still So Many Jobs? The History and Future of Workplace Automation. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* vol. 29 3–30 Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.29.3.3> (2015).
6. Frey, C. B. & Osborne, M. A. The future of employment: How susceptible are jobs to computerisation? *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change* **114**, 254–280 (2017).
7. Nedelkoska, L. & Quintini, G. Automation, skills use and training. (2018).
8. Pajarinen, M., Rouvinen, P., Ekeland, A. & Others. Computerization threatens one-third of Finnish and Norwegian employment. *Etila Brief* **34**, 1–8 (2015).
9. Acemoglu, D., Autor, D., Hazell, J. & Restrepo, P. AI and Jobs: Evidence from Online Vacancies. (2020) doi:10.3386/w28257.
10. Autor, D., Chin, C., Salomons, A. M. & Seegmiller, B. New Frontiers: The Origins and Content of New Work, 1940–2018. (2022) doi:10.3386/w30389.
11. Brynjolfsson, E., Mitchell, T. & Rock, D. What can machines learn and what does it mean for occupations and the economy? *AEA Pap. Proc.* **108**, 43–47 (2018).
12. Shestakofsky, B. Working Algorithms: Software Automation and the Future of Work. *Work Occup.* **44**, 376–423 (2017).
13. Frank, M. R. *et al.* Toward understanding the impact of artificial intelligence on labor. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **116**, 6531–6539 (2019).

14. Autor, D. H., Levy, F. S. & Murnane, R. J. The skill content of recent technological change: An empirical exploration. *SSRN Electron. J.* (2001) doi:10.2139/ssrn.272691.
15. Atalay, E., Phongthientham, P., Sotelo, S. & Tannenbaum, D. The Evolution of Work in the United States. *Am. Econ. J. Appl. Econ.* **12**, 1–34 (2020).
16. Hershbein, B. & Kahn, L. B. Do Recessions Accelerate Routine-Biased Technological Change? Evidence from Vacancy Postings. *Am. Econ. Rev.* **108**, 1737–1772 (2018).
17. Maccrory, F., Westerman, G., Alhammadi, Y. & Brynjolfsson, E. Racing with and against the machine: Changes in occupational skill composition in an era of rapid technological advance. http://k12accountability.org/resources/For-Parents/Racing_With_and_Against_the_Machine_-Changes_in_Occupational_Skill.pdf.
18. Card, D. & DiNardo, J. E. Skill-biased technological change and rising wage inequality: Some problems and puzzles. *J. Labor Econ.* **20**, 733–783 (2002).
19. Gordon Benzell, S., Brynjolfsson, E., Maccrory, F., Westerman, G. & Mit, N. †. Identifying the multiple skills in skill-biased technical change. <https://ide.mit.edu/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/Identifying-the-Multiple-Skills-in-SBTC-8-2-19.pdf> (2019).
20. Deming, D. J. & Noray, K. Earnings Dynamics, Changing Job Skills, and STEM Careers*. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* vol. 135 1965–2005 Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjaa021> (2020).
21. Anderson, K. A. Skill networks and measures of complex human capital. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **114**, 12720–12724 (2017).
22. Mikolov, T., Chen, K., Corrado, G. & Dean, J. Efficient Estimation of Word Representations in Vector Space. *arXiv [cs.CL]* (2013).
23. Frank, M. R., Sun, L., Cebrian, M., Youn, H. & Rahwan, I. Small cities face greater impact from automation. *J. R. Soc. Interface* **15**, (2018).
24. Moretti, E. *The New Geography of Jobs*. (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2012).

25. Berry, C. R. & Glaeser, E. L. The divergence of human capital levels across cities. *Pap. Reg. Sci.* **84**, 407–444 (2005).
26. Autor, D., Dorn, D., Katz, L. F., Patterson, C. & Van Reenen, J. The fall of the labor share and the rise of superstar firms. *Q. J. Econ.* **135**, 645–709 (2020).
27. Glaeser, E. L. *Cities, Agglomeration, and Spatial Equilibrium*. (OUP Oxford, 2008).
28. Barth, E., Davis, J. & Freeman, R. B. Augmenting the Human Capital Earnings Equation with Measures of Where People Work. *J. Labor Econ.* **36**, S71–S97 (2018).
29. Deming, D. & Kahn, L. B. Skill Requirements across Firms and Labor Markets: Evidence from Job Postings for Professionals. *J. Labor Econ.* **36**, S337–S369 (2018).
30. Glaeser, E. L. & Resseger, M. G. The complementarity between cities and skills. *J. Reg. Sci.* **50**, 221–244 (2010).
31. Hannan, M. T. & Freeman, J. Structural Inertia and Organizational Change. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* **49**, 149–164 (1984).
32. Haveman, H. A. Organizational Size and Change: Diversification in the Savings and Loan Industry after Deregulation. *Adm. Sci. Q.* **38**, 20–50 (1993).
33. Davis, D. R. & Dingel, J. I. A Spatial Knowledge Economy. *Am. Econ. Rev.* **109**, 153–170 (2019).
34. Stinchcombe, A. L. Social structure and organizations I. *Handbook of organizations (RLE: Organizations)* doi:10.4324/9780203629130-5/social-structure-organizations1-arthur-stinchcombe.
35. Frank, M. R., Sun, L., Cebrian, M., Youn, H. & Rahwan, I. Small cities face greater impact from automation. *J. R. Soc. Interface* **15**, (2018).
36. Gao, J., Jun, B., Pentland, A. ‘sandy’, Zhou, T. & Hidalgo, C. A. Spillovers across industries and regions in China’s regional economic diversification. *Reg. Stud.* **55**, 1311–1326 (2021).
37. Neffke, F. M. H. The value of complementary co-workers. *Sci Adv* **5**, eaax3370 (2019).
38. Shutters, S. T., Muneeppeerakul, R. & Lobo, J. Quantifying urban economic resilience through labour force interdependence. *Palgrave Communications* **1**, 1–7 (2015).
39. Fowler, C. S. & Jensen, L. Bridging the gap between geographic concept and the data we have: The

- case of labor markets in the USA. *Environ. Plan. A* **52**, 1395–1414 (2020).
40. Fowler, C. Labor-sheds for Regional Analysis. *Penn State University*
<https://sites.psu.edu/psucz/data/>.
 41. Gathmann, C. & Schönberg, U. How general is human capital? A task-based approach. *J. Labor Econ.* **28**, 1–49 (2010).
 42. Macaluso, C. *et al.* Skill remoteness and post-layoff labor market outcomes.
<http://conference.nber.org/confer/2017/SI2017/EFMPL/Macaluso.pdf> (2017).
 43. Neffke, F. M. H., Otto, A. & Hidalgo, C. The mobility of displaced workers: How the local industry mix affects job search. *J. Urban Econ.* **108**, 124–140 (2018).
 44. Börner, K. *et al.* Skill discrepancies between research, education, and jobs reveal the critical need to supply soft skills for the data economy. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **115**, 12630–12637 (2018).
 45. Alabdulkareem, A. *et al.* Unpacking the polarization of workplace skills. *Sci Adv* **4**, eaao6030 (2018).
 46. Kozlowski, A. C., Taddy, M. & Evans, J. A. The Geometry of Culture: Analyzing the Meanings of Class through Word Embeddings. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* **84**, 905–949 (2019).
 47. Caliskan, A., Bryson, J. J. & Narayanan, A. Semantics derived automatically from language corpora contain human-like biases. *Science* vol. 356 183–186 Preprint at
<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aal4230> (2017).
 48. Balland, P.-A. *et al.* The new paradigm of economic complexity. *Res. Policy* **51**, 104450 (2022).
 49. Mishel, L., Shierholz, H. & Schmitt, J. Don't blame the robots. *Assessing the job polarization explanation of growing wage inequality. Epi--Cepr Working Paper* **19**, (2013).
 50. Hunt, J. & Nunn, R. Has U.S. employment really polarized? A critical reappraisal. *Labour Econ.* **75**, 102117 (2022).
 51. Battisti, M., Dustmann, C. & Schönberg, U. The Effect of New Technologies on Workers, Jobs, and Skills. Preprint at https://w.cream-migration.org/files/techchange_Nov22.pdf (2023).
 52. Devereux, P. J. Occupational upgrading and the business cycle. *Labour* **16**, 423–452 (2002).

53. Modestino, A. S., Shoag, D. & Ballance, J. Downskilling: changes in employer skill requirements over the business cycle. *Labour Econ.* **41**, 333–347 (2016).
54. Modestino, A. S., Shoag, D. & Ballance, J. Upskilling: Do employers demand greater skill when workers are plentiful? *Rev. Econ. Stat.* **102**, 793–805 (2020).
55. Moro, E. *et al.* Universal resilience patterns in labor markets. *Nat. Commun.* **12**, 1972 (2021).
56. Carnevale, A. P., Jayasundera, T. & Repnikov, D. Understanding online job ads data: a technical report. *McCourt School on Public Policy, Center*
57. Lancaster, V., Mahoney-Nair, D. & Ratcliff, N. J. Review of burning glass job-ad data. <https://biocomplexity.virginia.edu/sites/default/files/projects/Technical%20Report%20Review%20of%20BGT%20Job-ad%20Data.pdf> (2019).
58. Braxton, J. C. & Taska, B. Technological Change and the Consequences of Job Loss. *Am. Econ. Rev.* **113**, 279–316 (2023).
59. Cheng, S. & Park, B. Flows and Boundaries: A Network Approach to Studying Occupational Mobility in the Labor Market. *Am. J. Sociol.* **126**, 577–631 (2020).
60. van Dam, A., Gomez-Lievano, A., Neffke, F. & Frenken, K. An information-theoretic approach to the analysis of location and co-location patterns. *arXiv [stat.AP]* (2020).
61. Newman, M. E. J. & Girvan, M. Finding and evaluating community structure in networks. *Physical Review E* vol. 69 Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.1103/physreve.69.026113> (2004).
62. Arora, S., Li, Y., Liang, Y., Ma, T. & Risteski, A. Linear algebraic structure of word senses, with applications to polysemy. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* **6**, 483–495 (2018).
63. Arseniev-Koehler, A., Cochran, S. D., Mays, V. M., Chang, K.-W. & Foster, J. G. Integrating topic modeling and word embedding to characterize violent deaths. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **119**, e2108801119 (2022).
64. Modestino, A. S., Shoag, D. & Ballance, J. Upskilling: Do employers demand greater skill when skilled workers are plentiful? *SSRN Electron. J.* (2015) doi:10.2139/ssrn.2788601.

65. Schubert, G., Stansbury, A. & Taska, B. Employer Concentration and Outside Options. (2022)
doi:10.2139/ssrn.3599454.
66. Azar, J., Marinescu, I. & Steinbaum, M. Labor Market Concentration. *J. Hum. Resour.* **57**, S167–S199 (2022).
67. Hershbein, B., Macaluso, C. & Yeh, C. Concentration in U.S. local labor markets: evidence from vacancy and employment data. https://economicdynamics.org/meetpapers/2019/paper_1336.pdf (2019).

Acknowledgments

We thank Lawrence Katz and workshop participants at MIT Institute for Work and Employment Research for helpful comments. We also thank Bledi Taska and the staff at Burning Glass Technologies for generously sharing their data and comments. J. E. thanks the NSF SBE-1829366, AFOSR FA9550-19-1-0354 and DARPA HR00111820006 for support, and L. W. acknowledges the support of Richard King Mellon Foundation and NSF SOS:DCI-2239418.

Supplementary Information for
Low-skilled occupations face the highest up-skilling pressure

Di Tong, Lingfei Wu, James A. Evans

Correspondence to: jevans@uchicago.edu (J.A.E.)

CONTENTS

- [1. Supplementary Data: Representativeness of Job Ads Data Collected by Burning Glass Technologies](#)
- [2. Supplementary Methods](#)
 - [2.1 Formula and Replication of Deming and Noray's \(2020\) Job Skill Change Measurement](#)
 - [2.2 Pointwise Mutual Information Network Construction and Community Detection for Figure 1a and b](#)
 - [2.3 Occupational Skill Change Measurements in Figure 1c and d Illustration](#)
 - [2.4 Cluster Approach to Measure Occupational Skill Change](#)
 - [2.5 Identifying the Direction of Occupational Skill Change with Skill Atoms](#)
- [3. Supplementary Results](#)
 - [3.1 Job Zone and Skill Change](#)
 - [3.2 Occupational Skill Change as the Most Significant Skill Transition](#)
 - [3.3 Upskilling of Low-Skilled Jobs](#)
 - [3.4 Re-Educational Costs Reflected by Occupational Skill Change](#)
 - [3.5 Labor Market Tightness and Skill Change](#)
 - [3.6 Robustness Check: Controlling for Employer Concentration](#)
 - [3.7 Robustness Check: Different Job Content Scope with Skill Weights](#)
- [4. Supplementary Figures](#)
 - [4.1 Figure S1. Validation of BG data representativeness](#)
 - [4.2 Figure S2. Cluster approach to measure occupational skill change](#)
 - [4.3 Figure S3. Occupations' re-skilling direction illustrated by skill atoms](#)
 - [4.4 Figure S4. Job zone and skill change](#)
 - [4.5 Figure S5. Upskilling of low-skilled jobs towards high-skilled jobs](#)
 - [4.6 Figure S6. Distribution of number of added skills by occupation](#)
 - [4.7 Figure S7. Unemployment rate and job skill change](#)
- [5. Supplementary Tables](#)
 - [5.1 Table S1. Explaining job skill change variation with skill complexity, measuring change with the most significant skill transition](#)
 - [5.2 Table S2. Example of job posts pairs used for predicting re-education cost](#)
 - [5.3 Table S3. Predicting education year difference with skill distance](#)
 - [5.4 Table S4. Explaining job skill change variation with skill complexity, controlling for employer concentration](#)
 - [5.5 Table S5. Explaining job skill change variation with employer and market size, controlling for employer concentration](#)
 - [5.6 Table S6. Explaining job skill change variation with skill complexity, different job content scope and skill weights](#)
 - [5.7 Table S7. Explaining job skill change variation with employer and market size, different job content scope and skill weights](#)

1. Supplementary Data: Representativeness of Job Ads Data Collected by Burning Glass Technologies

Burning Glass Technologies (BG) data could be biased for multiple reasons. They may include duplicate job ads and oversample high skill jobs which are more likely than low skill jobs to appear in online posts. Moreover, among the analyzed job ads, only 50% specified educational requirements and 17% listed salary. To address these concerns, we have compared BG data against the 2010 and 2018 Occupational Employment Statistics (OES) assembled by U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) in job demand / employment, education requirement, and salary for the entire sample of occupations. We confirm that these two data sources are highly consistent in all three variables. Specifically, we find the Pearson correlation coefficient $r \sim 0.8$ ($p < 0.001$) for labor market share (Fig. S1a), $r \sim 0.8$ ($p < 0.001$) for salary (Fig. S1b), and $r \sim 0.9$ ($p < 0.001$) for education (Fig. S1c).

In Fig. S1a, each dot represents a 6-digit SOC occupation. 786 Occupations can be matched between BG job post data and BLS-OES data in 2018; 759 occupations can be matched between the two datasets in 2010. The X axis denotes the log value of BG vacancy post number for each occupation. The Y axis denotes the log value of BLS estimated employment for each occupation. The Pearson correlation between the log of BG occupational vacancy post number and the log of BLS occupational employment is 0.8 in 2018 and 0.75 in 2010. The magnitude difference between BLS occupational employment data and BG occupational demand data could be attributed to the fact that employment includes incumbent workers not reflected in labor demands, and that not all jobs hire workers through online job ads and a single job post may seek to hire more than one worker.

Fig. S1b presents 772 occupations that can be matched between BG and BLS-OES datasets in 2018; and 743 occupations that can be matched between the two datasets in 2010. X and Y axes denote the log value of BG and BLS average annual median salary for each occupation, respectively. The Pearson correlation between the log of BG and BLS occupational annual median pay is 0.87 in 2018 and 0.83 in 2010.

In Fig. S1c, each dot represents an occupation in 2018, summing to 682 matches between BG entry education requirement data and BLS education and training assignments by detailed occupation data in 2018. The X axis denotes the average BG entry education year requirement for each occupation in 2018. The Y axis denotes the BLS estimated typical entry education year for each occupation in 2018. Here 12 refers to High school diploma or equivalent; 14 to Associate's degree; 16 to Bachelor's degree; 18 to Master's degree; 21 to Doctoral or professional degree. Note that in BG's job posts, education year could only take a value from the set $\{12, 14, 16, 18, 21\}$, denoting different degrees {"high school", "associates", "batchelors", "masters", "doctorate"}. Nevertheless, because we calculated the average education year from all job posts for each occupation, the occupational average education year could take on value between those in the set. BLS, on the other hand, only provides entry degree level for each occupation: "No formal educational credential"; "High school diploma or equivalent"; "Some college", "No degree"; "Postsecondary nondegree award"; "Associate's degree"; "Bachelor's degree"; "Master's degree"; "Doctoral or professional degree". In order to compare the two datasets, occupations with "No formal educational credential" are left out; "Some college", "No degree"

as well as “Postsecondary nondegree award” are coded as 12 (the same as “High school diploma or equivalent”). The Pearson correlation between BG and BLS 2018 occupational entry education level is 0.92.

We also verify the Two-step Deduplication Process that BG used⁵⁷, in which the key component is to build advanced parsing engine to extract and normalize a number of data elements from each job listing, including job title, job ID, source, posting date, employer name, location, job description text, etc., and then use these variables to screen for duplicates. In our data analysis, we did not find job posts that duplicated all of these fields.

2. Supplementary Methods

2.1 Formula and Replication of Deming and Noray's (2020) Job Skill Change Measurement

As is demonstrated in equation 1, Deming and Noray (2020)²⁰ measure the skill content change of occupation o as the sum of the absolute value of difference in share for each skill from 2007 to 2019, in which a given skill s 's share of occupation o in year t is defined as the proportion of o 's job ads that require s in year t . To account for temporal compositional changes in job post number and skill number per job post,²⁰ weight the skill change rate calculated from equation (1) by multiplying the ratio of skill occurrence divided by post number in 2007 to that in 2019, for each occupation.

$$SkillChange_o = \sum_{s=1}^S \left| \left(\frac{JobAds_o^s}{JobAds_o} \right)_{t1} - \left(\frac{JobAds_o^s}{JobAds_o} \right)_{t0} \right| \quad (1)$$

We replicate this measurement on the same job ads dataset compiled by Burning Glass Technologies, limiting the sample to posts with non-missing employer and MSA information. Our replication for 6-digit SOC occupation skill change rates from 2007 to 2019 highly correlates with the scores listed in²⁰ appendix with 0.87 Pearson correlation. The replicated measure does not obtain exactly the same values for two reasons: (1) We only have access to the first 5 month of job posts data in 2019, whereas²⁰ uses 10 months' data for 2019; (2)²⁰ further filter the sample by only retaining posts with employers that could be matched to a specific Compustat dataset inaccessible to us.

2.2 Pointwise Mutual Information Network Construction and Community Detection for Figure 1a and b

We used 2010 BG job postings data to construct a skill co-occurrence network, a topological representation of skills linked by co-presence within job advertisements²¹. Our approach adds geometric precision to create a Pointwise Mutual Information (PMI) skill network. We first calculate the PMI of each pair of skills using equation (2). With each skill represented as a node in the network, an edge between two nodes is added if the PMI between the two skills is larger than 0, implying that these two skills are more likely to co-occur in the same or similar job posts than expected under independence⁶⁰. The weight for each edge is the PMI score between the two skill nodes connected by the given edge. The 6 skill communities are detected from the PMI network by the commonly-used Louvain community detection algorithm: (a) business skills; (b) engineering, technical, and physical skills; (c) programming skills; (d) clerical and administrative

skills; (e) scientific knowledge; (f) health and medical care skills. The modularity of the partition is 0.51, indicating that this division is very strong, and represents substantial community structure in the network⁶¹.

$$\text{For skill } i \text{ and } j, PMI_{i,j} = \log \frac{p_{i,j}}{p_i \times p_j} \quad (2)$$

where p refers to probability and $p_{i,j} = \sum_{v=1}^V p(i|v) \times p(j|v) \times p(v)$ denotes the probability of skill i and j co-occurring in the same or a similar job post v .

We plotted this PMI skill network in Fig. 1a and b using python's networkx library, with each dot as a skill and the six skill communities plotted in different colors. The distance between skill dots on the network graph encodes their connectivity, which reflects skill similarity in this context. For Fig. 1a-b, we identified the 2010 (old) and 2018 (new) skills of food batchmakers (Fig. 1a) and computer programmers (Fig. 1b) on the skill network and plotted the old and new skills in blue and red, respectively. Each 2018 (new) skill is linked to its nearest 2010 (old) skill on the network. We use the length of these links to illustrate the relative skill transition distance between the new and old skills.

2.3 Occupational Skill Change Measurements in Figure 1c and d Illustration

In Fig. 1c, the area under the curve of each occupation corresponds to Deming and Noray's (2020)²⁰ job skill change measurement discussed in section 2.1. Note that all skills appearing in the job ads of a given occupation are taken into account. Because the measurement sums up the probability change for each skill required by the job in either start or ending year, we can easily decompose the total skill change for an occupation and rank skills by the proportion of occupation change for which they account. Fig. 1c presents the individual skill change for computer programmer and food batchmaker in a ranked order from highest to the lowest.

For Fig. 1d, we first calculate the occupational skill vector change for Food Batchmaker and Computer Programmer using the method described in Methods section and applied to our main analyses. Namely, we represent the occupation skill content in 2010 and 2018 with the average vector of top 5% core skills required in those two years, respectively. With these occupation vector representations, we measure occupational skill change as one minus the cosine distance between occupation vectors in 2010 and 2018.

We then locate two groups of skills that contribute to the occupation skill change and attribute occupation level change to each skill. For each new core skill that emerges in 2018, we remove it and recalculate the occupation vector representation in 2018 based on the remaining skills. We then use the cosine distance between this adjusted 2018 occupation representation and the 2010 representation to estimate the occupational skill vector change rate that would have occurred if a given new skill were not added in 2018. We approximate the change that a given skill accounts for as the absolute value of the difference between the real occupation skill vector change rate and this controlled occupation skill vector change rate. Similarly, for each removed core skill that only appears in 2010, we estimate the adjusted occupation skill vector change rate that would have arisen if this skill were absent in 2010. Using the same approach, we then estimate the change contributed by each removed skill.

In Fig.1d, for each occupation, we rank all these new 2018 core skills and removed 2010 core skills by their estimated individual contribution to the occupation level change in skill embedding distance. With a comparable arrangement with Fig. 1c, the area under the curve for each occupation in Fig. 1d sums up these individual skill level contributions and approximates occupation level skill distance change. Note that because our measure for occupational skill change does not naturally decompose to individual skill level as Deming and Noray's (2020)²⁰ approach, the area under the curve estimated from Fig. 1d (0.066 for food batchmaker, 0.027 for computer programmer) is slightly different from the real occupational-level skill change calculated by our holistic approach and applied for all analyses (0.082 for food batchmaker, 0.017 for computer programmer). Therefore, we report the real occupational level change in Fig. 1d text annotation to stay consistent with the rest of the paper.

2.4 Cluster Approach to Measure Occupational Skill Change

In order to construct a more conservative test of our conclusion regarding the reskilling burden for low-paid and low-educated occupations relative to that of Deming and Noray²⁰, we develop a version of occupational skill formally equivalent to Deming and Noray's approach, but using data-driven skill clusters rather than individual skills. Utilizing the 6 communities automatically detected from the PMI network (see section 2.2 for details), we calculated skill community change with equation (3). Fig. S2a shows that this measurement reverses the assessment of Deming and Noray²⁰. Fig. S2b suggests that this measurement highly correlates with our main skill vector change measurement.

$$SkillChange_o = \sum_{sc=1}^{SC} \left| \left(\frac{NSkill_o^{sc}}{NSkill_o} \right)_{t1} - \left(\frac{NSkill_o^{sc}}{NSkill_o} \right)_{t0} \right| \quad (3)$$

2.5 Identifying the Direction of Occupational Skill Change with Skill Atoms

Occupation vectors predict not only the magnitude of skill change but also its direction. First, we construct a “coordinate system” of the skill space by using the discourse atom topic modeling approach, which performs k -SVD matrix factorization on skill vectors to accurately and efficiently label the skill space^{62,63}. The derived vectors or “skill atoms”⁶² represent near-orthogonal axes capturing the essential “bases” of distinct human capacity, which can be linearly combined to recover the vector representations of 15,182 actual skills. Specifically, each skill is represented as a linear combination of k skill atoms. We trained models by setting the atom number k from 50 to 500. The model performs best with 210 atoms based on a balance between (1) R^2 , which measures how well the atoms predict all skill vectors; and (2) topic diversity, which measures how distinct the atoms are from one another.

After we obtain the 210 skill atoms to anchor our skill-space as coordinates, we specify the direction of occupational skill change within this system. We quantify the rise and fall of skill atoms as a function of how all 727 occupations shift collectively. Rising atoms are those a majority of occupations approach, and declining atoms are those a majority of occupations depart. Specifically, we calculate the overall importance of a skill atom as the sum of its weights across all occupations in that year and compare how overall importance changed between 2010 and 2018 following the procedures detailed below.

1) The compositionality of occupations based on skill atoms:

a) Map each occupation to 5% core skills filtered by skill probability

b) Map each skill to atoms - Denote each skill s with its weights on each atom j :

$$s = \sum_{j=1}^{210} weight_{sj} \quad (4)$$

Note that according to the current model, there are only 5 non-zero $weight_{sj}$ for each skill s .

c) Map each occupation to atoms - Denote each of the 727 occupations in a given year (2010 or 2018) as a combination of atoms by adding up its core skills represented by atoms in the equation (5). The weight of each atom for each occupation is normalized by dividing the sum of all atom weights for the given occupation. For an occupation O_t with S_t core skills at time point t :

$$O_t = \sum_{j=1}^{210} weight_{otj} \quad (5)$$

in which

$$weight_{otj} = \frac{\sum_{s=1}^{S_t} weight_{sj}}{\sum_{j=1}^{210} \sum_{s=1}^{S_t} weight_{sj}} \quad (6)$$

2) The overall importance change of skill atoms on the job space:

a) Measure the overall importance level for each skill atom on the job space at a given time point - for each atom j at each time point t , summing up its normalized weight for each occupation o ($weight_{otj}$):

$$importance_{jt} = \sum_{o=1}^{727} weight_{otj} \quad (7)$$

b) Measure atom overall importance change on the job space between 2010 and 2018 - for atom j :

$$ImportanceChange_j = importance_{j_{2018}} - importance_{j_{2010}} \quad (8)$$

Fig.S3a presents these 210 skill atoms in a matrix of 14 rows and 15 columns. To demonstrate the relative location of all 210 atoms on a 2-D graph, we first apply the T-SNE transformation on the original skill atom vectors to reduce their dimension from 200 to 2. We then construct a grid of 15 columns and 14 rows on the area between the lowest and highest values for each of the 2 dimensions for all atoms. Finally, for each node in the grid, we assign the nearest unassigned atom to occupy it. Finally, we employed two human coders to label these 210 skill atoms “human” or “machine”-related based on the closest 25 skills to a given skill atom in the space to observe how these two kinds of skill atoms rose or declined in the past decade. Fig.S3b shows two exemplary occupations and their most dramatically altered atoms, 2010 to 2018. We present human-interface skill atoms that decline in importance across all jobs and machine-interface atoms that increase in importance in this period (Fig.S3c-d) to highlight global transformations of skill in the U.S. labor market. Future work can build on these spaces to explore other causes and consequences of the rise and fall of skill atoms for skill change across distinct occupations.

3. Supplementary Results

3.1 Job Zone and Skill Change

We use O*NET five-level job zone classification (i.e., “little or no preparation”, “some preparation”, “medium preparation,” “considerable preparation”, “extensive preparation”) as a proxy for occupational skill level. The job zone measure (<https://www.onetonline.org/help/online/zones>) reflects on-the-job training and experience in addition to formal education in capturing the first-order learning costs associated with each job—their relative difference from no education. Fig. S4 demonstrates that skill change decreases as job zones increase from 1 to 5 except that jobs in zone 5 change more than those in zone 4.

3.2 Occupational Skill Change as the Most Significant Skill Transition

In the main paper, we measure occupational skill change as the distance between the occupational average skill vector at different time points. This approach may underestimate the skill change of high-skilled occupations compared to low-skilled occupations under a situation when both groups of occupations add the same number of distant new skills, and the high-skilled occupations also add many more similar new skills. With this skill-adding structure, the high-skilled occupations change more than the low-skilled occupations, yet the large number of similar skill additions may end up “diluting” the significant change embodied in the addition of dissimilar skills. To address this potential bias, we developed an alternative measurement to characterize occupational skill change as its most significant distance of skill transition, and tested whether low-skilled occupations still change more than high-skilled counterparts.

For each occupation o , we identify the n newly-added core skills in 2018. For each of these new skills, s_n , we find its nearest skill (based on embedding distance), s_{n10} , among the 2010 core skills of o . We consider the embedding distance between s_n and s_{n10} as reflecting the minimum amount of skill transition needed for a worker who held o in 2010 to acquire s_n . Calculating such distance from all pairs of s_n and s_{n10} , we use the maximum pairwise skill transition distance to measure the most significant individual skill transition a worker who held o in 2010 needs to experience to keep their job in 2018. To rule out the influence of outliers that may arise at the maximum boundary, we also investigated measurements based on various top positions within the distribution of individual skill transition. Specifically, we considered the pairwise skill transition distance that ranks the top 5% and 10% when ordered from the largest to the smallest.

In Table S1, we regress these three measurements of occupational skill change on occupational skill complexity (natural log of average core skill number), natural log of average occupational annual wage, and average education year, respectively. Results show that low-skilled occupations still have larger skill change than high-skilled occupations when skill change is measured as the most significant individual skill transition.

3.3 Upskilling of Low-Skilled Jobs

To understand whether the significant skill change that took place in low-skilled jobs denoted an upskilling direction, we calculated the skill gap between the low-skilled job group and high-skilled job group in 2010 and 2018 and examined whether the gap has narrowed over the years. In Fig. S5a-c, we divided occupations into two groups based on three different criteria: (a) occupations with core skill number at or above median core skill number across all occupations are classified into the high-skilled group, and the rest is classified into the low-skilled groups; (b) occupations with average annual pay at or above the median across all occupations are classified into the high-skilled group, and the rest is classified into the low-skilled groups; (c) occupations with college or above education requirement are classified into the high-skilled group, and the rest is classified into the low-skilled groups.

We calculate the skill gap between the high-skilled and low-skilled occupation group in a given year by pairing nearest occupations across the two groups and average the pairwise distance. Specifically, for each occupation in the high-skilled group in 2010, we pair it with its nearest occupation (based on 2010 average skill vector) among all low-skilled group occupations in 2010. Following the same procedure, we find the nearest occupation in the high-skilled group for each low-skilled group occupation in 2010. The skill distance between the high-skilled and low-skilled occupation groups in 2010 is measured as the average of all these pairwise occupation skill vector distances in 2010. The left yellow bars in Fig.S5a-c represent the skill distance between the high-skilled and low-skilled occupation groups in 2010, whereas the right green bars in Fig.S5a-c represent the inter-group skill distance in 2018, calculated based on the same approach described above. The three panels all suggest an ‘upskilling’ story of low-skilled occupations moving closer to high-skilled occupations in terms of skill requirements from 2010 to 2018.

3.4 Re-Educational Costs Reflected by Occupational Skill Change

Table S2 presents two job ad examples picked from January 2010 data to illustrate the type of comparison we are making in calculating the extra education necessitated by marginal skill change. The first example includes two ads for administrative assistant positions at entry and senior levels. Both ads require basic administrative skills, such as communication and administrative support, as well as proficiency in Microsoft Office tools like Excel, Word, and PowerPoint. The senior position, however, also requires specialized skills in customer management, such as Siebel CRM, Portal Tools, Customer Information Control System (CICS), Direct Mail, and Newsletters. Here, the skill distance between the two ads is 0.17, and the senior role requires an additional 2 years of education compared to the entry-level role (16 vs 14 years). The second example includes two job ads for registered nurses with different levels of specializations. Both positions require basic patient care and service skills, whereas the position that specializes in Interventional Radiology additionally requires more advanced skills on this direction, such as Advanced Cardiac Life Support (ACLS), Catheterization, Catheterization Laboratory (CATH LAB), Critical Care, and Interventional Radiology (IR). The skill distance between the two job posts is 0.15 and the education year difference is 2 years.

As mentioned in the method section, we examined the distribution of the number of added skills per occupation for within-occupation job post pairs where post y not only requires all skills specified by post x plus additional skills, but also requires more years of education than post x .

These posts are selected from a 10% random sample of 2010 data. Fig. S6 illustrates eight example occupations, each showcasing distinct distribution types peaking at varying numbers of additional skills. These unimodal distributions with peaks m_o suggest that on each occupational career leader there is a regularly-required skill progression consisting of m_o skills that are usually obtained through a more advanced education degree. Because our data do not allow a comprehensive measurement of all sorts of re-training for skill acquisition and that there are only a few levels of education degrees, we apply specific analytical sample selection criteria in order to upweight these cases where formal education requirements differ between job posts within the same occupation.

We focus on analyzing 6,585,524 pairs of job posts x and y where they belong to the same occupation o , and y require m_o , $m_o - 1$, or $m_o + 1$ more skills on top of the common set of skills shared with x . Again, they are selected from the same 10% random sample of all 2010 job posts data. Note that zooming back to this broader sample, job post y may add m_o skills but does not require a higher degree than x because either those skills are a different set, or could also be obtained without a new formal degree. We aim to test whether larger skill distances predict degree requirement changes and more substantial education year differences by comparing a range of cases, encompassing those with no meaningful degree changes, those with such changes, and variations in the magnitude of change among them. In the first column of Table S3, we regress the pairwise education year difference on the embedding distance between the average skill vectors of the jobs. These variables show a positive and statistically significant relationship.

Because the job posts pairs within each occupation tend to present similar pattern, we aggregate the data unit to occupation level by calculating for each occupation the average required education year difference and skill distance based on three groups of job posts pairs: pairs with m_o , $m_o - 1$, or $m_o + 1$ skill addition, respectively. The 2nd column in Table S3 presents the regression at occupation level and shows a stronger positive correlation between skill distance and education requirement difference. We then transform skill distances into z-scores in the 3rd column of Table S3 to facilitate the interpretation of results. We find that one standard deviation increase in skill distance is associated with 0.172 years more schooling.

To ensure these patterns are not a production of this specific sample, we applied different random selection approaches to draw samples from 2010 data, including with different seeds or randomly select a full month data. Based on the six different random samples we examined, the association between education year difference and skill distance is always positive and statistically significant. The average of the Pearson correlation of these variables is 0.05 with raw job post unit of analysis, and 0.14 with aggregated occupation level of analysis. The average coefficient from regressing education year difference on the z-score of skill distance is 0.1 at raw job post level, and 0.17 at aggregated occupation level.

3.5 Labor Market Tightness and Skill Change

We computed the year-on-year average occupational skill changes (e.g., 2010-2011, 2011-2012, etc.) across all occupations from 2010-2018 and found a positive correlation with the yearly

civilian unemployment rate released by BLS: pearson coefficient 0.95 with p-value less than 0.005. Fig. S7 shows that the yearly average occupational skill changes decline with the yearly unemployment rate from 2010-2018. Given that our skill change measure largely captures upskilling directions, this pattern is consistent with the business cycle literature^{52,53,64}. As the labor market becomes tighter from 2010 to 2018, employers have gradually eased off their upskilling attempts in skill requirements as they decrease education and experience requirements.

3.6 Robustness Check: Controlling for Employer Concentration

For occupations with high average local employer concentration, their skill change could be overwhelmingly determined by changes induced by a few employers. Therefore, we perform several robustness checks to ensure that the variation in job skill change by job skill complexity, employer size and local market size does not merely reflect variation in occupational employer concentration within the local labor market.

Following⁶⁵⁻⁶⁷, we measure employer concentration with the Herfindahl-Hirschman Index (HHI) of the share of BG vacancy postings from each employer for each SOC 6-digit occupations within a local labor market in a given year, as specified in equation (9). To align with the geographical unit used in examining job skill variation by local labor market size, here we identify the local labor market as commuting zones.

$$EmpConcentr_{o,k,t} = \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{JobAds_{i,o,k,t}}{\sum_{i=1}^N JobAds_{i,o,k,t}} \right)^2 \quad (9)$$

where $JobAds_{i,o,k,t}$ refers to the number of BG vacancy advertisements posted by employer i on occupation o in local market k during year t .

The regression analyses in this section and the next are all based on a dataset that concatenates job skill change values calculated from four different sub-samples: job posts of large local markets and large employers, those of large local markets and small employers, those of small local markets and large employers, and those of small local markets and small employers. Large employers or local markets refer to those in the highest 10th percentile of job posts annually. For each of the four sub-samples, we extract core skills for each occupation based on the job posts of firms and local markets of given size and construct occupation vector representations for different time points. For example, with 2010 and 2018 occupation vectors constructed from job ads posted by large employers in large local markets, we calculate a set of job skill change scores for large firms in large local markets. Concatenating four sets of occupational skill change scores, we end up with 1952 observations, each of which summarizes its occupation, employer size, and local market size information.

Assuming that job skill level is constant across markets and organizations, we use the same collection of occupational skill level measurements for observations from different sub-samples. We measure skill complexity as the log number of top 5% core skills calculated based on the full sample; education as the average required entry level education years calculated based on the full sample; and pay as the log of average annual median salary calculated based on the full sample. For employer concentration, we calculate two sets of average occupational employer concentration for large and small local markets. For each occupation and local market combination, we average the 2010 and 2018 employer concentration scores. Following the

common practice in the existing papers⁶⁵⁻⁶⁷, we use the natural employer concentration for regression estimation.

Table S4 presents OLS regression results explaining job skill change variation with the three different measurements for job skill level: job skill complexity, pay, and education. Consistent with Fig. 2 in the main body, models 1-3 show that low-skilled occupations change more. Models 4-5 demonstrate that this pattern still holds when employer concentration is controlled. The coefficients for employer concentration align with the findings in⁶⁷ --- occupations with larger local employer concentration experience more re-skilling.

Table S5 presents a series of occupational fixed effect model results describing how skill content change for the same occupation varies with organization and local market size. Model 1 and 2 show that larger organizations and larger local markets experience smaller skill changes for the same occupation than their smaller counterparts. As is shown in model 3, these results are still robust when employer concentration is taken into consideration, when market size is controlled for testing employer size variation, as well as when employer size is controlled for testing market size variation. Surprisingly, when employer and labor market size is controlled, larger employer concentration correlates with lower job skill change. Given that employer concentration is constructed at a relatively narrow region level, this pattern might result from the high collinearity between local market size and employer concentration.

3.7 Robustness Check: Different Job Content Scope with Skill Weights

While the BG job postings data provide rich and valuable information on dynamic job skill requirements that enables analyses in this paper, the data also create the new task of identifying the relative importance of skills to jobs as compared with the O*NET data. In the main analysis, we adopt a discrete approach to account for skill importance differences in representing occupational skill content --- limiting occupational skill composition to the most common 5% skills for a given occupation. This 5% threshold is arbitrary, however, and a discrete approach is not necessarily better than a continuous approach that assigns weights to each skill. Therefore, we present a series of robustness checks here with different job content scopes (all skills, top 50% core skills, and top 75% core skills) using a continuous approach to incorporate skill importance differences: we represent occupation vectors as the sum of weighted skill vectors, as shown in equation (10).


$$Vector_{o,t} = \sum_{s=1}^{S_t} \frac{Freq_{o,s,t}}{Freq_{o,t}} \times Vector_s \quad (10)$$

where the weight is the proportion of occurrences of skill s in job posts on occupation o in year t among the sum of occurrences for all skills that appear in job posts on occupation o in year t .

Table S6 consists of three sets of estimations of model 4 in the main table S4 that explain job skill change variation with skill complexity using all skills, top 50% core skills, and 75% core skills to define job skill content, respectively. Similarly, Table S7 presents estimations of model 3 from Table S5 testing the variation of skill change by organization and local market size with different job content scopes. All findings are robust to the continuous skill weight approach and different thresholds for job skill content definition.


4. Supplementary Figures

4.1 Figure S1. Validation of BG data representativeness




Supplementary Figure 1. Validation of BG data representativeness: **a**, BG occupational demand is highly consistent with the state of occupational employment in the U.S. Coral dots are occupations in 2018, while royal blue dots are occupations in 2010. The red line is the diagonal $y = x$. The black line shows the red line's vertical translation upward. **b**, BG occupational median pay accurately represents occupational median pay in the U.S. Purple dots are occupations in 2018, while pink dots are the same in 2010. The red line is the diagonal $y = x$. **c**, The BG occupational entry education level information could be trusted to represent the occupational entry education requirement in the U.S. Each dot represents an occupation in 2018.

4.2 Figure S2. Cluster approach to measure occupational skill change




Supplementary Figure 2. Cluster approach to measure occupational skill change: **a**, After roughly controlling for skill distance through tracking skill community share change instead of individual skill probability change, food batchmakers are associated with much larger skill change than programmers. Each unit of the x axis corresponds to a skill community ranked from highest to lowest in terms of skill community share change. The y axis denotes skill community share change for each skill community. Area under the curve (AUC) of skill community share change for each occupation demonstrates the sum of skill community changes for all 6 skill communities from 2010 to 2018. **b**, Occupation skill change measured by skill community share change and skill vector change highly correlate with a 0.76 Pearson correlation.

4.3 Figure S3. Occupations' re-skilling direction illustrated by skill atoms




Supplementary Figure 3: Occupations' re-skilling direction illustrated by skill atoms. **a**, Each dot denotes a latent skill atom learned from the skill embedding space, embodying a meaningful dimension in the skill space and embedding its relationship to the other skill atoms as well as to each compositional skill. There is a division between orange skill atoms defined predominantly by the human interface, and blue atoms defined by requiring machine-operation and/or interface. More machine-interface skill atoms rose in importance between 2010 and 2018, while more human-interface skill atoms fell during the same period. **b**, Examples of the re-skilling direction for individual occupations. For Gaming Dealers employed by casinos, the skill atom that declines most in importance from 2010 to 2018 is hospitality industry knowledge, whereas the one that increases in importance most is big data processing. For Management Analysts, the web development atom declines most and the web analytics atom rises most in importance (2010-2018). **c**, The declining human-interface skill atoms with negative (<0) importance change in the job space: the less transparent an atom, the larger its importance declines. **d**, The rising machine-interface skill atoms with positive (>0) importance increase: the less transparent an atom, the larger its importance increases.

4.4 Figure S4. Job zone and skill change




Supplementary Figure 4. Job zone and skill change: Occupations have higher average skill content change as job zone increase from 1-4. Each bar denotes the average skill vector change for a group of jobs in a specific job zone labeled on the x-axis.

4.5 Figure S5. Upskilling of low-skilled jobs towards high-skilled jobs




Supplementary Figure 5. Upskilling of low-skilled jobs towards high-skilled jobs. a. The skill distance between occupations with relatively complex and simple skills have narrowed from 2010 to 2018. The left yellow bar represents the average skill vector distance between the occupation group with more complex skill requirement (at or above median core skill number across all occupations) and the group of occupations with simpler skill requirements in 2010. The right green bar represents such distance in 2018. **b.** The skill distance between occupations with relatively higher and lower pay have narrowed from 2010 to 2018. The left yellow bar represents the average skill vector distance between the occupation group with higher pay (at or above median in the distribution of annual median salary across all occupations) and the group of occupations with lower pay in 2010. The right green bar represents such distance in 2018. **c.** The skill distance between occupations with college and above vs. non-college degree requirements have narrowed from 2010 to 2018. The left yellow bar represents the average skill vector distance between the occupation group with college and above education requirement and the group of occupations with non-college degree requirements in 2010. The right green bar represents such distance in 2018.

4.6 Figure S6. Distribution of number of added skills by occupation



Supplementary Figure 6. Distribution of number of added skills by occupation. Each panel is constructed based on all pairs of within-occupation 2010 job posts, x and y , where y encompasses all skills required by x plus additional ones, and meanwhile has a higher education degree requirement than x . Each panel presents the distribution of the number of added skills in y compared to x from all pairs of x and y under the title occupation.

4.7 Figure S7. Unemployment rate and job skill change



Supplementary Figure 7. Unemployment rate and job skill change. The blue dots represent the year-on-year (e.g., 2010-2011, 2011-2012, etc.) average occupational skill change, corresponding to the blue y-axis on the left. The orange dots represent the yearly unemployment rate in the U.S., corresponding to the orange y-axis on the right.

5. Supplementary Tables

5.1 Table S1. Explaining job skill change variation with skill complexity, measuring change with the most significant skill transition

<i>Dependent variable: Most Significant Skill Transition</i>									
	Max	Max	Max	Rank 5%	Rank 5%	Rank 5%	Rank 10%	Rank 10%	Rank 10%
Skill Complexity	-0.010*** (0.002)			-0.053*** (0.002)			-0.062*** (0.002)		
Log Annual Pay		-0.021*** (0.006)			-0.053*** (0.007)			-0.069*** (0.007)	
Education			-0.004*** (0.001)			-0.009*** (0.001)			-0.010*** (0.001)
Observations	721	721	721	721	721	721	721	721	721
R ²	0.025	0.019	0.025	0.486	0.081	0.072	0.536	0.113	0.086
Adjusted R ²	0.024	0.018	0.024	0.485	0.080	0.071	0.535	0.112	0.085
Residual Std. Error	0.057 (df=719)	0.057 (df=719)	0.057 (df=719)	0.050 (df=719)	0.067 (df=719)	0.068 (df=719)	0.053 (df=719)	0.073 (df=719)	0.074 (df=719)
F Statistic	18.775*** (df=1; 719)	14.079*** (df=1; 719)	18.379*** (df=1; 719)	679.363*** (df=1; 719)	63.626*** (df=1; 719)	55.877*** (df=1; 719)	829.453*** (df=1; 719)	91.385*** (df=1; 719)	67.906*** (df=1; 719)

Note:

*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

5.2 Table S2. Example of job posts pairs used for predicting re-education cost

	Job Ad <i>i</i>	Job Ad <i>j</i>	Job Ad <i>i</i>	Job Ad <i>j</i>
BGTJobId	311043099	311477284	311765112	311777227
Title	Administrative Assistant	Administrative Assistant III	Registered Nurse Signature Suites Vip	Registered Nurse Interventional Radiology N
Education Years	14	16	14	16
Common Skills	Communication Skills Microsoft Excel Microsoft Powerpoint Administrative Support Microsoft Word	Communication Skills Microsoft Excel Microsoft Powerpoint Administrative Support Microsoft Word	Budgeting Patient Care Process Improvement Research Teamwork/Collaboration Customer Contact Life Support Planning	Budgeting Patient Care Process Improvement Research Teamwork/Collaboration Customer Contact Life Support Planning
Additional skill		Customer Information Control System (CICS) Direct Mail Newsletters Portal Tools Siebel CRM		Advanced Cardiac Life Support (ACLS) Catheterization Catheterization Laboratory (CATH LAB) Critical Care Interventional Radiology (IR)
Skill Distance	0.17		0.15	

5.3 Table S3. Predicting education year difference with skill distance

<i>Dependent variable: Education Year Difference</i>			
	Job Post Unit	Occupation Aggregated Unit	Occupation Aggregated Unit
Skill Distance	0.741*** (0.007)	1.839*** (0.352)	
Skill Distance Z-score			0.172*** (0.033)
Observations	6,585,524	1,257	1,257
R ²	0.002	0.021	0.021
Adjusted R ²	0.002	0.020	0.020
Residual Std. Error	2.038 (df=6585522)	1.167 (df=1255)	1.167 (df=1255)
F Statistic	11524.516*** (df=1; 6585522)	27.230*** (df=1; 1255)	27.230*** (df=1; 1255)
Note:	*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001		

5.4 Table S4. Explaining job skill change variation with skill complexity, controlling for employer concentration

<i>Dependent variable: Job Skill Change</i>						
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
Skill Complexity	-0.048*** (0.002)			-0.042*** (0.002)		
Log Annual Pay		-0.030*** (0.004)			-0.026*** (0.003)	
Education			-0.005*** (0.001)			-0.005*** (0.001)
Log Emp. Concentr.				0.009*** (0.001)	0.024*** (0.001)	0.024*** (0.001)
Observations	1,952	1,952	1,952	1,952	1,952	1,952
R ²	0.338	0.034	0.027	0.354	0.191	0.192
Adjusted R ²	0.338	0.033	0.026	0.353	0.191	0.191
Residual Std. Error	0.051 (df=1950)	0.061 (df=1950)	0.062 (df=1950)	0.050 (df=1949)	0.056 (df=1949)	0.056 (df=1949)
F Statistic	995.353*** (df=1; 1950)	68.536*** (df=1; 1950)	53.888*** (df=1; 1950)	534.334*** (df=2; 1949)	230.672*** (df=2; 1949)	231.933*** (df=2; 1949)

Note: *p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

Log Emp. Concentr. refers to the natural log of HHI (employer concentration).

5.5 Table S5. Explaining job skill change variation with employer and market size, controlling for employer concentration

<i>Dependent variable: Job Skill Change</i>			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Large Employer	-0.024*** (0.002)		-0.027*** (0.002)
Large Market		-0.019*** (0.002)	-0.046*** (0.004)
Log Emp. Concentr.			-0.016*** (0.002)
Occ. FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	1,952	1,952	1,952
R ²	0.730	0.719	0.763
Adjusted R ²	0.599	0.583	0.647
Residual Std. Error	0.040 (df=1313)	0.040 (df=1313)	0.037 (df=1311)
F Statistic	5.569*** (df=638; 1313)	5.276*** (df=638; 1313)	6.588*** (df=640; 1311)

Note: *p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

Log Emp. Concentr. refers to the natural log of HHI (employer concentration).

5.6 Table S6. Explaining job skill change variation with skill complexity, different job content scope and skill weights

<i>Dependent variable: Job Skill Change</i>			
	All Skills	Top 50% Skills	Top 75% Skills
Skill Complexity	-0.023*** (0.001)	-0.023*** (0.001)	-0.024*** (0.001)
Log Emp. Concentr.	0.003** (0.001)	0.003** (0.001)	0.003** (0.001)
Observations	2,551	2,551	2,551
R ²	0.218	0.218	0.223
Adjusted R ²	0.217	0.217	0.222
Residual Std. Error	0.042 (df=2548)	0.042 (df=2548)	0.043 (df=2548)
F Statistic	354.181*** (df=2; 2548)	354.534*** (df=2; 2548)	365.124*** (df=2; 2548)

Note: *p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

Log Emp. Concentr. refers to the natural log of HHI (employer concentration).

5.7 Table S7. Explaining job skill change variation with employer and market size, different job content scope and skill weights

<i>Dependent variable: Job Skill Change</i>			
	All Skills	Top 50% Skills	Top 75% Skills
Large Employer	-0.006*** (0.001)	-0.006*** (0.001)	-0.005*** (0.001)
Large Market	-0.009*** (0.003)	-0.009*** (0.003)	-0.007** (0.003)
Log Emp. Concentr.	-0.002 (0.002)	-0.002 (0.002)	-0.001 (0.002)
Occ. FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	2,551	2,551	2,551
R ²	0.692	0.692	0.701
Adjusted R ²	0.568	0.569	0.581
Residual Std. Error	0.031 (df=1819)	0.031 (df=1819)	0.032 (df=1819)
F Statistic	5.593*** (df=731; 1819)	5.599*** (df=731; 1819)	5.846*** (df=731; 1819)

Note: *p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

Log Emp. Concentr. refers to the natural log of HHI (employer concentration).