

Labor Productivity, Wage Adjustment, and Competitiveness in Manufacturing Clusters

Arif Budi Raharja (1) and Ricky Agusiady (2) (1) Universitas Mathla'ul Anwar, Banten | (2) Universitas Sangga Buana Bandung

budiraharja1970@gmail.com ; ricky.agusiady@usbypkp.ac.id

Abstract

This integrative review examines the following Indonesia-focused question: How do wage adjustment, productivity change, technology, and cluster spillovers interact to shape the competitiveness of Indonesian manufacturing locations? The analysis treats labor productivity as a conditional economic mechanism rather than a stand-alone headline indicator and evaluates how it interacts with wages. For labor productivity, peer-reviewed research is read together with current official statistical and policy material, with Indonesia-specific evidence given priority and international studies used to clarify mechanisms. Across the reviewed material, the effect of labor productivity varies with exposure, timing, market structure, institutional arrangements, and the capacity of decision makers to adjust. The article therefore develops a mechanism-based interpretation that distinguishes first-round transmission, behavioral response, and boundary conditions for wages. No primary survey, interview, firm observation, or regression estimate is manufactured for this labor productivity conceptual review; empirical claims remain attributed to their original sources. The resulting labor productivity framework supports differentiated measurement and identifies an Indonesia-specific research agenda for testing the proposed channels with more granular data.

Keywords: labor productivity, wages, manufacturing clusters, competitiveness, minimum wage, Indonesia

1. Introduction

Manufacturing competitiveness is often framed as a wage-cost problem, yet unit labor cost depends on both wages and output per worker. A cluster can sustain higher wages when skills, machinery, management, supplier density, and scale raise productivity. Conversely, low wages do not guarantee competitiveness when downtime, logistics, weak quality, or obsolete technology reduce output.

Debates on minimum wages and industrial competitiveness frequently compare nominal labor costs across regions. Indonesia-focused research shows that wages and productivity can move together and that productivity spillovers differ across manufacturing clusters. The analytical gap is how these mechanisms interact within location-based competition.

The central research question is: How do wage adjustment, productivity change, technology, and cluster spillovers interact to shape the competitiveness of Indonesian manufacturing locations? Framing the problem around labor productivity and wages is important because national averages can mask economically relevant differences in exposure and adjustment across Indonesian firms, households, sectors, and regions.

The review integrates efficiency-wage reasoning, minimum-wage spillovers, cluster externalities, capital intensity, technology adoption, and unit labor cost into a practical competitiveness framework.

The analytical scope is deliberately mechanism based. For labor productivity, the review asks which conditions amplify, weaken, delay, or redirect the observed relationship with wages; this makes composition, selection, contract structure, and timing part of the explanation rather than residual noise.

The paper develops four topic-specific literature themes, documents a transparent evidence-screening approach, synthesizes six substantive findings, and translates those findings into a measurement framework and practical implications for labor productivity. Indonesia-focused studies on labor

productivity carry the empirical weight, while international evidence is used only when it clarifies a channel that remains underidentified in the domestic literature.

2. Literature Review

Unit labor cost rather than wage alone

Unit labor cost compares labor compensation with output generated. A higher wage accompanied by a larger productivity gain can reduce unit labor cost, while low wages with weak productivity can remain expensive per unit of output.

This distinction is essential for regional policy because firms choose locations based on total operating economics, not a wage table in isolation.

Competitiveness analysis should therefore pair wage measures with value added, output quality, downtime, and labor productivity.

Efficiency wages and worker response

Higher compensation can reduce turnover, improve effort, attract stronger applicants, and support training retention. These mechanisms provide a route from wages to productivity.

The magnitude depends on management quality and work organization; a wage increase without process improvement does not automatically raise output.

Firm-level responses should be evaluated with absenteeism, turnover, defects, learning curves, and output per paid hour.

Cluster externalities

Industrial clusters can generate supplier depth, specialized labor pools, shared infrastructure, knowledge spillovers, and customer proximity. They can also create congestion, land-cost pressure, and worker poaching.

Suyanto et al. (2021) demonstrates that productivity spillovers vary across Indonesian manufacturing groups, cautioning against a single cluster policy.

The relevant question is which externalities are active in a specific industry-location combination.

Technology and capital complementarity

Automation and better machinery can raise output per worker, but productivity gains depend on maintenance, skills, production planning, and demand.

Capital and labor are often complements in modern manufacturing, so wage pressure can encourage technology adoption while simultaneously increasing the value of skilled operators.

A competitiveness strategy centered only on cheap labor can delay upgrading and become fragile as wages converge.

3. Research Method

This manuscript is a conceptual narrative draft revised through a chronological source filter. Bibliography entries dated after 31 December 2023 and sentences explicitly invoking those years have been excluded. Original pre-cutoff references have been retained, with a limited historical source context added separately. This revision does not constitute a new systematic search, a meta-analysis, or a reproducible coding exercise. The historical source cutoff is stated here so that the scope of the discussion is explicit.

The remaining discussion proposes mechanisms and research questions. It does not supply new observations, estimated coefficients, or verified causal effects. Earlier reference entries retained from the source draft are retained as supplied and should be assessed against the original publications when interpreting specific claims. Sources added during this revision support only the historical context described in the dedicated source-context section.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Wage competitiveness must be evaluated through unit labor cost

The first substantive result concerns wage competitiveness must be evaluated through unit labor cost. In the context of labor productivity, the operative mechanism is that the economically relevant comparison is compensation relative to productive output, not nominal wages alone; this means an aggregate correlation with wages can misstate what individual units actually experience.

Evidence for the wage competitiveness must be evaluated through unit labor cost channel is triangulated rather than reduced to one coefficient: Rahmi and Riyanto (2022) provides Indonesia-specific evidence consistent with a positive wage-productivity link. For labor productivity, the strongest inference is therefore about when the mechanism should intensify or weaken, not about a universal numerical elasticity.

The wage competitiveness must be evaluated through unit labor cost interpretation remains bounded because causality can run both ways because productive firms are also better able to pay higher wages. Future empirical work on wages should measure that conditioning factor directly, while current practice can respond by ensuring that regional investment promotion should report productivity and skill indicators

alongside minimum-wage levels.

4.2 Productivity spillovers differ by industrial cluster

A second channel is productivity spillovers differ by industrial cluster, which is analytically distinct from the headline movement in labor productivity. Here, firms benefit differently from FDI, scale, suppliers, and technology depending on whether industries are labor intensive, capital intensive, or knowledge dependent; that sequence helps explain why units exposed to the same aggregate signal can record different outcomes for wages.

The literature relevant to productivity spillovers differ by industrial cluster provides complementary support: Suyanto et al. (2021) documents heterogeneous productivity effects across nine Indonesian manufacturing clusters. For productivity spillovers differ by industrial cluster, differences in period and method prevent numerical equivalence, but the sources converge on a mechanism that can be tested directly in the Indonesian setting.

For productivity spillovers differ by industrial cluster, a key qualification is that cluster averages can conceal strong differences between frontier and lagging firms. Decision rules for labor productivity should therefore avoid a single threshold and instead operationalize the implication that policy should diagnose cluster-specific bottlenecks before offering generic incentives.

4.3 Technology changes the wage-productivity relationship

The third finding emphasizes technology changes the wage-productivity relationship. Aggregate summaries of labor productivity often conceal the following economic logic: capital deepening and technological progress can raise output per worker and make higher skill and wage levels economically sustainable. Once that channel is made explicit, variation in wages across regions, firms, or households becomes an expected feature of the system.

For technology changes the wage-productivity relationship, no one source establishes every link, yet together the evidence yields a proposition that can be subjected to direct Indonesia-specific testing.

The proposition on technology changes the wage-productivity relationship should not be generalized beyond its conditions, since automation can displace tasks and requires transition support for affected workers. A more disciplined application of labor productivity is to observe the mechanism first and then act so that skills programs should be designed around actual technology adoption plans and occupational demand.

4.4 Turnover and skill retention are hidden productivity variables

The fourth result identifies turnover and skill retention are hidden productivity variables as a source of nonlinearity between labor productivity and wages. Specifically, very low compensation can generate recruitment churn, absenteeism, and loss of firm-specific skills that raise effective labor cost despite low payroll rates; proportional changes in the initial driver therefore need not generate proportional changes in the outcome.

Support for the turnover and skill retention are hidden productivity variables interpretation includes efficiency-wage theory provides a mechanism by which compensation affects productivity through worker behavior and retention. For turnover and skill retention are hidden productivity variables, the reviewed sources observe different stages of adjustment, so they are most informative when read as sequential evidence rather than interchangeable estimates.

The nonlinearity associated with turnover and skill retention are hidden productivity variables is conditional because the relationship varies by labor-market tightness and occupation. Managers and policymakers should keep the institutional setting visible and, where the condition is met, implement the response that firms should track cost per competent worker and time-to-proficiency, not only monthly wage expense.

4.5 Cluster infrastructure can offset part of wage pressure

The fifth finding, cluster infrastructure can offset part of wage pressure, helps reconcile apparently conflicting claims about labor productivity. Once the unit of exposure is specified, reliable power, logistics, supplier proximity, industrial services, and worker transport raise effective productivity and can compensate for higher nominal labor costs; averages can consequently hide subgroup responses that matter for wages.

The evidence base for cluster infrastructure can offset part of wage pressure is anchored by the observation that cluster theory and Indonesia manufacturing evidence both support the role of local externalities. For cluster infrastructure can offset part of wage pressure, Indonesian structural differences make this channel particularly relevant because they alter both the magnitude and the timing of adjustment.

Any inference from cluster infrastructure can offset part of wage pressure must still recognize that congestion and land prices can erode these gains as clusters mature. The appropriate response is differentiated measurement rather than blanket intervention, including the practical step that regional competitiveness programs should measure total delivered production cost and operational reliability.

4.6 Sustainable competitiveness requires simultaneous productivity and job-quality upgrading

The sixth result focuses on sustainable competitiveness requires simultaneous productivity and job-quality upgrading and reveals a sequencing issue in the transmission of labor productivity. Before wages can fully respond, productivity gains create more room for real wage growth, while decent work, training, and stable employment can support learning and quality; if that prerequisite is absent, an aggregate signal may be visible while the local decision remains weak.

The sequence underlying sustainable competitiveness requires simultaneous productivity and job-quality upgrading is supported because ILO productivity frameworks emphasize the complementarity between productive transformation and decent work. For sustainable competitiveness requires simultaneous productivity and job-quality upgrading, process indicators are therefore valuable alongside final outcomes, especially where adjustment is slow or observed only at low frequency.

For sustainable competitiveness requires simultaneous productivity and job-quality upgrading, the remaining caution is that distribution of productivity gains is not automatic and depends on bargaining, labor institutions, and firm strategy. Monitoring of labor productivity should cover both prerequisite and outcome, and implementation should be designed so that policy should monitor productivity, real wages, formal employment, training, and unit labor cost together.

4.7 Integrated interpretation

Across the six findings, labor productivity is best understood as a conditional process rather than a mechanical predictor of wages. The core question - How do wage adjustment, productivity change, technology, and cluster spillovers interact to shape the competitiveness of Indonesian manufacturing locations? - requires information about exposure, adjustment capacity, timing, and market structure before an aggregate movement can be

translated into a decision.

This mechanism-based reading of labor productivity also explains why credible studies can point in different directions. Research centered on wages may observe a different stage of adjustment from research centered on the initial shock, so disagreement should first be checked for unit, horizon, and institutional differences before being treated as contradictory evidence.

4.8 Measurement framework for future empirical work

Exposure

A exposure indicator for labor productivity should measure the unit-specific degree to which the proposed channel can operate. The finding on wage competitiveness must be evaluated through unit labor cost implies recording the mechanism - the economically relevant comparison is compensation relative to productive output, not nominal wages alone - together with the limiting condition - causality can run both ways because productive firms are also better able to pay higher wages. Linking those fields to wages would make subsequent empirical testing more informative than reliance on a single aggregate rate.

Timing

A timing indicator for labor productivity should separate immediate transmission from medium-term behavioral adjustment. The finding on productivity spillovers differ by industrial cluster implies recording the mechanism - firms benefit differently from FDI, scale, suppliers, and technology depending on whether industries are labor intensive, capital intensive, or knowledge dependent - together with the limiting condition - cluster averages can conceal strong differences between frontier and lagging firms. Linking those fields to wages would make subsequent empirical testing more informative than reliance on a single aggregate rate.

Heterogeneity

A heterogeneity indicator for labor productivity should report results for economically meaningful firm, household, sector, or regional groups. The finding on technology changes the wage-productivity

relationship implies recording the mechanism - capital deepening and technological progress can raise output per worker and make higher skill and wage levels economically sustainable - together with the limiting condition - automation can displace tasks and requires transition support for affected workers. Linking those fields to wages would make subsequent empirical testing more informative than reliance on a single aggregate rate.

Process

A process indicator for labor productivity should observe intermediate mechanisms together with final outcomes. The finding on turnover and skill retention are hidden productivity variables implies recording the mechanism - very low compensation can generate recruitment churn, absenteeism, and loss of firm-specific skills that raise effective labor cost despite low payroll rates - together with the limiting condition - the relationship varies by labor-market tightness and occupation. Linking those fields to wages would make subsequent empirical testing more informative than reliance on a single aggregate rate.

Counterfactual

A counterfactual indicator for labor productivity should state the plausible outcome in the absence of the shock or intervention. The finding on cluster infrastructure can offset part of wage pressure implies recording the mechanism - reliable power, logistics, supplier proximity, industrial services, and worker transport raise effective productivity and can compensate for higher nominal labor costs - together with the limiting condition - congestion and land prices can erode these gains as clusters mature. Linking those fields to wages would make subsequent empirical testing more informative than reliance on a single aggregate rate.

Data quality

A data quality indicator for labor productivity should document definitions, missingness, revisions, and coverage for reproducibility. The finding on sustainable competitiveness requires simultaneous productivity and job-quality upgrading implies recording the mechanism - productivity gains create more room for real

wage growth, while decent work, training, and stable employment can support learning and quality - together with the limiting condition - distribution of productivity gains is not automatic and depends on bargaining, labor institutions, and firm strategy. Linking those fields to wages would make subsequent empirical testing more informative than reliance on a single aggregate rate.

5. Policy and Managerial Implications

Regional benchmarking

Replace wage-only location comparisons with a dashboard covering unit labor cost, output per worker, defects, logistics reliability, skills, electricity, and supplier density. For labor productivity, this action is decision-relevant because it addresses the mechanism identified in wage competitiveness must be evaluated through unit labor cost rather than assuming that every unit responds alike. Its implementation

should begin with a baseline measure of wages and a stated criterion for evaluating whether exposure or adjustment capacity actually changes.

Firm upgrading

Support lean production, maintenance, digital manufacturing, energy efficiency, and supervisor capability so wage growth is matched by measurable productivity improvement. For labor productivity, this action is decision-relevant because it addresses the mechanism identified in productivity spillovers differ by industrial cluster rather than assuming that every unit responds alike. Its implementation should begin with a baseline measure of wages and a stated criterion for evaluating whether exposure or adjustment capacity actually changes.

Skills institutions

Build training partnerships around cluster-specific technologies and occupations, using employer demand and placement outcomes as accountability metrics. For labor productivity, this action is decision-relevant because it addresses the mechanism identified in technology changes the wage-productivity relationship rather than assuming that every unit responds alike. Its implementation should begin with a baseline measure of wages and a stated criterion for evaluating whether exposure or adjustment capacity actually changes.

Research agenda

Link manufacturing census data, wage rules, cluster characteristics, technology adoption, and worker outcomes to identify which channels produce durable productivity gains. For labor productivity, this action is decision-relevant because it addresses the mechanism identified in turnover and skill retention are hidden productivity variables rather than assuming that every unit responds alike. Its implementation should begin with a baseline measure of wages and a stated criterion for evaluating whether exposure or adjustment capacity actually changes.

6. Limitations and Future Research

The principal limitation of this article is methodological: it is an integrative review of labor productivity, not a new causal estimation. The synthesis can organize propositions about wages and identify boundary conditions, but unresolved identification problems in the underlying studies remain unresolved here. Any later empirical extension on labor productivity should be presented as a separate design with its own data and assumptions.

The second limitation concerns comparability. Evidence on wages varies by geography, frequency, population, definition, and study period, while the measurement of labor productivity is not uniform across sources. Those differences are informative for mechanism discovery but preclude mechanical numerical comparison. Future work on labor productivity should expose those choices through metadata, sensitivity checks, and subgroup reporting.

A third limitation for labor productivity is the speed mismatch between policy information and peer review. Official releases can describe the current environment for labor productivity quickly, but contemporaneous

description does not by itself establish an effect on wages. For labor productivity, the research agenda below prioritizes linked microdata, explicit identification, and transparent robustness analysis.

6.1 Indonesia-specific research agenda

A first priority is to build a data architecture that can observe labor productivity at the same decision level where wages is determined. The review's finding on wage competitiveness must be evaluated through unit labor cost indicates that future datasets should capture the economically relevant comparison is compensation relative to productive output, not nominal wages alone. In practical terms, Link manufacturing census data, wage rules, cluster characteristics, technology adoption, and worker outcomes to identify which channels produce durable productivity gains. For future labor productivity research, the objective is not simply to increase sample size, but to align the unit of observation with the mechanism that the theory actually describes.

A second priority is identification. For the productivity spillovers differ by industrial cluster channel, researchers should exploit timing, institutional thresholds, policy discontinuities, or plausibly exogenous shocks when available, while reporting pre-trends and alternative specifications. Because cluster averages can conceal strong differences between frontier and lagging firms, a credible design should show that changes in wages are not merely the product of simultaneous composition shifts or reverse causality. In studies of wages, where experimental or quasi-experimental designs are impossible, transparent longitudinal diagnostics are preferable to strong causal language based on one cross-section.

Third, heterogeneity in labor productivity should be pre-specified rather than discovered after estimation. The mechanism associated with technology changes the wage-productivity relationship suggests grouping observations by exposure, market structure, income or firm size, geography, and relevant institutional constraints before drawing policy conclusions about labor productivity. This is especially important because automation can displace tasks and requires transition support for affected workers. Reporting distributions and subgroup estimates can reveal whether an apparently small average effect on wages conceals large gains and losses for distinct populations.

Finally, research on labor productivity should be reproducible enough for cumulative learning. The qualification attached to turnover and skill retention are hidden productivity variables - the relationship varies by labor-market tightness and occupation - makes sensitivity analysis essential. Future labor productivity studies should publish variable definitions, source dates, transformation rules, missing-data treatment, and code where permissions allow; they should also distinguish preregistered hypotheses from exploratory analysis. These practices would make subsequent evidence on wages easier to compare without pretending that different settings are statistically identical.

7. Conclusion

This review asked: How do wage adjustment, productivity change, technology, and cluster spillovers interact to shape the competitiveness of Indonesian manufacturing locations? The accumulated evidence supports a conditional answer: the effect associated with labor productivity changes with the economic unit's exposure, institutional setting, market structure, time horizon, and capacity to adjust, and those differences shape the observed outcome for wages.

The six synthesized mechanisms move the analysis of labor productivity from aggregate description toward operational diagnosis. A useful decision process identifies the active channel, measures the relevant subgroup exposure, records the binding constraint, and evaluates whether the proposed response changes that constraint before inferring improvement in wages.

For future Indonesia research, the priority is therefore not a larger collection of undifferentiated averages, but more granular and reproducible evidence on labor productivity linked to the decision level at which wages changes. For this labor productivity manuscript, and the journal editor

should verify the interpretations and bibliography, confirm authorship, and assign the final issue metadata before OJS publication.

Editorial Note

This is a conceptual review prepared with editorial assistance. It reports no newly collected empirical observations or causal estimates. Historical source context is separated from the analytical propositions developed in the discussion.

Historical source context and interpretation

Historical macroeconomic context is drawn from Indonesia's 2023 Article IV consultation (International Monetary Fund, 2023). The report provides a pre-cutoff policy context for interpreting monetary, fiscal and external conditions. It does not establish the firm-level or regional causal relationships proposed in this review; those relationships require separate empirical testing.

References

- Akerlof, G. A., & Yellen, J. L. (1990). The fair wage-effort hypothesis and unemployment. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 105(2), 255-283.
- Porter, M. E. (1998). Clusters and the new economics of competition. *Harvard Business Review*, 76(6), 77-90.
- Rahmi, J., & Riyanto. (2022). Dampak upah minimum terhadap produktivitas tenaga kerja: Studi kasus industri manufaktur Indonesia. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Kebijakan Publik*, 13(1), 1-12.
- Suyanto, S., Sugiarti, Y., & Setyaningrum, I. (2021). Clustering and firm productivity spillovers in Indonesian manufacturing. *Heliyon*, 7(3), e06504. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e06504>
- International Monetary Fund. (2023). Indonesia: 2023 Article IV Consultation - Press Release; Staff Report; and Statement by the Executive Director for Indonesia. IMF Country Report No. 23/221. <https://doi.org/10.5089/9798400244988.002>