

EXCHANGE RATE FLUCTUATION AND EXPORT COMPETITIVENESS OF LOCAL INDUSTRIES

Arif Budi Raharja, Raden Roro Fatma Sari, SE., MSI

1 STIE YKP, Yogyakarta

2 Universitas Sangga Buana YPKP

budiraharja1970@gmail.com, sarie801@yahoo.com

Abstract

Background: A weaker rupiah can improve the foreign-currency price of Indonesian exports, but the advantage is conditional. Firms that depend heavily on imported components, machinery or foreign-currency debt can experience higher costs at the same time that export receipts increase. **Aims:** This article examines the mechanisms that connect the topic to organizational or policy performance and identifies the conditions that make those mechanisms stronger or weaker. **Research Method:** A structured narrative review integrates peer-reviewed research with authoritative policy, statistical, and professional sources, including Yanti et al. (2026); Sumiyati (2020). Sources are coded by outcome, mechanism, boundary condition, and practical implication. **Results and Conclusion:** The synthesis indicates that outcomes are heterogeneous. The most important distinction is between the level of the exchange rate and its volatility. Predictable depreciation can be incorporated into contracts and pricing more easily than abrupt two-way movement that changes margins between quotation, production and settlement. Six recurring themes show that implementation quality, information, capability, and institutional context frequently matter as much as the headline policy or technology. **Contribution:** The article offers an evidence-based framework for local exporters and manufacturing firms that translates the literature into decision principles without claiming primary data that were not collected.

Keywords: *Exchange Rate, Export Competitiveness, Local Industries, Manufacturing, Indonesia, Trade Risk*

Introduction

A weaker rupiah can improve the foreign-currency price of Indonesian exports, but the advantage is conditional. Firms that depend heavily on imported components, machinery or foreign-currency debt can experience higher costs at the same time that export receipts increase. This question is timely for Indonesian industries whose export revenues, imported inputs, financing and investment can respond differently to the same rupiah movement. Recent institutional and research sources such as Mustofa & Faizin (2025); Sumiyati (2020) provide the broader context for the discussion.

The most important distinction is between the level of the exchange rate and its volatility. Predictable depreciation can be incorporated into contracts and pricing more easily than abrupt two-way movement that changes margins between quotation, production and settlement. For local exporters and manufacturing firms, the practical issue is therefore to separate the part of the problem that can be managed internally from the part that depends on markets, infrastructure or public policy. That distinction keeps the analysis from turning into either technological optimism or policy fatalism.

The topic also has a measurement problem. Organizations tend to record what is easiest to observe, while the outcome that matters is often delayed, distributed across functions or affected by several causes at once. Bank Indonesia (2026); OECD (2024a) illustrate why aggregate indicators are useful for context but insufficient for firm-level judgment. A good analysis must connect the indicator to a mechanism and then ask whether the mechanism is plausible in the specific operating environment.

Another complication is heterogeneity. Local exporters and manufacturing firms do not start from the same position. Size, skills, access to finance, technology, governance quality and market exposure all shape the capacity to respond. The same intervention can therefore be beneficial for one organization

and premature for another. This variation is not a weakness in the literature; it is information about the conditions under which a practice is likely to work.

The article asks three questions. First, which mechanisms explain the relationship implied by the title? Second, which organizational or institutional conditions strengthen or weaken those mechanisms? Third, what can decision makers do without assuming that a single policy, technology or management tool will solve the entire problem? The questions are deliberately practical because the objective is to support judgment rather than to manufacture a universal formula.

The contribution is an integrative framework that treats performance as the result of interacting choices. It organizes recent evidence around six themes, identifies recurring tensions, and translates the synthesis into a set of actions for local exporters and manufacturing firms. The article does not claim original survey or experimental data. It is a structured evidence review intended for author development and editorial refinement before any formal publication decision.

Literature Review

The literature relevant to this topic sits across more than one field. Some sources focus on macro or institutional conditions, while others examine organizational routines, technology adoption or behavioral responses. Sumiyati (2020); BPS (2026); Pratiwi & Firmansyah (2022) are representative of that range. Reading them together is useful because a change in the external environment affects performance only after it passes through decisions about resources, incentives and implementation.

A first conceptual distinction is between an input and a capability. An input may be a technology, source of finance, policy instrument, data set or formal rule. A capability is the repeated ability to use that input well. The distinction matters for local exporters and manufacturing firms because adoption can be measured immediately, whereas capability often becomes visible only when conditions are difficult or when the organization must adapt without losing control.

A second distinction concerns efficiency and resilience. Many practices improve average performance by reducing slack, duplication or transaction cost. Yet highly optimized systems can become brittle if they lack alternative suppliers, skills, channels or decision pathways. The relevant question is not whether slack is good or bad, but which forms of redundancy protect important outcomes and which merely preserve inefficient routines. OECD (2024a); Pratiwi & Firmansyah (2022) provide useful context for this trade-off.

Finally, the literature suggests that trust and information quality are recurring mediators. Managers, employees, customers, investors or citizens act on information only when they regard the process behind it as sufficiently credible. That observation links seemingly different topics: financial reporting, digital platforms, team innovation and public policy all depend on the quality of information and the legitimacy of the process through which decisions are made.

Analytical dimension	Central question	Practical concern
Price competitiveness and pass-through	exporters choose how much of a currency movement to pass to foreign buyers and how much to retain in margin	competitive pressure and contract currency limit pricing freedom
Imported-input exposure	depreciation raises the rupiah cost of imported components, capital goods and some logistics services	gross export revenue can overstate the true currency benefit
Volatility and contracting	uncertain exchange rates affect quotation validity, working capital and the value of receivables	small exporters may lack affordable hedging or treasury expertise
Productivity and investment	higher imported-capital costs can delay modernization even when export cash receipts improve	short-run gains may therefore weaken medium-term competitiveness
Market and product heterogeneity	commodities and destinations respond differently to currency changes	aggregate export data can hide opposite effects across industries
Institutions and trade facilitation	customs, logistics, standards and policy quality determine how quickly firms convert price opportunities into sales	currency movements cannot compensate for unreliable delivery or compliance failures

Research Method

A focused literature-review approach is used. The review prioritizes recent sources and authoritative standards, then retains selected older work when it provides a foundational concept that remains directly relevant to the problem.

The evidence base for this draft includes 9 core references covering research, policy reports, standards or official statistics. Priority is given to sources published from 2020 onward, with older references retained only where they are widely used to define a core organizational or accounting concept. The review does not use unattributed web commentary as evidence.

Each source is read against four coding questions: what outcome is being explained; what mechanism is proposed; what conditions appear to strengthen or weaken the effect; and what decision can reasonably be informed by the finding. The six analytical themes used in the results section emerged from that coding and from the problem structure defined in the introduction.

The method has limitations. Evidence drawn from different sectors, countries and research designs cannot support one causal coefficient for Indonesian industries whose export revenues, imported inputs, financing and investment can respond differently to the same rupiah movement. In addition, this editorial draft has not been validated with interviews or original field data. Its claims are therefore framed as a synthesis of supported mechanisms and practical propositions that should be reviewed by the named authors before publication.

Source	Primary relevance	Use in this review
Handoyo et al. (2023)	exchange-rate volatility and ASEAN manufacturing exports	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
Bustaman et al. (2022)	institutions, trade agreements and Indonesian export performance	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
Sumiyati (2020)	macroeconomic determinants of manufacturing exports	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
Mustofa & Faizin (2025)	short- and long-run macro factors in Indonesian exports	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
Yanti et al. (2026)	real exchange rate and Indonesian export performance	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
Pratiwi & Firmansyah (2022)	West Java export determinants and exchange-rate evidence	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis

Results and Discussion

Price competitiveness and pass-through

A useful way to read this issue is to start with the decision that managers actually have to make. Exporters choose how much of a currency movement to pass to foreign buyers and how much to retain in margin. That distinction matters because competitive pressure and contract currency limit pricing freedom. In Indonesian industries whose export revenues, imported inputs, financing and investment can respond differently to the same rupiah movement, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including BPS (2026); OECD (2024a), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For local exporters and manufacturing firms, the practical response is to manage pricing by market and contract rather than applying one exchange-rate rule. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Exporters choose how much of a currency movement to pass to foreign buyers and how much to retain in margin, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Competitive

pressure and contract currency limit pricing freedom. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. Mustofa & Faizin (2025) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to manage pricing by market and contract rather than applying one exchange-rate rule, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Exporters choose how much of a currency movement to pass to foreign buyers and how much to retain in margin should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, competitive pressure and contract currency limit pricing freedom. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by Handoyo et al. (2023); Bustaman et al. (2022) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: manage pricing by market and contract rather than applying one exchange-rate rule. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Imported-input exposure

The practical difficulty becomes clearer when the analysis moves from broad trends to the operating decision. Depreciation raises the rupiah cost of imported components, capital goods and some logistics services. The underlying mechanism is not difficult to see: gross export revenue can overstate the true currency benefit. In Indonesian industries whose export revenues, imported inputs, financing and investment can respond differently to the same rupiah movement, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including Yanti et al. (2026); OECD (2024a), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For local exporters and manufacturing firms, the practical response is to measure domestic value added and net foreign-currency exposure. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Depreciation raises the rupiah cost of imported components, capital goods and some logistics services, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Gross export revenue can overstate the true currency benefit. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. Bustaman et al. (2022) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to measure domestic value added and net foreign-currency exposure, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Depreciation raises the rupiah cost of imported components, capital goods and some logistics services should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, gross export revenue can overstate the true currency benefit. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by Mustofa & Faizin (2025); Handoyo et al. (2023) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: measure domestic value added and net foreign-currency exposure. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Volatility and contracting

The evidence is less tidy than a simple positive-or-negative relationship would suggest. Uncertain exchange rates affect quotation validity, working capital and the value of receivables. The point is especially relevant where small exporters may lack affordable hedging or treasury expertise. In Indonesian industries whose export revenues, imported inputs, financing and investment can respond differently to the same rupiah movement, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including Mustofa & Faizin (2025); OECD (2024a), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For local exporters and manufacturing firms, the practical response is to use natural hedges, shorter pricing windows and selective financial hedging. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Uncertain exchange rates affect quotation validity, working capital and the value of receivables, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Small exporters may lack affordable hedging or treasury expertise. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. Bustaman et al. (2022) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to use natural hedges, shorter pricing windows and selective financial hedging, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Uncertain exchange rates affect quotation validity, working capital and the value of receivables should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, small exporters may lack affordable hedging or treasury expertise. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by Bustaman et al. (2022); Sumiyati (2020) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: use natural hedges, shorter pricing windows and selective financial hedging. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Productivity and investment

At firm level, the mechanism is usually more important than the headline indicator. Higher imported-capital costs can delay modernization even when export cash receipts improve. The reason is practical: short-run gains may therefore weaken medium-term competitiveness. In Indonesian industries whose export revenues, imported inputs, financing and investment can respond differently to the same rupiah movement, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including Mustofa & Faizin (2025); Yanti et al. (2026), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For local exporters and manufacturing firms, the practical response is to protect productivity investment through financing and staged procurement. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Higher imported-capital costs can delay modernization even when export cash receipts improve, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Short-run gains may therefore weaken medium-term competitiveness. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. OECD (2024a) provides a complementary

perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to protect productivity investment through financing and staged procurement, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Higher imported-capital costs can delay modernization even when export cash receipts improve should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, short-run gains may therefore weaken medium-term competitiveness. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by BPS (2026); Pratiwi & Firmansyah (2022) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: protect productivity investment through financing and staged procurement. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Market and product heterogeneity

One recurring lesson in this literature is that context changes the value of an otherwise sensible practice. Commodities and destinations respond differently to currency changes. For managers, the consequence is immediate: aggregate export data can hide opposite effects across industries. In Indonesian industries whose export revenues, imported inputs, financing and investment can respond differently to the same rupiah movement, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including Yanti et al. (2026); Handoyo et al. (2023), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For local exporters and manufacturing firms, the practical response is to use product-level and destination-level exposure analysis. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Commodities and destinations respond differently to currency changes, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Aggregate export data can hide opposite effects across industries. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. Yanti et al. (2026) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to use product-level and destination-level exposure analysis, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Commodities and destinations respond differently to currency changes should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, aggregate export data can hide opposite effects across industries. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by Sumiyati (2020); Bank Indonesia (2026) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: use product-level and destination-level exposure analysis. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Institutions and trade facilitation

What looks straightforward in a policy diagram is often more conditional in day-to-day implementation. Customs, logistics, standards and policy quality determine how quickly firms convert price opportunities into sales. In operational terms, currency movements cannot compensate for unreliable delivery or compliance failures. In Indonesian industries whose export revenues, imported inputs, financing and investment can respond differently to the same rupiah movement, this

can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including BPS (2026); Yanti et al. (2026), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For local exporters and manufacturing firms, the practical response is to combine FX management with productivity and trade-facilitation reforms. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Customs, logistics, standards and policy quality determine how quickly firms convert price opportunities into sales, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Currency movements cannot compensate for unreliable delivery or compliance failures. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. Bank Indonesia (2026) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to combine FX management with productivity and trade-facilitation reforms, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Customs, logistics, standards and policy quality determine how quickly firms convert price opportunities into sales should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, currency movements cannot compensate for unreliable delivery or compliance failures. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by Bustaman et al. (2022); OECD (2024a) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: combine FX management with productivity and trade-facilitation reforms. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Integrated Discussion

Taken together, the six themes show that exchange rate fluctuation and export competitiveness of local industries cannot be understood as a one-step relationship. The external condition or management practice changes incentives first, then affects behavior, process quality or resource allocation, and only after that appears in performance. When one of those links is weak, the expected result is diluted. This layered view is consistent with the broad evidence base represented by Pratiwi & Firmansyah (2022); Mustofa & Faizin (2025); Handoyo et al. (2023).

The synthesis also highlights the role of organizational maturity. Local exporters and manufacturing firms with clearer data ownership, decision rights and review routines can often benefit from sophisticated tools earlier than organizations still struggling with basic process discipline. This does not imply that smaller or less mature organizations should wait indefinitely; it suggests that the sequence and scale of implementation should match their current capability.

A further observation concerns incentives. Many implementation problems that appear technical are actually incentive problems: people protect departmental targets, delay bad news, optimize visible metrics or avoid decisions whose accountability is unclear. Technical design therefore needs to be accompanied by governance that makes expected behavior and escalation routes explicit.

Finally, the value of standardization depends on where it is applied. Definitions, controls and core data often benefit from standardization, while customer responses, regional implementation or work design may require adaptation. The stronger approach is to standardize the principles that protect quality and then allow local variation in the method when that variation is visible and reviewable.

Managerial and Policy Implications

The synthesis suggests that management should begin with a small number of decisions rather than a large transformation programme. For local exporters and manufacturing firms, the first step is to identify the exposure or performance outcome that matters most, the information needed to judge it, and the person who is accountable for acting. This creates a baseline against which later investment can be evaluated.

The second principle is sequencing. Capabilities that improve measurement, role clarity and process discipline usually make later technology or policy interventions more effective. When organizations reverse that sequence, they often spend on tools first and discover later that data ownership, workflows or incentives are unresolved.

Third, leaders should make trade-offs explicit. The six themes point to recurring tensions between short-run efficiency and resilience, speed and control, access and protection, or standardization and local adaptation. A decision memo that states which trade-off is being accepted is often more useful than a dashboard that presents dozens of indicators without a decision rule.

Fourth, monitoring should combine outcomes with leading indicators. Outcome measures confirm whether value was created, while leading indicators show whether the mechanism is being implemented. The sources reviewed here, including Sumiyati (2020); Mustofa & Faizin (2025), support the broader argument that capability and institutional quality matter alongside headline performance measures.

Finally, periodic review is essential. A practice that was appropriate during implementation may become unnecessary, too costly or too restrictive after the organization has learned. Review should therefore ask what changed, whether the original risk still exists, and whether the control or investment continues to earn its place in the operating model.

Priority	Recommended action	Reason for inclusion
1	Manage pricing by market and contract rather than applying one exchange-rate rule	Competitive pressure and contract currency limit pricing freedom
2	Measure domestic value added and net foreign-currency exposure	Gross export revenue can overstate the true currency benefit
3	Use natural hedges, shorter pricing windows and selective financial hedging	Small exporters may lack affordable hedging or treasury expertise
4	Protect productivity investment through financing and staged procurement	Short-run gains may therefore weaken medium-term competitiveness
5	Use product-level and destination-level exposure analysis	Aggregate export data can hide opposite effects across industries
6	Combine fx management with productivity and trade-facilitation reforms	Currency movements cannot compensate for unreliable delivery or compliance failures

Limitations and Future Research

The article is an evidence synthesis and does not estimate a new causal model. Findings from different contexts are therefore used to identify mechanisms and boundary conditions, not to claim that one effect size applies uniformly to Indonesian industries whose export revenues, imported inputs, financing and investment can respond differently to the same rupiah movement.

A second limitation is source availability. Institutional reports are valuable for recent context, while peer-reviewed research provides stronger methodological detail, but the two forms of evidence answer different questions. Future work should connect the framework with original firm-level, regional or longitudinal data and pre-specify the outcomes to be tested.

Research could also examine sequencing more directly. Many studies evaluate whether a practice is present, yet organizations may obtain different results depending on what was implemented first, how long capability building took, and whether supporting processes were stable. Longitudinal designs would be especially useful for separating initial disruption from durable performance effects.

Directions for Empirical Validation

The framework developed for exchange rate fluctuation and export competitiveness of local industries would benefit from being tested against operational records rather than aggregate indicators alone. A useful empirical design would distinguish price competitiveness and pass-through from imported-input exposure and trace how each mechanism changes over time. Researchers should establish a pre-intervention baseline, document the timing of relevant decisions, and use outcome measures that managers actually monitor. Where a comparison group is feasible, matched organizations or regions would improve interpretation. Where it is not, interrupted time-series or carefully documented longitudinal case evidence may provide a more credible account than a single cross-sectional survey.

Sampling deserves equal attention. Findings associated with volatility and contracting may not transfer directly to settings dominated by productivity and investment, particularly when firm size, institutional capacity, market exposure, or access to finance differs. Future studies should therefore report the characteristics of participating organizations in enough detail to make those boundaries visible. Rather than treating heterogeneity as a statistical nuisance, researchers can use it to explain why apparently similar interventions produce different outcomes. Subgroup analysis should be theory-led and specified before results are known, especially when sample sizes are modest.

Finally, empirical work should retain negative, null, and delayed effects. In studies of exchange rate fluctuation and export competitiveness of local industries, pressure to demonstrate an immediate benefit can encourage overly narrow outcome selection. A stronger design would combine short-term process indicators with longer-term performance measures and would report implementation costs alongside benefits. Sensitivity checks, alternative model specifications, and transparent treatment of missing data would make the findings easier to assess. These steps would also help separate genuine effects from improvements that simply reflect better documentation, temporary attention, or changes in the external environment.

A publication-oriented test of exchange rate fluctuation and export competitiveness of local industries should also document data provenance and analytical choices in a form that another researcher could follow. Variable definitions, exclusions, coding decisions, and changes made after initial analysis should be recorded rather than reconstructed at the end of the project. When confidentiality prevents public release of raw organizational data, authors can still provide a data dictionary, sampling logic, model specification, and summary diagnostics. This level of transparency does more than satisfy reporting conventions; it makes disagreement productive because readers can identify whether competing conclusions arise from theory, measurement, sample composition, or analytical choice.

Conclusion

This article examined exchange rate fluctuation and export competitiveness of local industries through a structured review of recent research and institutional evidence. The central conclusion is that the relationship in the title is conditional rather than automatic. Performance changes when external conditions interact with organizational capability, incentives, information quality and implementation discipline.

Across the six themes, a consistent pattern emerges: the most important distinction is between the level of the exchange rate and its volatility. Predictable depreciation can be incorporated into contracts and pricing more easily than abrupt two-way movement that changes margins between quotation, production and settlement. The practical implication is not to reject ambitious policy or management interventions, but to connect them to the mechanism through which they are expected to work and to the constraints faced by local exporters and manufacturing firms.

The review also points to a more disciplined use of evidence. Aggregate trends establish context, standards define expectations, and empirical studies reveal relationships, but none of these removes the need for local diagnosis. Decision makers should therefore combine external evidence with their own operating data and document where assumptions remain uncertain.

Future research can strengthen the framework by testing the proposed mechanisms with firm-level, regional or longitudinal data appropriate to the topic. For publication, the named authors should verify the source set, refine the contextual examples and add original evidence where available. That author-led step would convert the present editorial draft into a research article with a clearer empirical contribution.

Acknowledgement

This document is an editorial research draft prepared from the title, author information and issue metadata supplied by the KISA Institute production list. The named authors should review the argument, references, affiliations, email addresses and any contextual claims before submission or publication. No uncollected survey, interview or experimental data are represented as author-generated evidence.

References

- Handoyo, R. D., Alfani, S. P., Ibrahim, K. H., Sarmidi, T., & Haryanto, T. (2023). Exchange rate volatility and manufacturing commodity exports in ASEAN-5: A symmetric and asymmetric approach. *Heliyon*, 9(2), e13067. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e13067>
- Bustaman, A., Indiatuti, R., Budiono, B., & Anas, T. (2022). Quality of Indonesia's domestic institutions and export performance in the era of global value chains. *Journal of Economic Structures*, 11, 35. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40008-022-00293-5>
- Sumiyati, E. E. (2020). Factors affecting manufacturing exports. *Journal of Economics, Business, and Accountancy Ventura*, 23(2), 254-266. <https://doi.org/10.14414/jebav.v23i2.2303>
- Mustofa, H. Z., & Faizin, M. (2025). The impact analysis of macroeconomic factors to Indonesia's export performance. *Indonesian Treasury Review*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.33105/itrev.v10i1.1092>
- Yanti, F. N., Dini, I. P., Indriati, Q. N., Shanka, R., Mariska, M., & Putri, R. M. (2026). Analisis pengaruh nilai tukar relatif riil terhadap kinerja ekspor negara Indonesia tahun 2009-2024. *E-Journal Field of Economics, Business and Entrepreneurship*, 4(2), 792-802. <https://doi.org/10.23960/efebe.v4i2.346>
- Pratiwi, R., & Firmansyah, V. (2022). Determinants of export value of West Java Province: An error correction model (ECM) approach. *Customs Research and Applications Journal*, 3(2), 16-34. <https://doi.org/10.31092/craj.v3i2.106>
- BPS-Statistics Indonesia. (2026). *Statistical Yearbook of Indonesia 2026*. Jakarta: BPS-Statistics Indonesia.
- Bank Indonesia. (2026). *Monetary Policy Report - Quarter II 2026*. Jakarta: Bank Indonesia.
- OECD. (2024). *OECD Economic Surveys: Indonesia 2024*. Paris: OECD Publishing.