

Trade Diversification and Export Resilience among Indonesian Regional Industries

Arif Budi Raharja (1) and Nyoman Dwika Ayu Amrita (2)

(1) Universitas Mathla'ul Anwar, Banten | (2) Universitas Ngurah Rai

budiraharja1970@gmail.com ; dwika.ayu@unr.ac.id

Abstract

This integrative review examines the following Indonesia-focused question: Which forms of market, product, and input diversification make Indonesian regional industries more resilient when external trade shocks disrupt particular destinations or supply chains? The analysis treats trade diversification as a conditional economic mechanism rather than a stand-alone headline indicator and evaluates how it interacts with export resilience. For trade diversification, 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 trade diversification 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 export resilience. No primary survey, interview, firm observation, or regression estimate is manufactured for this trade diversification conceptual review; empirical claims remain attributed to their original sources. The resulting trade diversification framework supports differentiated measurement and identifies an Indonesia-specific research agenda for testing the proposed channels with more granular data.

Keywords: trade diversification, export resilience, regional industry, non-tariff measures, supply chains, Indonesia

1. Introduction

Regional industries in Indonesia often depend on a narrow set of commodities, destination countries, ports, or imported inputs. This concentration can support scale during stable periods but becomes a vulnerability when demand, exchange rates, geopolitics, shipping, or trade policy change abruptly. Diversification is therefore better understood as a portfolio problem than as a simple increase in the number of exported products.

Export diversification is frequently measured with national product indices, while resilience is observed at firm and regional levels. The policy gap lies in connecting those scales: a province can appear diversified nationally while individual clusters remain dependent on one buyer, one imported intermediate, or one logistics corridor.

The central research question is: Which forms of market, product, and input diversification make Indonesian regional industries more resilient when external trade shocks disrupt particular destinations or supply chains? Framing the problem around trade diversification and export resilience is important because national averages can mask economically relevant differences in exposure and adjustment across Indonesian firms, households, sectors, and regions.

The review distinguishes destination, product, supplier, input, and logistics diversification and evaluates their different contributions to export resilience. It also highlights the costs of diversification and the role of trade-policy frictions.

The analytical scope is deliberately mechanism based. For trade diversification, the review asks which conditions amplify, weaken, delay, or redirect the observed relationship with export resilience; 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 trade diversification. Indonesia-focused studies on trade diversification 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

Diversification as portfolio resilience

A diversified export portfolio can reduce exposure to a single product or destination shock, but the protective effect depends on correlation among components. Ten destinations facing the same global demand shock may provide less resilience than three destinations with genuinely different cycles.

Product diversification also varies in quality. Adding low-complexity products that depend on the same inputs and logistics can raise product counts without creating meaningful shock absorption.

Resilience assessment should therefore consider concentration and covariance, not only the number of products or partners.

Input access and policy frictions

Exporters require imported machinery, components, chemicals, and services. Trade restrictions on inputs can limit the ability to reconfigure production precisely when a foreign shock requires adjustment.

This shifts diversification policy from a demand-only perspective toward supply-chain flexibility.

A region with many export destinations but a single constrained input source may remain highly fragile.

Regional capabilities and path dependence

Regional diversification is constrained by skills, supplier bases, infrastructure, standards, and existing industrial knowledge. New export lines are easier to develop when they are related to capabilities already present in the region.

This path dependence explains why diversification policies based only on promotional missions may produce limited results if firms cannot meet standards, finance working capital, or access reliable logistics.

Capability-building and market diversification need to be sequenced rather than treated as substitutes.

Goeconomic fragmentation and partner risk

Trade tensions and geopolitical alignment can alter tariffs, standards, sanctions exposure, and buyer strategies. Firms increasingly evaluate the stability of trade relationships in addition to current margins.

Diversification can spread policy risk but also raise compliance costs as exporters manage multiple standards and documentation systems.

The optimal portfolio balances concentration economies against the option value of alternative markets and suppliers.

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 require

bibliographic and claim-level checking by the authors before submission. Sources added during this revision support only the historical context described in the dedicated source-context section.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Destination counts overstate resilience when markets share the same shock

The first substantive result concerns destination counts overstate resilience when markets share the same shock. In the context of trade diversification, the operative mechanism is that true diversification requires destination demand to be imperfectly correlated, otherwise an exporter can appear geographically diversified while remaining exposed to one global cycle; this means an aggregate correlation with export resilience can misstate what individual units actually experience.

Evidence for the destination counts overstate resilience when markets share the same shock channel is triangulated rather than reduced to one coefficient: trade-fragmentation analysis and portfolio logic both support risk-weighted rather than count-based diversification. For trade diversification, the strongest inference is therefore about when the mechanism should intensify or weaken, not about a universal numerical elasticity.

The destination counts overstate resilience when markets share the same shock interpretation remains bounded because small firms may lack sales capacity to serve many markets profitably. Future empirical work on export resilience should measure that conditioning factor directly, while current practice can respond by ensuring that regional export agencies should track concentration, destination correlation, and buyer concentration together.

4.2 Input diversification is as important as destination diversification

A second channel is input diversification is as important as destination diversification, which is analytically distinct from the headline movement in trade diversification. Here, export adjustment depends on access to alternative components, materials, and logistics; a destination pivot is ineffective if production is constrained by one imported input; that sequence helps explain why units exposed to the same aggregate

signal can record different outcomes for export resilience.

For input diversification is as important as destination diversification, 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 input diversification is as important as destination diversification, a key qualification is that qualifying alternative suppliers can be costly and slow for regulated or technically complex products. Decision rules for trade diversification should therefore avoid a single threshold and instead operationalize the implication that resilience programs should support supplier qualification, standards testing, and customs predictability.

4.3 Related diversification is more feasible than random product expansion

The third finding emphasizes related diversification is more feasible than random product expansion. Aggregate summaries of trade diversification often conceal the following economic logic: regions can move more successfully into products that reuse existing skills, supplier relationships, processing technologies, and logistics. Once that channel is made explicit, variation in export resilience across regions, firms, or households becomes an expected feature of the system.

Triangulation for related diversification is more feasible than random product expansion is useful because structural transformation research and Indonesian regional capability differences support a path-dependent view. For related diversification is more feasible than random product expansion, 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 related diversification is more feasible than random product expansion should not be generalized beyond its conditions, since relatedness can also lock regions into low-value segments if upgrading is never attempted. A more disciplined application of trade diversification is to observe the mechanism first and then act so that portfolio design should combine adjacent opportunities with selected capability-building bets in

higher-value activities.

4.4 Logistics redundancy protects export continuity

The fourth result identifies logistics redundancy protects export continuity as a source of nonlinearity between trade diversification and export resilience. Specifically, multiple ports, carriers, routes, and consolidation options reduce the probability that one physical disruption stops exports; proportional changes in the initial driver therefore need not generate proportional changes in the outcome.

Support for the logistics redundancy protects export continuity interpretation includes Indonesia's archipelagic geography makes logistics structure part of trade resilience rather than a secondary operating detail. For logistics redundancy protects export continuity, 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 logistics redundancy protects export continuity is conditional because redundancy can increase fixed costs and reduce scale discounts in normal times. Managers and policymakers should keep the institutional setting visible and, where the condition is met, implement the response that firms should map critical routes and pre-negotiate alternatives for high-margin or time-sensitive exports.

4.5 Policy diversification reduces exposure to regulatory surprises

The fifth finding, policy diversification reduces exposure to regulatory surprises, helps reconcile apparently conflicting claims about trade diversification. Once the unit of exposure is specified, serving markets with different trade arrangements can reduce dependence on one regulatory regime, while preferential agreements can lower entry costs in selected destinations; averages can consequently hide subgroup responses that matter for export resilience.

The evidence base for policy diversification reduces exposure to regulatory surprises is anchored by the observation that geo-economic fragmentation research emphasizes the growing role of policy risk in market selection. For policy diversification reduces exposure to regulatory surprises, Indonesian structural differences make this channel particularly relevant because they alter both the magnitude and the timing of adjustment.

Any inference from policy diversification reduces exposure to regulatory surprises must still recognize that managing more rules of origin and standards can overwhelm smaller exporters. The appropriate response is differentiated measurement rather than blanket intervention, including the practical step that public export support should provide practical compliance intelligence, not only market leads.

4.6 Regional resilience requires firm-level capabilities

The sixth result focuses on regional resilience requires firm-level capabilities and reveals a sequencing issue in the transmission of trade diversification. Before export resilience can fully respond, a province cannot diversify sustainably if firms lack quality control, product adaptation, finance, digital marketing, and standards certification; if that prerequisite is absent, an aggregate signal may be visible while the local decision remains weak.

The sequence underlying regional resilience requires firm-level capabilities is supported because BPS and OECD structural evidence imply that export composition reflects underlying productive capabilities. For regional resilience requires firm-level capabilities, process indicators are therefore valuable alongside final outcomes, especially where adjustment is slow or observed only at low frequency.

For regional resilience requires firm-level capabilities, the remaining caution is that headline export growth can mask concentration among a few large firms. Monitoring of trade diversification should cover both prerequisite and outcome, and implementation should be designed so that regional policy should monitor the number of capable exporting firms and supplier depth alongside export value.

4.7 Integrated interpretation

Across the six findings, trade diversification is best understood as a conditional process rather than a mechanical predictor of export resilience. The core question - Which forms of market, product, and input diversification make Indonesian regional industries more resilient when external trade shocks disrupt

particular destinations or supply chains? - 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 trade diversification also explains why credible studies can point in different directions. Research centered on export resilience 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 trade diversification should measure the unit-specific degree to which the proposed channel can operate. The finding on destination counts overstate resilience when markets share the same shock implies recording the mechanism - true diversification requires destination demand to be imperfectly correlated, otherwise an exporter can appear geographically diversified while remaining exposed to one global cycle - together with the limiting condition - small firms may lack sales capacity to serve many markets profitably. Linking those fields to export resilience would make subsequent empirical testing more informative than reliance on a single aggregate rate.

Timing

A timing indicator for trade diversification should separate immediate transmission from medium-term behavioral adjustment. The finding on input diversification is as important as destination diversification implies recording the mechanism - export adjustment depends on access to alternative components, materials, and logistics; a destination pivot is ineffective if production is constrained by one imported input - together with the limiting condition - qualifying alternative suppliers can be costly and slow for regulated or technically complex products. Linking those fields to export resilience would make subsequent empirical testing more informative than reliance on a single aggregate rate.

Heterogeneity

A heterogeneity indicator for trade diversification should report results for economically meaningful firm, household, sector, or regional groups. The finding on related diversification is more feasible than random product expansion implies recording the mechanism - regions can move more successfully into products that reuse existing skills, supplier relationships, processing technologies, and logistics - together with the limiting condition - relatedness can also lock regions into low-value segments if upgrading is never attempted. Linking those fields to export resilience would make subsequent empirical testing more informative than reliance on a single aggregate rate.

Process

A process indicator for trade diversification should observe intermediate mechanisms together with final outcomes. The finding on logistics redundancy protects export continuity implies recording the mechanism - multiple ports, carriers, routes, and consolidation options reduce the probability that one physical disruption stops exports - together with the limiting condition - redundancy can increase fixed costs and reduce scale discounts in normal times. Linking those fields to export resilience would make subsequent empirical testing more informative than reliance on a single aggregate rate.

Counterfactual

A counterfactual indicator for trade diversification should state the plausible outcome in the absence of the shock or intervention. The finding on policy diversification reduces exposure to regulatory surprises implies recording the mechanism - serving markets with different trade arrangements can reduce dependence on one regulatory regime, while preferential agreements can lower entry costs in selected destinations - together with

the limiting condition - managing more rules of origin and standards can overwhelm smaller exporters. Linking those fields to export resilience would make subsequent empirical testing more informative than reliance on a single aggregate rate.

Data quality

A data quality indicator for trade diversification should document definitions, missingness, revisions, and coverage for reproducibility. The finding on regional resilience requires firm-level capabilities implies recording the mechanism - a province cannot diversify sustainably if firms lack quality control, product adaptation, finance, digital marketing, and standards certification - together with the limiting condition - headline export growth can mask concentration among a few large firms. Linking those fields to export resilience would make subsequent empirical testing more informative than reliance on a single aggregate rate.

5. Policy and Managerial Implications

Regional portfolio dashboard

Track product, destination, buyer, supplier, port, and input concentration using a common risk dashboard. For trade diversification, this action is decision-relevant because it addresses the mechanism identified in destination counts overstate resilience when markets share the same shock rather than assuming that every unit responds alike. Its implementation should begin with a baseline measure of export resilience and a stated criterion for evaluating whether exposure or adjustment capacity actually changes.

Input-side reform

Review non-tariff measures and customs processes that constrain critical intermediates while preserving legitimate safety and strategic objectives. For trade diversification, this action is decision-relevant because it addresses the mechanism identified in input diversification is as important as destination diversification rather than assuming that every unit responds alike. Its implementation should begin with a baseline measure of export resilience and a stated criterion for evaluating whether exposure or adjustment capacity actually changes.

Capability development

Link export promotion to certification, engineering support, finance, and supplier development. For trade diversification, this action is decision-relevant because it addresses the mechanism identified in related diversification is more feasible than random product expansion rather than assuming that every unit responds alike. Its implementation should begin with a baseline measure of export resilience and a stated criterion for evaluating whether exposure or adjustment capacity actually changes.

Research agenda

Construct firm-region-destination panels to test whether different diversification dimensions predict survival, recovery speed, and export growth after identifiable shocks. For trade diversification, this action is decision-relevant because it addresses the mechanism identified in logistics redundancy protects export continuity rather than assuming that every unit responds alike. Its implementation should begin with a baseline measure of export resilience 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 trade diversification, not a new causal estimation. The synthesis can organize propositions about export resilience and identify boundary conditions, but unresolved identification problems in the underlying studies remain unresolved here. Any later empirical extension on trade diversification should be presented as a separate design with its own data and assumptions.

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

A third limitation for trade diversification is the speed mismatch between policy information and peer review. Official releases can describe the current environment for trade diversification quickly, but contemporaneous description does not by itself establish an effect on export resilience. For trade diversification, 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 trade diversification at the same decision level where export resilience is determined. The review's finding on destination counts overstate resilience when markets share the same shock indicates that future datasets should capture true diversification requires destination demand to be imperfectly correlated, otherwise an exporter can appear geographically diversified while remaining exposed to one global cycle. In practical terms, Construct firm-region-destination panels to test whether different diversification dimensions predict survival, recovery speed, and export growth after identifiable shocks. For future trade diversification 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 input diversification is as important as destination diversification channel, researchers should exploit timing, institutional thresholds, policy discontinuities, or plausibly exogenous shocks when available, while reporting pre-trends and alternative specifications. Because qualifying alternative suppliers can be costly and slow for regulated or technically complex products, a credible design should show that changes in export resilience are not merely the product of simultaneous composition shifts or reverse causality. In studies of export resilience, 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 trade diversification should be pre-specified rather than discovered after estimation. The mechanism associated with related diversification is more feasible than random product expansion suggests grouping observations by exposure, market structure, income or firm size, geography, and relevant institutional constraints before drawing policy conclusions about trade diversification. This is especially important because relatedness can also lock regions into low-value segments if upgrading is never attempted. Reporting distributions and subgroup estimates can reveal whether an apparently small average effect on export resilience conceals large gains and losses for distinct populations.

Finally, research on trade diversification should be reproducible enough for cumulative learning. The qualification attached to logistics redundancy protects export continuity - redundancy can increase fixed costs and reduce scale discounts in normal times - makes sensitivity analysis essential. Future trade diversification 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 export resilience easier to compare without pretending that different settings are statistically identical.

7. Conclusion

This review asked: Which forms of market, product, and input diversification make Indonesian regional industries more resilient when external trade shocks disrupt particular destinations or supply chains? The accumulated evidence supports a conditional answer: the effect associated with trade diversification 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 export resilience.

The six synthesized mechanisms move the analysis of trade diversification 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 export resilience.

For future Indonesia research, the priority is therefore not a larger collection of undifferentiated averages, but more granular and reproducible evidence on trade diversification linked to the decision level at which export resilience changes. For this trade diversification 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

Cadot, O., Carrere, C., & Strauss-Kahn, V. (2011). Export diversification: What is behind the hump? *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 93(2), 590-605.

Imbs, J., & Wacziarg, R. (2003). Stages of diversification. *American Economic Review*, 93(1), 63-86.

World Trade Organization. (2023). *World Trade Report 2023: Re-globalization for a Secure, Inclusive and Sustainable Future*. Geneva: WTO.

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>