

## Warning signs for Europe's north

Labour cost competitiveness has been shifting within the eurozone as the south has gained and the north has lost competitiveness. A strong feat for southern economies, but this does raise questions about the north's export-led growth model



We seem to be seeing a two-speed Europe emerging. Pictured: trams and cars in Lisbon, Portugal

### Labour cost competitiveness continues to converge within the eurozone

As the euro celebrates its 25-year anniversary, labour cost competitiveness has gone through significant swings. In the first ten years, southern European economies in particular lost competitiveness, while northern European economies led by Germany saw a sharp improvement. This divergence in (cost and price) competitiveness saw its sad climax with the European sovereign debt crisis – a crisis that Europe tried to cure with austerity measures and reforms to improve competitiveness. While the former led to questionable results, the latter has started to bear fruit, and the overall result has been one of regained internal competitiveness.

To assess labour cost competitiveness, we look at the European Commission's real effective exchange rates (REER) based on unit labour costs vis-à-vis other eurozone economies. This shows relative competitiveness within the eurozone. In the past four years, Austria, France, Belgium and the Netherlands have seen labour competitiveness deteriorate on average, while Germany's


performance was almost stable. The countries that have seen improvements were Italy, Spain, Greece and Ireland [1].

This is no surprise, and is the continuation of a longer trend that started with – or slightly after – the euro crisis. In the years leading up to the euro crisis, unit labour costs had worsened quickly in the ‘periphery’, which resulted in a structurally weak competitive position. During the euro crisis, southern eurozone countries embarked on a forced, painful process of internal devaluation. For most countries, this resulted in prolonged recessions and long-standing high unemployment. While we wouldn’t argue that this is a preferable remedy for structurally problematic countries, the result was there in the end. The big gaps that had opened up in relative unit labour costs before the euro crisis have been closed.

Northern economies also experienced faster wage growth, while productivity growth weakened materially. The faster wage growth helped domestic demand – but thanks to the drop in productivity growth, this also had a material impact on unit labour costs which started to rise. Sure enough, this helped foster a rebalancing within the eurozone when it came to labour competitiveness, as northern eurozone economies allowed southern eurozone markets to catch up.

[1] For Ireland, the strong performance since 2015 also has to do with multinational accounting activity, which distorts productivity figures. In this note, we therefore do not focus too much on the Irish performance.

## Relative competitiveness has shown a longer trend of rebalancing



Source: European Commission DG ECFIN, ING Research calculations

## Healthy for the eurozone, but worries about northern growth models emerge

From the perspective of imbalances in the eurozone, most of this is good news. The export powerhouses of the north have been outpaced in recent years by other countries playing catch up. Not in absolute terms, but the pace of export growth in Germany and Netherlands has been slower

than that of Spain, Portugal, Greece and Italy. Industrial companies in the south are more upbeat about their competitive position and have seen export growth improve.

Some of the macro imbalances that the European Commission worries about are addressed by these developments, likely leading to a more even performance between countries. At the same time, it would have been better had productivity performance in the north held up – the adjustment would have come mostly from faster wage growth in the north, as well as faster productivity growth in the south. At this point, it feels more like a race to the bottom in terms of structural performance, which doesn't help European competitiveness at a global scale.

Germany is already dubbed the sick man of Europe again. Worries about labour cost competitiveness add to a list of concerns about its growth model. For other northern countries, lost labour cost competitiveness serves more as a wakeup call: some rebalancing towards a more domestic demand driven economy is probably healthy, but watch your productivity performance while wage growth increases.

To read the longer original report, click [here](#)

## Author

### Bert Colijn

Chief Economist, Netherlands

[bert.colijn@ing.com](mailto:bert.colijn@ing.com)

### Carsten Brzeski

Global Head of Macro

[carsten.brzeski@ing.de](mailto:carsten.brzeski@ing.de)

## Disclaimer

This publication has been prepared by the Economic and Financial Analysis Division of ING Bank N.V. (“ING”) solely for information purposes without regard to any particular user's investment objectives, financial situation, or means. *ING forms part of ING Group (being for this purpose ING Group N.V. and its subsidiary and affiliated companies).* The information in the publication is not an investment recommendation and it is not investment, legal or tax advice or an offer or solicitation to purchase or sell any financial instrument. Reasonable care has been taken to ensure that this publication is not untrue or misleading when published, but ING does not represent that it is accurate or complete. ING does not accept any liability for any direct, indirect or consequential loss arising from any use of this publication. Unless otherwise stated, any views, forecasts, or estimates are solely those of the author(s), as of the date of the publication and are subject to change without notice.

The distribution of this publication may be restricted by law or regulation in different jurisdictions and persons into whose possession this publication comes should inform themselves about, and observe, such restrictions.

Copyright and database rights protection exists in this report and it may not be reproduced, distributed or published by any person for any purpose without the prior express consent of ING. All rights are reserved. ING Bank N.V. is authorised by the Dutch Central Bank and supervised by the European Central Bank (ECB), the Dutch Central Bank (DNB) and the Dutch Authority for the Financial Markets (AFM). ING Bank N.V. is incorporated in the Netherlands (Trade Register no. 33031431 Amsterdam). In the United Kingdom this information is approved and/or communicated by ING Bank N.V., London Branch. ING Bank N.V., London Branch is authorised by the Prudential Regulation Authority and is subject to regulation by the Financial Conduct Authority and limited regulation by the Prudential Regulation Authority. ING Bank N.V., London branch is registered in England (Registration number BR000341) at 8-10 Moorgate, London EC2 6DA. For US Investors: Any person wishing to discuss this report or effect transactions in any security discussed herein should contact ING Financial Markets LLC, which is a member of the NYSE, FINRA and SIPC and part of ING, and which has accepted responsibility for the distribution of this report in the United States under applicable requirements.

Additional information is available on request. For more information about ING Group, please visit [www.ing.com](http://www.ing.com).