

Team E

1. It helped Marimekko to growth and it forced them to change their business models. To do so they adapt to the new situation.
2. Both, they got entrance to new markets and more legislative security. But they had to change their business model and to manage to succeed in a market with more competitors
3. In Finland there were a extreme growth due to mergers and acquisitions, their "Finishness", their strong brand, and their ability to rapidly adapt to new business environments and take provid out of that. In the Northic countries they only have grown organically. They developed their market position and achieved that growth due to ordinary scaling effects. When it comes to the rest of Europe they around 2005 due to the cease of quantitative restriction in the EU textile trade with china, like the rest of the European Textile industry. When they changed their former policy; Focusing on Asia; and raised their efforts in europe again, they managed to overcompensate their losses.
4. Yes, it could
5. It was a benefit and a disadvantage. Due to their big stake in the finnish market without the euro, there would have been more depending on this national sales field. Because the Finnish economy also suffered due to the crisis they could have become bankrupt or near to it. It also was a disadvantage because the finnish government could take classical monetary countermeasures due to european integration and therefore Marimekko suffered a little bit longer and/or more. -No Subventions, no contolabel exchange rates,...