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ABSTRACT

The aim of this research is to realize the best of its kind benchmarking practice among five hundred big industry companies in Turkey. This research is realized benchmarking practice in three main criterions as a. the public sector – private sector criterion, b. geographical region and city criterion, c. activity making sector criterion. Each of these main criterions is compared to ten subcriterions. These subcriterions are determined as a. number, b. sales from production (except VAT – Value Added Tax), c. sale return (except VAT), d. gross value added, e. capital stock sum, f. net assets sum, g. period income sum (before tax), h. exportation, i. wage/salary workers average, j. capital dispersion. For each of these main criterions is formed a shared scale that has higher reliability and validity. As the result of this comparison is reached these diagnosis.

a. Though the 8,2 % of five hundred big industry companies in Turkey are public capital companies, these companies form some important subcriterions.

b. According to the geographical region and city criterion, the dispersion of five hundred big industry companies in Turkey is out of balance. The 44,2 % of these companies are in İstanbul. This city is followed by İzmir with 10,8 % and Ankara with 6,4 %. As The Marmara Region includes 58,2 % of these five hundred big industry companies, The Ege Region with 15,6 % and The İç Anadolu Region with 13 % follows it.

c. The 36,8 % of these five hundred big industry companies work in textile, ready to wear clothing and food sectors. This situation is an opposite composition to the world development.

INTRODUCTION

Recently, one of the new concepts and techniques as it comparison and intercompany confrontation in management is benchmarking. Benchmarking is accepted as a management technique for increasing company performance (De Toro, 1995: 61). Benchmarking as an effective competition mean that is used, also is an important technique for developing
strategies and determining the real position of a company’s process which is benifited by strategic management process (Watson, 1993: 12). This management technique is a method for a company to provide leadership position and a kind of comparison and evaluation study.

American Productivity and Quality Center (APQC) defines benchmarking as a continuous process which is used for comparing and considering a company to leader companies and increasing a company performance with these gotten information (Weisendanger, 1993: 20). According to Özer benchmarking is a mean to adapt the best practices to a company conditions, structure, aim, culture and its a permanently repeating management mean for providing quality and increasing power of competition ability by having the conscious of learning and development are infinite periods, comparing a company to other companies without thinking sector difference and without imitation, adding creavity in the quickly changing competition conditions (Özer, 1997: 6).

Today, benchmarking is a systematic part for quality development process of some successfull companies like AT&T, Digital (DEC), Ford Motor, Du Pont, General Electric, IBM, Alcoa, Motorola, Miliken, Nec.

Koçel attracts attention to three dimensions of benchmarking concepts (Koçel, 1998: 295-296):

**Dimension 1** The company, which will be made benchmarking, must be at least the most successful company in that industry sector.

**Dimension 2** Each company can learn many things from a company working in a completely different branch. For this reason, benchmarking should not be limited only in the same industry branched companies.

**Dimension 3** Benchmarking processes should be made systematically for customer satisfaction and quality increase.

As taking note of these dimensions, benchmarking can be defined as increasing a company’s own performance by examining superior performance of other companies, comparing their working metod to other companies, working methods and practice of using these results which found at the end of that comparison (Camp, 1989: 10).

As seen benchmarking, according to its fundamental approach, expresses continously and consciously researching and examining the most successful companies how they do specific works, concluding by making comparison with their own methods and practising the results in a practice plan for efforts to reach higher level success. In that meaning, benchmarking is a learning from foremen by looking to their surroundings even to other companies that are in different branches instead of a company’s looking its own past and bringing to conclusion. This learning involves all subjects of company activities. Some typical examples are how cost is low, increasing productivity and quality, better customer services, creavity, successful personnel practice (Dosi, Teece and Chytry, 1998).

Benchmarking is classified as (Shetty, 1993: 40)

a. Strategic Benchmarking,

b. Practice Benchmarking,

c. Management Benchmarking.
Strategic benchmarking expresses examining and comparing the strategies that are followed by successful companies and fundamental elements of these strategies. But practice benchmarking or operational benchmarking involves comparisons of all the activities which have cost elements. Management benchmarking expresses the comparison between management functions (Al Salgado, 1998).

Paying attention to the focus of comparison, there are three kinds of benchmarking (Akat, Budak and Budak, 1997: 428).

   a. Focusing Product Benchmarking,
   b. Focusing Period Benchmarking,
   c. Focusing Strategies Benchmarking or Strategic Benchmarking.

Paying attention to the position of the sample company chosed for comparison, there are four kinds of benchmarking.

   a. Internal Benchmarking,
   b. Competitious Benchmarking,
   c. Out of Sector Benchmarking,
   d. The Best Practice of Its Kind.

Benchmarking practice which is said to be the best practice of its kind, is different from others for one thing. In other benchmarking kinds, only one company is examined as a comparison sample. But in the comparisons which are made by the best practice of its kind, more than one companies are modals.

Generally, the best competitor is not only one company, but the best of its kind and is the composition of many companies are good at some parts. It is necessary to look to many best companies or competitors what they give and the last total or the composition. This composition can contain product, service, education and conception (Juran Institute, 1996: 1-23).

This research which name is The Experiment Of The Benchmarking On Five Hundred Big Industry Companies in Turkey has the aim of one of the experiment on the best practice of its kind benchmarking according to three criterions determined and according to ten subcriterions for each main criterions repeated one by one.

**BENCHMARKING SUBJECTS**

The comparison method used in that research is the best practice of its kind comparison method. By this method, three criterions were determined for comparison.

1. Public Sector-Private Sector Criterion: It is the comparison of five hundred big industry companies according to public and private sector criterions.

2. Geographical Region and City Criterion: It is the comparison of five hundred big industry companies according to geographical regions and cities in Turkey criterions.

3. Functioning Sector Criterion: It is the comparison of five hundred big industry companies according to functioning sector criterion.
Each of these main criterions are compared to ten subcriterions determined. The definitions of these subcriterions are below.

1. Number: It shows the number of companies that are subjects of this comparison.
2. Sales from production (except VAT): It defines the equivalent of all goods and services which are sold by company, without VAT.
3. Sale Return (except VAT): It defines the total equivalent of all goods and services sold by company, without VAT.
4. Gross Value Added: It defines the difference between total sale returns and total cost equivalent of sold goods and services of the company.
5. Capital Stock Sum: It defines the sources provided by company owner or copartner in the period of organization and activity.
6. Net Assets Sum: It defines the value which is found by subtracting company total assets (the wealth and credits it owns) from the gotten debts without company owners and copartners.
7. Period Income Sum (before tax): It defines the income found by subtracting all of the incomes of a company in its activity period from all of the expenses that were done for continuing its activity and it is the important income for calculating tax.
8. Exportation: It defines the good and service sales of a company which are to outer national borders.
9. Wage/Salary Workers Average: It defines working power average in the period that company works.
10. Capital Dispersion: It defines the numerical average of a company capital as a. public, b. private, c. foreign, d. public-private, e. public-foreign, f. private-foreign, g. public-private-foreign.

**BENCHMARKING MAKING COMPANIES**

This research is done on five hundred big industry companies in Turkey according to 1998 datum. The companies that are subjects of this comparison were determined by evaluations of Economist (1999), Capital (1999) and Industry Chambers (see appendix for benchmarking making companies).

**GATHERING DATUM METHOD**

The datum providing comparison was gathered by Industry Chambers in Turkey and also companies themselves. 16 of these 500 companies gave datum but they didn’t want us to declare their names.
BENCHMARKING PRACTICE

1. Benchmarking According To Public Sector-Private Sector Main Criterion

Table 1: Benchmarking Of Five Hundred Big Industry Companies According To Public Sector-Private Sector Criterion

Table Statements:
A Number
B Sales from production (except VAT – 1,000,000 T.L.)
   * 15 of 459 private industry companies didn’t determine their sales from production amount.
C Sale return (except VAT – 1,000,000 T.L.)
   * 15 of 459 private industry companies didn’t determine their sale return amount.
D Gross value added (1,000,000 T.L.)
   * 19 of 459 private industry companies didn’t determine their gross value added.
E Capital stock sum (1,000,000 T.L.)
   * 21 of 459 private industry companies didn’t determine their capital stock sum.
F Net assets sum (1,000,000 T.L.)
   * 17 of 459 private industry companies didn’t determine their net assets sum.
G Period income sum (before tax – 1,000,000 T.L.)
   * 25 of 459 private industry companies didn’t determine their period income sum.
H Exportation
   a. USD (1,000 USD)
      * 15 of 41 public industry companies didn’t determine their exportation sum by USD.
      * 63 of 459 private industry companies didn’t determine their exportation sum by USD.
   b. TL. (1,000,000 TL.)
      * 14 of 41 public industry companies didn’t determine their exportation sum by TL.
      * 62 of 459 private industry companies didn’t determine their exportation sum by TL.
I Wage / salary workers average (number)
   * 18 of 459 private industry companies didn’t determine their wage/salary workers average.
J Capital dispersion (number)
   a. public
   b. private
   c. foreign
   d. public-private
   e. public-foreign
   f. private-foreign
   g. public-private-foreign
a. Public sector forms 8,2 % of five hundred big industry companies in Turkey. However public sector sales from production (except VAT) is 30,7 %, sale return (except VAT) is 31,6 %, gross value added is 40,9 %, capital stock sum is 41,4 % and net assets sum is 39,2 %. This situation can be interpreted as the reflection of publical economic policies done in the past.

b. There is a proportioned similarity between public sector and exportation as 9,8 % USD and 9,2 % TL., period income sum (before tax) as 18,7 % subcriterions and other criterions. There may be some harmony problems in public sector, about global structure and economical developments.

c. Public sector forming 8,2 % of five hundred big industry companies has 34 % of wage/salary workers average. But private sector forming 91,2 %, has 66 % of wage/salary workers average. New human resources management comprehension is necessary for public sector. However it is necessary for these mentioned associations to look over their technology again.

d. There is a corporation between private sector forming 91,2 % of five hundred big industry companies and 21,2 % of foreign capital. But 3,8 % of private sector has foreign capital. This situation is a positiveness about providing harmony of global structure. There aren’t any corporations between public sector and foreign capital. The corporation with private sector is 1,6 %.
2. Benchmarking According To Geographical Region and City Main Criterion

Table 2: Benchmarking Of Five Hundred Big Industry Companies According To City Criterion

Table Statements:
A Number
B Sales from production (except VAT – 1.000.000 T.L.)
   * 15 of 500 industry companies didn’t determine their sales from production amount.
C Sale return (except VAT – 1.000.000 T.L.)
   * 15 of 500 industry companies didn’t determine their sale return amount.
D Gross value added (1.000.000 T.L.)
   * 19 of 500 industry companies didn’t determine their gross value added.
E Capital stock sum (1.000.000 T.L.)
   * 21 of 500 industry companies didn’t determine their capital stock sum.
F Net assets sum (1.000.000 T.L.)
   * 17 of 500 industry companies didn’t determine their net assets sum.
G Period income sum (before tax – 1.000.000 T.L.)
   * 25 of 500 industry companies didn’t determine their period income sum.
H Exportation
   a. USD (1.000 USD)
      * 78 of 500 industry companies didn’t determine their exportation sum by USD.
   b. TL. (1.000.000 TL.)
      * 76 of 500 industry companies didn’t determine their exportation sum by TL.
I Wage / salary workers average (number)
   * 18 of 459 industry companies didn’t determine their wage/salary workers average.
J Capital dispersion (number)
   a. public
   b. private
   c. foreign
   d. public-private
   e. public-foreign
   f. private-foreign
   g. public-private-foreign
### Table 3: Benchmarking Of Cities Having Industry Companies Between 11- +

**Table Statements:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Sales from production (except VAT – 1,000,000 T.L.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Sale return (except VAT – 1,000,000 T.L.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Gross value added (1,000,000 T.L.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Capital stock sum (1,000,000 T.L.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Net assets sum (1,000,000 T.L.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Period income sum (before tax – 1,000,000 T.L.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Exportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>USD (1,000 USD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>TL. (1,000,000 TL.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Wage / salary workers average (number)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table Statements | İstanbul | İzmir | Ankara | Bursa | Kocaeli | Adana | Kayseri | Total |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>83.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Benchmarking Of Five Hundred Big Industry Companies According To Geographical Region Criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical Region</th>
<th>Cities having industry companies between 1-5</th>
<th>Cities having industry companies between 6-10</th>
<th>Cities having industry companies between 11-+</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marmara</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>58.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ege</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>15.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İç Anadolu</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akdeniz</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karadeniz</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Güney Doğu Anadolu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doğu Anadolu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>390</strong></td>
<td><strong>500</strong></td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. İstanbul, İzmir, Ankara, Bursa, Kocaeli, Adana and Kayseri that own industry companies between 11-+ has 78 % of five hundred big industry companies. There is an unstableness in the intercity dispersion of these cities. This situation is the result company location which is explained as gathering area in management. A gathering area of İstanbul, İzmir and Adana is the result of historical period. But gathering area of other cities are result of publical and economical policy.

b. Companies which are 78 % of five hundred big industry companies and having industry companies between 11-+ in the cities, has 84,8 of sales from production (except VAT), 86,3 % of sale return (except VAT), 88,9 % of grass value added, 81,9 % of capital stock sum, 83,2 % of net assets sum, 93,6 of period income sum, 79,6 % (as USD) and 80,5 % (as T.L.) of exportation, 76,7 % of wage/salary workers average.

c. 44,2 % of five hundred big industry companies are in İstanbul. This situation shows that big industry companies are gathered in İstanbul. 52.5 of five hundred big industry companies of Turkey exportation total is done by the companies are in İstanbul.
d. 58.2% of five hundred big industry companies of Turkey are in The Marmara Region, 15.6% of there are in The Ege Region, 13% of there are The İç Anadolu Region. This station shows that these five hundred big industry companies are gathered in definite regions as out of balance.

3. Benchmarking According To The Sector Functioned Main Criterion

Table 5: Benchmarking Of Five Hundred Big Industry Companies According To The Sector Functioned Main Criterion

Table Statements
A Number
B Sales from production (except VAT – 1.000.000 T.L.)
   * 15 of 500 industry companies didn’t determine their sales from production amount.
C Sale return (except VAT – 1.000.000 T.L.)
   * 15 of 500 industry companies didn’t determine their sale return amount.
D Gross value added (1.000.000 T.L.)
   * 19 of 500 industry companies didn’t determine their gross value added.
E Capital stock sum (1.000.000 T.L.)
   * 21 of 500 industry companies didn’t determine their capital stock sum.
F Net assets sum (1.000.000 T.L.)
   * 17 of 500 industry companies didn’t determine their net assets sum.
G Period income sum (before tax – 1.000.000 T.L.)
   * 25 of 500 industry companies didn’t determine their period income sum.
H Exportation
   a. USD (1.000 USD)
      * 78 of 500 industry companies didn’t determine their exportation sum by USD.
   b. TL. (1.000.000 TL.)
      * 76 of 500 industry companies didn’t determine their exportation sum by T.L.
I Wage / salary workers average (number)
   * 18 of 500 industry companies didn’t determine their wage/salary workers average.
J Capital dispersion (number)
   a. public
   b. private
   c. foreign
   d. public-private
   e. public-foreign
   f. private-foreign
   g. public-private-foreign
**Table 6:** Benchmarking Of Sectors Having Industry Companies Between 26+-

Table Statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Statements</th>
<th>Sectors having Industry companies between 1-25*</th>
<th>Sectors having Industry companies between 26-50**</th>
<th>Sectors having Industry companies between 51-***</th>
<th>The industry companies that didn’t reveal their names</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>4.166.600.406</td>
<td>3.563.804.978</td>
<td>15.533.100</td>
<td>15.018.271.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8.723.849.329</td>
<td>4.869.327.776</td>
<td>4.176.247.702</td>
<td>15.533.100</td>
<td>17.786.957.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>3.487.251.801</td>
<td>3.822.426.627</td>
<td>22.117.761</td>
<td>16.063.808.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>486.725.530</td>
<td>327.294.440</td>
<td>122.026.697</td>
<td>-1.467.409</td>
<td>994.578.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>3.323.360</td>
<td>3.920.416</td>
<td>4.001.621</td>
<td>1.058</td>
<td>11.296.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>1.069.914.020</td>
<td>1.072.424.131</td>
<td>242.564</td>
<td>3.024.008.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>107.281</td>
<td>122.882</td>
<td>223.402</td>
<td>1.504</td>
<td>555.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.0.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>19.3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.1.4</td>
<td>106.21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>9.0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Iron&Steel(18), Machine(17), Energy(16), Paper(15), Mining(11), Plastic(9), Glass(6), Packing(6), Tobacco(6), Ceramics(5), Tyre(5), Beer(4), Fodder(4), Forest Products(4), Furniture(4), Press(4), Construction(2), Leather(1).

** Chemical and Pharmaceutical Industry(50), Automative and Subsidiary Products(34), Metal(30), Electric and Electronics(26).

*** Textile(112), Food(72).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Statements</th>
<th>Textile Ready to wear clothing</th>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Chemical and Pharmaceutical</th>
<th>Automotive and Subsidiary Products</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Electric and Electronics</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H a.</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H b.</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Textile (112 – 22,4 %) and Food (72 – 14,4 %) sectors having industry companies between 51-+, form 36,8 % of five hundred big industry companies of Turkey. These two sectors are 35,5 % exportation total of five hundred big industry companies. The total of wage/salary workers average is 40,3 %. This situation shows that these two sectors give importance to bigger labour intensive technology than other sectors proportionaly.

b. Sectors having industry companies between 26-50 are chemical and pharmaceutical industry (50 – 10 %), automative and subsidiary products (34 – 6,8 %), metal (30 – 6 %), electric and electronics (26 – 5,2 %) and they form 28 % of five hundred big industry companies of Turkey. These sectors form 35,1 % of total exportation of five hundred big industry companies. In these sectors the total of wage/salary workers average is 22,1 %. This situation shows that these sectors have more developed technological structure and global trend than other sectors proportionaly.

c. Sectors having industry companies between 1-25 form 32 % of five hundred big industry companies of Turkey. These sectors form 29,4 % of total exportation of five hundred big industry companies. For these sectors, the total of wage/salary workers average is 37,3 %. Because of difference in sector areas, it is difficult to interpret about technology.

d. Companies organising chemical and pharmaceutical, automative and subsidiary products, metal, electric and electronics are 2,2 % foreign capitaled companies, but 8,8 % of are foreign capital corporationed companies. This situation is suitable for global trend of these sectors.
As the result of The Experiment of Five Hundred Big Industry Companies in Turkey is evaluated these results:

1. There are public capitaled companies among five hundred big industry companies of Turkey. These companies form important part of some subcriterions.

2. It is clear that according to geographical region and city criterions, the dispersion of five hundred big industry companies of Turkey are out of balance.

3. 36,8 % of five hundred big industry companies work in textile & ready to wear clothing and food sectors. On the contrary to development in the world, sectors that have capital intensive companies don’t come to the fore. Sectors having labour intensive companies are much in Turkey. There is a composition difference between sector dispersion in the world and in Turkey.

**APPENDIX**

**Benchmarking Making Companies**
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