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Complexity, volatility, ambiguity and blinding speed—these are some of the fundamental characteristics that distinguish today’s global business environment. This massively interconnected system, sustained by a torrent of digital information, is subject to instantaneous disruption—a significant interruption to an existing business arising from innovative technology, a new business model, or political, economic and environmental forces. Organizations that expect to flourish in this environment must have processes in place that enable them to anticipate and respond to disruption—and, in some cases, to become disruptors themselves.

**Middle-market companies play an important role in this environment and in the U.S. economy.** The nearly 20,000 of these companies employ more than 30 million people and produce approximately $10 trillion of the $30 trillion annual gross receipts generated nationwide.
Organizations that expect to flourish in this environment must have processes in place that enable them to anticipate and respond to disruption—and, in some cases, to become disruptors themselves.
Do executives at middle-market companies feel they are vulnerable to disruption?

To what extent are they prepared for disruptive events? Do they see disruption as a threat or as an opportunity? To answer these questions, Capital One surveyed more than 300 senior executives from companies that generate between $100 million and $3 billion in annual revenues to find out where they and their companies stand on these critical issues. The key findings of this survey highlight the challenges that middle-market executives face and their response to them.

Survey Key Findings

Key Finding #1
Disruption reaches across the Middle Market

Fifteen percent of middle-market companies have already faced a disruption that had a material impact on their finances, and an additional 73 percent expect to experience a disruption within the next three years. Middle-market executives as a group cite the Internet of Things and big data analytics as likely causes of disruption, but this finding varied considerably by industry.

Key Finding #2
Middle-market executives expect disruption, but not to their companies

When asked to appraise the outlook for their industries, forty-three percent said that their industry is quite or extremely vulnerable to disruption. However, when asked about their own prospects, a different picture emerges. Just 18 percent reported that their own company is quite vulnerable to a disruption. One reason for this discrepancy is that an overwhelming number (79 percent) view disruption as an opportunity, not a threat.

Key Finding #3
Preparation is the exception, not the rule

Given this viewpoint, it is not surprising that only one-sixth of the survey respondents feel quite or extremely prepared to deal with a disruptive event. Eighty-nine percent of middle-market firms are taking at least one measure to defend themselves against disruption, but in categories like implementing regular firewall testing or purchasing interruption insurance, preparation falls quite low.

Key Finding #4
Company size affects response to disruption

Company size correlates with attitude toward disruption. Companies with revenue between $2 billion and $3 billion are much more likely to see a disruptive event as an opportunity than companies in the $100 million to $499 million range. In addition, they are more likely to have insulated themselves from the effects of a disruptive event and to be pursuing a disruptive strategy of their own that could lead to a competitive advantage.
Strategic Approach

We posit that success in the face of disruption requires both preparation and proactivity. Better-prepared companies that are also pursuing a disruptive strategy of their own that could lead to a competitive advantage tend to see disruption as an opportunity. We dubbed this group “the disruptors.” By contrast, those who were not at all or just slightly prepared for disruption and are not pursuing a disruptive strategy tend to see it as a threat—a group we named “the delayers.”

The results of this survey point to a strategic approach consisting of 4 steps that delayers and smaller companies—with revenues between $100 million and $499 million—could implement to better defend themselves from disruption and support the launch of their own disruptive strategies:

1. **Deploy comprehensive defensive measures**

   The survey found that most companies are at best employing one or two defensive measures against disruption, and, disconcertingly, 11 percent are doing nothing. In particular, delayers and smaller companies lag behind in designating an in-house disruption person or team, collecting additional data for analysis, and implementing regular firewall testing. They should focus on these areas to build their defenses.

2. **Strengthen financial relationships**

   Almost one-third of our respondents lack a banking relationship that could provide the financial advice and support they might need to weather a disruptive event. To increase their readiness to confront disruption, companies should look for stable, established financial partners that offer a broad and evolving selection of services and have a deep understanding of the industry as the marketplace changes.

3. **Increase spending on R&D**

   An investment in R&D expands a company’s options in a disruptive environment—helping it to defend against disruption, while giving it the tools to be a disruptor. Delayers and smaller companies should focus on developing a robust R&D capability both to protect against disruption and develop potentially disruptive capabilities.

4. **Adopt disruptive financial technology**

   Disruptive technologies, especially rapidly evolving digital tools, have the potential to streamline operations, create efficiencies, and reduce costs. Not surprisingly, we found that disruptors are more enthusiastic about adopting these technologies than any other group. We suggest that delayers follow their lead, concentrating first on online and mobile payments.
In the popular mind, disruption is traditionally the purview of start-up companies, but in fact they have no monopoly on it. Large, well-established companies have led the broad adoption of personal computers and have revolutionized mobile devices. These enterprises had a willingness to envision the future, rewrite their business plans to seize the opportunities they identified and dedicate capital to support the transition.

Middle-market companies have an opportunity both to adjust to disruption and even become disruptors themselves, but they must be prepared. Our survey found that many middle-market companies have focused so intently on introducing disruptive strategies themselves that they have given defensive measures short shrift. Others have delayed deploying defensive methods while a third group, the smaller companies, lacks resources.

The major obstacle for many companies is access to capital. Seventy-five percent of respondents believe they will need additional capital to remain competitive in the event of an industry disruption. Having the right financial partner capable of offering a broad spectrum of services is critical for such defensive as investing in R&D or adopting digital products and services. For these middle-market firms to thrive in a complex business environment, they will require a financial partner that is equal to the challenge.

Middle-market companies have an opportunity both to adjust to disruption and even become disruptors themselves, but they must be prepared.
Findings

Most discussions of disruption focus on the role of start-ups in generating disruption and the effect of this disruption on large, established companies that dominate their industries. Middle-market companies, however, are not mere bystanders in this struggle between large and small. Resource constraints can make middle-market companies an object of disruption. At the same time, their size can provide the flexibility needed to adapt to disruption and even become agents of disruption. These survey findings highlight the range of attitudes and strategies that middle-market companies have adopted in this volatile business environment.
Key Finding #1: Disruption reaches across the Middle Market

When will disruption have a material impact on your finances?

- **15%** It has already happened
- **41%** Between 1 & 3 years
- **32%** Within the next year
- **12%** Between 3 & 5 years

Many in the Middle Market have already felt the effects of disruption or anticipate doing so in the near future. **Fifteen percent have already faced a disruption that had a material impact on their finances, and an additional 73 percent expect to experience a disruption within the next three years.**

Which technology has the greatest chance to disrupt your business?

- **41%** Big Data Analytics
- **32%** Mobile apps/capabilities
- **24%** Social Media
- **17%** Artificial Intelligence
- **5%** Robotics
- **4%** Alternative Energy
- **3%** Energy Storage

Half of our middle-market respondents cited the Internet of Things as a major source of disruption to their business, while another 41 percent think disruption will most likely emerge from a related area, big data analytics. Despite rapid advances in energy technology, only 4 percent chose alternative energy and just 3 percent selected advances in energy storage as potential sources of disruption.

Technology, telecom and IT companies, financial services and insurance companies, and those with $1 billion or more in revenue are the most likely to cite big data analytics as a technology that presents the greatest chance of disruption to their business.

Industry Insight

Companies in financial services were most likely to say that they have already experienced a disruption. Approximately half the companies in healthcare and in technology, telecom, and IT anticipate a disruption within the next year.

Not surprisingly, more apparel and retail companies selected social media as a disruptive technology, more manufacturers selected robotics, and more financial services and insurance companies chose blockchain.
Middle-market executives also see government actions as a potential source of disruption. Significantly more respondents are concerned about federal and state regulatory changes and executive orders than legislative action. Small companies, those with revenues between $100 million to $499 million, are most likely to be concerned with federal or state regulatory changes, whereas large companies were least likely to be concerned.

**Are you concerned about disruption due to these government actions?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manner of Action</th>
<th>Concerned Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive orders</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal or state regulatory changes</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Reserve changes</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative action</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all concerned</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44% are concerned about executive orders.
Key Finding #2: Middle-market executives expect disruption, but not to their companies

How vulnerable are you to disruption?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Your Company</th>
<th>Your Industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not At All Vulnerable</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Vulnerable</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Vulnerable</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Vulnerable</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Vulnerable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Industry Insight

Manufacturers feel their companies are just as vulnerable as the industry at large. In fact, they actually believe their individual companies are more vulnerable than the overall manufacturing industry – the only sector with this view.

Although 88 percent of the respondents said that disruption had already happened or was imminent, they are strikingly optimistic about its effects on their companies. Just 18 percent reported that they feel quite vulnerable to a disruption that would provide a simpler, cheaper, or more convenient alternative, and not one said its company was extremely vulnerable.

However, when asked to appraise the vulnerability of their industries, a strikingly different picture emerges. Forty-three percent said that their industry is quite or extremely vulnerable to disruption. In other words, their response to this question suggests that many expect their companies to be exempt from the industry trend.

This dichotomy was especially pronounced for executives in apparel and retail. Just 23 percent reported that their companies were quite or extremely vulnerable, compared to their appraisal of industry vulnerability at 70 percent. Apparently, while tacitly acknowledging their industry’s vulnerability to disruption from online merchants, they evidently feel that their companies have a strategy that will enable them to survive in this new environment.

The apparel and retail industry is not alone. Respondents from energy, resources, and chemical companies declared that their industry’s vulnerability was almost five times that of their companies, and those from commercial real estate said their industry was six times more vulnerable. This finding is so general across industries that it supports a contention of overconfidence.
This sanguine view of company susceptibility to disruption is consistent with the respondents’ overall view of disruption as an opportunity. The overwhelming (79 percent) view of disruption as primarily or completely an opportunity is consistent with middle-market companies’ sense of their invulnerability. Remarkably, even those who feel quite or extremely vulnerable to disruption are significantly more likely to view disruption as an opportunity.

A potential rationale for middle-market companies’ enthusiasm for disruption is that 60 percent of them are actively pursuing a disruptive strategy that would lead to competitive advantage. In fact, the more vulnerable they feel, the more likely they are to be pursuing a disruptive strategy of their own. Eighty-five percent of those who feel quite or extremely vulnerable have launched disruptive strategies.

For most middle-market companies, the old adage applies: the best defense is a good offense. As the survey revealed, this often precludes any traditional defense at all.

Industry Insight
Energy, resources, and chemicals companies, as well as companies in manufacturing are most likely to view disruption primarily as a threat, while 75 percent of their counterparts in transportation, logistics, and distribution consider it primarily an opportunity.

Industry Insight
Financial services and insurance, apparel and retail, and healthcare companies are most likely to be pursuing a disruptive strategy.
A quarter of the respondents expressed their intention to turn to operations and logistics for their disruptive strategy. They were also likely to tap marketing and communications, as well as information technology.

**In what area of your business is a disruptive strategy likely to emerge?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operations and logistics</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and communications</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and accounting</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and development</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Industry Insight**

Financial services and insurance companies are the most likely to be developing disruptions based on finance and accounting, while technology, telecom, and IT companies will look to information technology as the source of disruptions.
Key Finding #3: Preparation is the exception, not the rule

Are you prepared for disruption?

Companies that see an opportunity to disrupt are not necessarily prepared to be disrupted. It is true that 43 percent of those who see disruption completely as an opportunity are quite or extremely prepared, and those who see disruption completely as a threat do so because they are not at all prepared. However, there is a significant group whose view of disruption does not match their level of preparation. Fifty-five percent of those who see disruption primarily as an opportunity are only slightly prepared for potential disruption of their business.

Eighty-nine percent of middle-market companies are taking at least one measure to defend themselves against disruption. However, none of the individual defensive actions listed in the survey were taken by 50 percent of all those surveyed. In cases like implementing regular firewall testing or purchasing interruption insurance, preparation falls quite low.

Industry Insight

Financial services and insurance companies and technology, telecom, and IT companies are likely to be quite or extremely prepared for a disruption.

As we have seen, middle-market companies view disruption as pervasive but cast themselves as disruptors, not victims. Given this viewpoint, it is not surprising that only one-sixth of the survey respondents feel quite or extremely prepared to deal with a disruptive event.

Industry Insight

Financial services and insurance companies, manufacturing, and technology, telecom, and IT companies are likely to have adopted a broad-based defense against disruption.

Specific preparations for disruption

- In-house person/team for identifying threats and opportunities: 49%
- Created a contingency plan: 45%
- Collected additional data for analysis: 44%
- Implemented regular firewall testing: 21%
- Purchased interruption insurance: 19%
- None of the above: 11%
Key Finding #4: Company size affects response to disruption

Large vs. small: What specific preparations have you taken?

Company size correlates with attitude toward disruption. Companies with revenues between $2 billion and $3 billion are much more likely to see a disruptive event as an opportunity than companies in the $100 million to $499 million range.

They are also more likely to have insulated themselves from the effects of a disruptive event. More than their counterparts in smaller companies, the largest companies in the survey have created contingency plans and purchased interruption insurance. They are also investing heavily in R&D. Half of them have increased their R&D budgets by 11 to 25 percent in the last year. Compared to smaller companies, these companies are also more likely to be pursuing a disruptive strategy of their own that could lead to a competitive advantage.

Smaller companies—those with revenues between $100 million and $499 million—are likely to take the opposite view. They are more likely to view disruption as a threat, primarily because they have difficulty mustering the financial resources for preparation.

For instance, they often lack the banking relationships needed to secure this funding. If confronted by a disruption in their industry, these smaller companies would require an infusion of capital. They are not investing in R&D—in 49 percent of the cases, their R&D budgets have declined, remained the same, or grown no more than 5 percent in the last year—and they are not taking other precautions. Just a third have put in place a contingency plan, created an in-house team to identify threats, or collected additional data for analysis and even fewer purchased interruption insurance or implemented regular firewall protection.
We posit that success in the face of disruption requires both preparation and proactivity. **Those who are quite or extremely prepared for disruption and are pursuing a disruptive strategy, we dubbed disruptors.** They constituted 16 percent of the respondents.

Seen in this light, financial services and insurance companies are archetypical disruptors. Forty-seven percent are quite or extremely prepared for disruption, and 83 percent are pursuing a disruptive strategy. The averages for the survey as a whole are 16 percent and 60 percent respectively. Every respondent from this industry viewed disruption as primarily or completely an opportunity.

**By contrast, delayers are those who are slightly or not at all prepared for a disruptive event and are not pursuing a disruptive strategy.** They account for 30 percent of the respondents. Energy, resources, and chemicals companies tend to be classic delayers. Eighty-three percent are slightly or not at all prepared for a disruptive event (compared to 53 percent of the total executives surveyed), and only 37 percent are pursuing a disruptive strategy (compared to 60 percent). Fifty-seven percent see it as primarily or completely a threat, compared to 21 percent for the survey as a whole.

There is a clear correlation between company size and whether a company is a disruptor or delayer. Just 3 percent of companies with revenues between $100 million and $499 million are disruptors, while 44 percent are delayers. By contrast, 27 percent of companies with revenues between $2 billion and $3 billion annually are disruptors, while only 13 percent are delayers.

Disruptors are significantly more likely than any other group in our survey to feel vulnerable to disruption because they are significantly more likely to have already experienced a disruptive event.

- Virtually every disruptor—92 percent—has an in-house person or team tasked with identifying threats, and 85 percent have created a contingency plan. By contrast, only 41 percent of delayers have a person or team dedicated to disruption and 24 percent have created a contingency plan.
- They are four to five times as likely to have purchased interruption insurance and to have implemented regular firewall testing than delayers.
- Almost two-thirds (63 percent) have increased their overall R&D budget by 11 percent to 25 percent over the last year. Thirty-three percent of delayers, on the other hand, did not grow their R&D budget at all.
- Disruptors are almost three times more likely to have sufficient banking relationships to provide financial advice and support during a disruptive event than delayers, and are less likely to require additional capital to remain competitive.

In essence, disruptors feel confident about their defenses against disruption, which have freed them to concentrate on being disruptors themselves.
Strategic Approach

The results of our survey point to four steps that the 30 percent of the respondents defined as delayers and smaller companies—those with revenues between $100 million and $499 million—can take to better defend themselves from disruption and even to launch more effective disruptive strategies of their own.
Step #1: Deploy comprehensive defensive measures

The survey found that most companies are employing just one or two defensive measures against disruption, and, disconcertingly, 11 percent are doing nothing. Thirty-five percent of the delayers fall into this group, as do 19 percent of the smaller middle-market companies.

Disruptors vs. Delayers: What specific preparations have you taken?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disruptors</th>
<th>Delayers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-house person/team responsible for identifying threats and opportunities</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created a contingency plan</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collected additional data for analysis</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased interruption insurance</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implemented regular firewall testing</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared to the middle-market average, delayers lag behind in:
- designating an in-house disruption person or team,
- collecting additional data for analysis,
- and implementing regular firewall testing.

They should focus on these areas to build their defenses.
Step #2: Strengthen financial relationships

Sixty-eight percent of our respondents report having a banking relationship in place that could provide the financial advice and support they might need to weather a disruptive event—but this leaves 32 percent relatively underprepared.

Do you have banking relationships to support you in case of disruption?

- **68%** Yes
- **32%** No

Industry Insight

Healthcare institutions and financial services and insurance companies are significantly more likely to have the banking relationships to help them withstand a disruptive event than companies in other sectors.

Having this relationship in place is particularly important because an infusion of capital is often necessary to adjust to disruption. Seventy percent of those with an ongoing banking relationship expect to need additional funding in the face of a disruption. They will find it easier to arrange than the 86 percent without a strong banking relationship who will require an infusion of capital to stay competitive.

Which sources of capital would you consider?

- **41%** Private equity
- **40%** Peer-to-peer lending
- **38%** Asset-based lending
- **36%** Asset securitization
- **30%** Venture capital
- **28%** Crowdfunding
- **17%** Subordinated debt
- **3%** Mezzanine debt

Industry Insight

Manufacturing companies were more likely to explore crowdfunding and peer-to-peer lending than any other industry group. Manufacturers were especially attracted by the speed to close and ease of access of such funding.

Financial institutions remain the preferred source of funding for most middle-market companies, who are especially interested in asset-based lending and asset securitization as well as access to private equity. This is particularly true of disruptors.

The survey revealed, however, a surprising willingness to seek alternative sources of capital like peer-to-peer lending and crowdfunding, although it is primarily the smaller companies and delayers that are exploring these alternatives.

To increase their readiness to confront disruption, companies should look for stable, established financial partners that offer a broad and evolving selection of services and have a deep understanding of the industry as the marketplace changes.
Step #3: Increase spending on research and development

An investment in R&D expands a company’s options in a disruptive environment—helping it to defend against disruption, while providing the tools to be a disruptor. Two-fifths of our respondents report that their firms increased their R&D budgets between 6 and 10 percent in the past year.

The strategic decision to increase R&D spending between 11 and 25 percent—the level most likely to yield a disruptive strategy—led disruptors to stand apart. Sixty-three percent of disruptors made this level of investment, compared to 14 percent of the small companies, and 13 percent of the delayers.

**Disruptors vs. Delayers: How has your R&D budget changed?**

![Disruptors vs. Delayers Chart]

Significantly, access to capital is a critical issue in a company’s willingness to make this sort of investment. Those with strong banking relationships are most likely to have increased their R&D budgets by between 11 and 25 percent.

**Industry Insight**

Almost half (47 percent) of financial services and insurance companies devote more than 6 percent of their R&D budgets for disruption.

**Small firms and delayers should focus on developing a robust R&D capability in order to protect against disruption and develop potentially disruptive capabilities.**
Step #4: Adopt disruptive financial technology

A final way for middle-market companies to protect against disruption is to adopt disruptive technologies, especially new digital tools. These technologies have the potential to streamline operations, create efficiencies, and reduce costs.

Are you open to digital products?

About one-fifth (19 percent) of the respondents said that they were open to introducing digital products to their business. By far most of these were disruptors, a position consistent with their penchant for innovation. Nearly three-fifths (58 percent) of the disruptors welcomed digital tools. This is compared to just 2 percent for delayers, and 9 percent for small companies.

Disruptors vs. Delayers: Have you adopted a disruptive financial service?

These findings were reinforced by a related finding: 60 percent of disruptors use new technology for bills, transfers, and accounting, 58 percent for payroll and benefits, and 52 percent for merchant services. Here again, small companies and delayers lag far behind.

Industry Insight

Healthcare companies are more likely to have adopted disruptive financial procedures than any other sector, perhaps as a result of requirements in the Affordable Care Act.
Which digital products hold the most promise?

Online and mobile payments are the digital products considered to offer the greatest benefits, according to 54 percent of the respondents.

Overall, disruptors were much more enthusiastic than any other group about specific FinTech products. For instance, seventy-one percent recognized the benefits of online and mobile payments. Interestingly, small companies were more interested in alternative lending than larger companies, a result consistent with findings about preferred sources of capital.

**Industry Insight**

Companies in apparel and retail as well as financial services and insurance are most likely to feel that online and mobile payments offer the greatest potential. Manufacturers saw great potential in investment management and advising as well as blockchain.

Small firms and delayers would do well to follow the lead of disruptors in strengthening their companies by adopting disruptive technologies. They should begin by concentrating on online and mobile payments.
Globalization and the advent of new technologies, which have made new business models possible while dramatically lowering costs, are transforming once staid industries.

This transformation has been asymmetrical, creating winners and losers. When large electronic commerce companies succeed, brick and mortar retailers suffer. Short-term rental services take rooms from established hotels.

**Middle-market companies have an opportunity both to adjust to disruption and even become disruptors themselves, but they must actively prepare.** Our survey found that many middle-market companies have focused so intently on introducing disruptive strategies themselves that they have given defensive measures short shrift. Others have delayed deploying defensive methods while a third group, the smaller companies, lacks resources.

**The major obstacle for many of them is access to capital.** Seventy-five percent of respondents believe they will need additional capital to remain competitive in the event of an industry disruption. Having the right financial partner capable of offering a broad spectrum of services is critical for such defensive measures as investing in R&D or adopting digital products and services. For these middle-market firms to thrive in a complex business environment, they will require a financial partner that is equal to the challenge.
About the Research

From April 12, 2017 to May 8, 2017, Capital One engaged Beresford Research, a market research firm, to conduct a study by phone about disruption in the Middle Market. The study consisted of a survey that catalogued the views of 301 senior middle-market executives about the effects of disruptive events on their businesses and the steps they were taking to respond to these events. For purposes of the study, middle-market companies were defined as firms with operations in the United States with annual revenues between $100 million and $3 billion. The 301 responses represent the U.S. middle-market population with a margin of error of 5.65 points (at 95 percent confidence).
Seventy percent of the respondents were C-level executives, who tended to be from companies with revenues between $500 million and $1.9 billion. Twenty percent of the C-level executives were COOs and another 20 percent were CFOs. The remainder of the respondents—direct reports to C-level executives—were most often from larger companies, those with between $1 and $3 billion in revenue. Fifty-six percent of these direct reports were senior vice presidents.

The respondents were divided among 10 industries. They are transportation, logistics, distribution; technology, telecom, IT; security; professional services; healthcare; financial services and insurance; energy, resources, chemicals; commercial real estate; apparel and retail; and manufacturing.

Half of the respondents worked for companies with revenues between $100 million and $999 million and half worked for companies with revenues of $1 billion to $3 billion.
Take the next step

Whether insulating your company from a disruptive event, facilitating an R&D expansion or acquiring new online and mobile payment solutions, a strong banking relationship is key. As a top-10 U.S. bank housing a digital innovation lab, we’re committed to providing you the resources, tools and expertise needed in promoting disruptive innovation across your business.

Let’s discuss the possibilities.

Capital One
299 Park Ave., New York, NY 10171
commercialbanking@capitalone.com

About Us

Capital One Financial Corporation (www.capitalone.com) is a financial holding company whose subsidiaries, which include Capital One, N.A., and Capital One Bank (USA), N.A., had $241.2 billion in deposits and $348.5 billion in total assets as of March 31, 2017. Headquartered in McLean, Virginia, Capital One offers a broad spectrum of financial products and services consumers, small businesses and commercial clients through a variety of channels. Capital One, N.A. has branches located primarily in New York, Louisiana, Texas, Maryland, Virginia, New Jersey and the District of Columbia. A Fortune 500 company, Capital One trades on the New York Stock Exchange under the symbol “COF” and is included in the S&P 100 index.