

**the Gediman Research Group, Inc.**

26 Sixth Street  
Stamford, Connecticut 06905  
203-348-0009

MODEL 700 ADL

PRODUCT/MARKETING REVITALIZATION RESEARCH

---

For: Remington Arms Company, Inc.  
June, 1982

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE. . . . . 1

SUMMARY AND STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS. . . . . 2

STEP ONE

INTRODUCTION. . . . . 6

THE FOCUS GROUPS. . . . . 7

THE PERSONAL INTERVIEWS . . . . . 17

STEP TWO

INTRODUCTION. . . . . 40

PREFERENCE. . . . . 41

DETAILED LIKES AND DISLIKES OF THE MODELS . . . . . 55

EVALUATION OF SCOPE MOUNTING SYSTEMS. . . . . 63

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

In connection with Remington's concern over increasing market share loss of its Model 700 ADL bolt action center fire rifle (presumably) to the Ruger Model 77, this research was designed to:

1. Provide additional qualitative understanding of comparatively recent Ruger purchase decisions in this category;
2. Screen four new ADL prototypes to identify the best combination of finish and stock style to place against the Ruger 77 in the marketplace;
3. Conduct a preference test between the winner in 2., above and the current Ruger 77; and also to evaluate a Remington scope mounting system being considered as a standard addition to the new ADL model.

The research was conducted in two steps, with the first addressing objectives 1. and 2., above, and the second step addressing objective 3. Detailed descriptions of method and sample are set forth in the separate "Introduction" sections for each step.

## SUMMARY AND STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS

### Why Ruger Owners Purchase Rugers\*

For the Ruger 77 buyer, good price -- or, more accurately, value for the money -- is by far the main purchase determinant. Contributing importantly to perceived value are included features that cost extra on competing models. Of particular value (worth \$50 or more) on the Ruger is the integral scope mount and included rings, as well as swivels and the recoil pad. Ruger's excellent reputation (amounting, in the not infrequent extreme, almost to a "mystique") also plays an important role. Part of this powerful positive imagery -- especially, it seems, among some of the more experienced and ostensibly knowledgeable hunters -- is the conception of the Ruger as an ideal "working gun," a "classic," not unlike the pre-1964 Winchester 70.

### Preference Testing

Step One "screening down" of the main test variables reveals the Monte Carlo stock with glossy finish to be the preferred model. However, since Remington already has a glossy finish in its 700 line (BDL); and since the Ruger 77 (the key target at issue) has a satin finish; and, finally, since the Monte Carlo stock with satin finish comes up a strong second in the test...the latter was selected as the most promising design direction overall.

In the Step Two match-up of this revised Remington Model 700 ADL against the current Ruger Model 77, the sample as a whole prefers the Ruger (though not by much). More to the point is the finding that only a very small minority of Ruger owners -- the target segment at issue -- prefer the Remington. Indeed, as shown in the summary table below, the Ruger "wins over" more Remington owners than vice versa.

<u>Preferred Model</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Ruger</u>	<u>Remington 700</u>	<u>Other**</u>
	(75)	(22)	(28)	(25)
Ruger	55%	91%	29%	52%
Remington	45	9	71	48

\*Qualitative data, based mainly on the two focus group discussions in Step One.

\*\*Includes eight Remington non-700 purchasers.

It is important to note that while the remaining intended major test variable -- stock configuration\* -- to some degree may be operating indirectly and/or unconsciously, consumers only infrequently cite it directly in support of their overall preference (for either model). Rather they cite other factors. For example, the reasons given for Ruger preference center on brand reputation, prior ownership experience, convenient tang safety, and tighter/smooth action, as well as feel/fit attributes, overall quality, and the stronger, more convenient scope mount. Preference for the Remington model is based on a wider variety of reasons, although voiced with comparatively less intensity. Reputation heads the list here, too, followed by feel/fit attributes. Other mentions include the satin finish, smooth action, accuracy, better wood, quality, Monte Carlo stock, and the convenient, positive safety.

Scope mounting system preference. Consumers in this research favor the Ruger system by a margin of nearly three to one. Even among those who prefer the Remington model overall, a (scant) majority favor the Ruger mount. The convenience of easy attachment and removal, along with the perceived greater stability and strength afforded by the integral design are the chief reasons given.

The main disadvantage seen in the Remington scope mounting system is the material used in the rings. Obviously not steel, the rings are perceived to be plastic, alloy, pot metal or an unknown material which appears flimsy and cheap. Other negatives seen in the Remington system relate to problems inherent in the design such as needing tools to install the scope, the potential for thread damage, possible mount loosening, and the need to remove the scope from the rings in order to remove the mount.

\*The other main intended variable -- stock finish -- was resolved in favor of satin in Step One.

### Strategic Implications

The revised Remington Model 700 ADL represents an improvement in several respects over the current offering. Of particular merit are better blueing and cut checkering, and overall good appearance. However, with regard to the new gun's prospects for stemming Ruger's market share gains, the results of this research are not especially encouraging.

A large part of the problem derives from the strong and rather "special" positive imagery surrounding the Ruger brand and the Ruger family in general, and the "classic" Model 77 in particular. Another large part follows from widespread consumer perception of the Model 77 as an extraordinarily good value -- both in its own right and also compared to the Model 700 ADL.

Remington product and communications (and of course pricing) strategy implementations should address both those aspects of the problem above.\* One approach would be to defuse any Remington "false negatives" and/or Ruger "false positives," such as now seem to exist regarding, for example:

- manufacturing processes in general
- quality; hand operations
- stamping vs. machining of parts
- strength, reliability of clip extractor vs. Mauser extractor
- materials comparisons
- accuracy

Communications should also project "working gun," "shooter" benefit meanings for the ADL -- these themes often voiced by Ruger owners in describing their utilitarian yet quality hunting rifle that "really means business." Inclusion of the scope mount and rings as standard equipment on the new ADL surely will help narrow the perceived price/value gap, as will such additional features as the butt pad and improved blueing.

\*It might be noted in passing that these issues should be addressed not simply in relation to the revised ADL, but rather in relation to the entire Model 700 line, including the Classic.

Finally, some additional thoughts for management consideration:

- If a lightweight, "flimsy" looking material is used for the rings -- e.g., aluminum -- its strength and other advantages must be communicated
- a provision for self-aligning the scope when remounting would be a plus
- a quick release feature for the scope (and rings) might be included
- for the screwed-on bases, provide visual cues to strength -- e.g., possibly increasing screw diameter
- perhaps redesign the bases to incorporate a more permanent screwed-on portion with a slotted or similar mechanism of attaching the rings

STEP ONE



## INTRODUCTION

The purposes of this first step were to explore why Ruger Model 77 owners purchased their Rugers, and to identify consumers' stock style and finish preferences for the projected new Remington Model 700 ADL. This step itself consisted of two parts -- focus groups and then personal one-on-one interviews -- conducted in San Antonio, Texas and Denver, Colorado.

### Focus Groups

In the groups the primary emphasis was to explore the reasons for purchasing Ruger Model 77's. Therefore, all participants (nine in Texas; eleven in Colorado) were screened for purchase of a Model 77 within at least the past 5 years. Secondary emphasis was placed on their preference for one of the four test models.

A brief note on the make-up of the sample: These groups seem to reflect a more experienced level of shooter/hunter, as evidenced by the fact that all of the San Antonio men are hand loaders, as are a majority of the Denver group. Also, in the Denver group, two of the men are part-time hunting guides, one is a retired gun store owner, and another is a gunsmithing student.

### Personal Interviews

In the individual interviews the emphases were reversed -- i.e., design preference primary and reasons for purchase secondary. The sample make-up was:

	<u>Total</u>	<u>TX</u>	<u>CO</u>
	(51)	(26)	(25)
Ruger Purchasers	16	5	11
Remington 700 Purchasers	20	12	8
Other Purchasers	15	9	6

THE FOCUS GROUPS

Why Ruger Owners Purchased Rugers

The reasons for purchase of a Ruger Model 77, although varied,\* can be analytically clustered into three groupings:

- Price/Value
- Design/Performance
- Other Influences

The Price/Value dimension reflects the combined influence of a good price (usually lower than its competition), good quality, and the inclusion of features that otherwise would cost extra. Equally important are the Design/Performance aspects, reflecting the influence of appearance, functional, and performance attributes. Of somewhat lesser import, but not to be ignored (especially for first time buyers), are the roles of recommendation and Ruger's reputation. These groupings are discussed in detail following the table on the next page.

\*See table on next page.

Reasons for Purchasing a Ruger Model 77

(Ranked by frequency of mention)

Quality/overall quality/fit of parts/finish of metal/hand  
cut checkering

Price/value

Classic design/style/looks

Accuracy

Dependability/reliability/durability/rugged

Features/integral scope mount/swivels/tang safety/  
adjustable trigger

Action/mechanics/strength

Stock finish

Prior experience

Caliber

Reputation/status

Recommendation

Quality and Price/Value. The Ruger Model 77 adds up to what consumers see as a "best buy." Our group session participants repeatedly tell us that for the money you can't buy a better gun. Not only is the price right but so is the quality -- the rare case where a comparatively lower priced product is also of better quality. Included in this assessment is Ruger's offering as standard, features that cost extra on other brands. The following quote is a good summary:

"Dollar for dollar it's the best rifle on the market. Basically, I love Winchester, I guess for sentimental reasons, but that has nothing to do with it when it comes to spending money."

Price, specifically, is mentioned frequently as an important factor in the purchase of a Ruger. In many cases, the men tell us that the Ruger is less expensive, or that other choices -- Remington, Winchester, Sako, Browning, etc. -- are more expensive. The Remington 700 model that would be most nearly competitive on price is the ADL. That price is important is further emphasized by the fact that the buyer often waits for a sale or buys a used gun. Indicative of these various perspectives on price:

"You take the three top ones -- Winchester, Remington and Ruger -- and for the same thing on all three guns, you'll pay more for the Winchester and you'll pay more for the Remington."

"I was looking at Remington also. Ruger happened to be a little bit cheaper."

"The Ruger is normally cheaper than the Winchester and the Remington."

"I bought mine on sale last August, so I was comparing them."

"Recently I got what I wanted in a gun shop. I watched for a good used one (Ruger 77)."

"Cost was a definite factor versus the Remington. I didn't even look at the BDL."

As noted previously, contributing further to Ruger's good value for the money is the inclusion of a number of features that buyers would have to pay extra for, or would require buying a more expensive model, in other

brands. The most important in terms of dollar value and the most frequently mentioned is the Integral scope mount and rings. Ruger owners tell us this can be worth \$50 or more:

"You get your rings and mounts, which automatically saves you \$50 right there."

"Mounting the scope...most shops, if you brought it in to have it mounted and bore sighted, you're looking at \$50. That's if you bring in the mounts, the scope and the rifle."

"If you buy a Remington or a (Winchester) Model 70, you buy the scope rings extra."

Also mentioned, but less frequently, are the sling swivels (a particularly desirable quick disconnect type) and the recoil pad:

"The strap mounts are already on the Ruger. With the Remington you've got to pay extra to have those little suckers put on there. That's one of the reasons. Why pay \$20-\$25 for something the Ruger's already got?"

Ruger quality is perceived as being very good, especially for the price range in which this gun sells. The respondents feel strongly about this, in some cases telling us that, all features being equal, they would pay more for the Ruger than a Remington:

"I would pay more money to buy a Ruger than an ADL."

"Even at the same price, the Ruger's better."

One factor shaping their opinions of Ruger quality is the belief that Ruger does less stamping and more machining of parts than Remington; and that, in fact, Remington has been shifting to more stampings. Other quality factors mentioned are the better, more consistent fitting of parts; better, deeper bluing; and better wood. Some of these beliefs are aired thusly:

"The overall workmanship of the Ruger compared to Remington or Winchester is better."

"In the Ruger, all the parts fit and therefore it's a solid gun."

"Yes...the machining is better."

"Stock wood-to-metal fit is better."

"The Ruger just seems to be finished a little better -- the stock finish, the machining, the metal finish."

"Back when parts were machined (on the Remington 700) they were a lot smoother, a lot more dependable. If you took a gun apart today, you'd probably faint if you saw all those jagged edges, the nasty looking metal in there."

Additional perceived evidence of Ruger quality is found in the checkering, which is hand cut rather than stamped as on the Remington 700 ADL:

"The hand-cut checkering (is better). There's checkering on all three of them but Remington uses stamped checkering. It's not actually cut; it's just stamped into it."

"That stamped checkering ain't worth a damn."

Design/performance. The Ruger, described by some as "a shooter," is viewed as a gun that is well designed, a reliable performer and good looking without being a "wall hanger" show gun. An all-around, "working" gun, the Ruger also is described as being a "classic" -- the best thing since the legendary pre-'64 Winchester. Two major elements of this classic design are the straight stock and the oil rubbed finish, enhanced by the hand-cut checkering. Respondents tell us that the Ruger marks a return to plainer yet pleasing lines -- a welcome relief from glaring high-gloss finishes and "fancy junk" such as white line spacers. Classic also means a constancy, an absence of change for change's sake characterized by the frequent introduction of new models. These themes can be heard in the following:

"One word to describe the Ruger is a classic."

"A classic (straight) stock on it."

"Ruger has gone back to that old classic stock, cut checkering, non-shiny finish, not a whole bunch of extra junk and spacers and things. It's just a good clean basic American rifle like the (Winchester) Model 70 was."

"Ruger has an oil finish stock, a minimum amount of checkering on it. It's not really a show piece gun, a wall hanger."

"The 700's got a laminated (plastic gloss finish) stock and that reflects light."

"It's as close as I can get to a pre-'64 Winchester for \$250. When you say classic I think everything's based on the pre-'64 Winchester Model 70. That was the ultimate."

"You don't change something that's good just to sell it."

"It doesn't change overnight. Mine, that I guess is about 17 years old, is no different than what I can buy today. Remington, they've brought out new guns just about every year."

(It's worth noting that these Ruger owners feel that the Remington 700 Classic comes closest to the Ruger 77, but at a premium price.)

The Ruger action is well liked for its solid, smooth reliability -- modeled after the "tried and true" Mauser 1898 action. Our respondents see the best of two worlds -- the genius of Bill Ruger combining modern developments with one of the most successful bolt actions ever designed:

"The Mauser action is one of the stronger actions you can get."

"The Ruger is probably the most advanced design of the Mauser '98 because it's got all the modern features."

"You can take a Ruger 77 action and build virtually any cartridge made on it. It will withstand the pressures. It will perform longer than any other action made."

"What I like about it is it's a smoother action."

"It's not as sloppy an action as it is with Remington."

Nevertheless, there are a few who believe that maybe the Mauser is oversold. Interestingly, in the Denver group, when presented with the question of why so many bench rest shooters use Remington actions, a number quickly concede that the Remington action (at least on the 40-XB's) is a good, tough one. This leads one individual to conclude that any Remington accuracy problems may be related to the barrel rather than to the action.

Another aspect of the Mauser action issue that draws considerable attention is the extractor, which is viewed as being stronger and more reliable...

"I like the way the extractor is on the Ruger; it's like having a crow bar to pry the shell out."

"When you close the bolt it grabs more of the shell head than with those two pieces that are thinner."

...than the tiny, clip extractor on the Remington. In Colorado, when confronted with the fact that the clip extractor, in tests, proved to be just as reliable, the respondents find that hard to believe:

"Damn right it is (hard to believe)."

"I'd rather have that (Mauser) extractor than a two piece extractor of spring steel."

"I've seen Remingtons break but I've never seen a Ruger break."

A very desirable performance result in addition to reliability is accuracy, and the Ruger is believed to be (is found to be, by owners) a very accurate gun. One of the respondents even talks of five shot groups within a dime's breadth at 100 yards. A few criticize the Remington's inability to perform similarly. While one does support the Remington, he suggests that his is an older, and thus perhaps better made, model. The Ruger's accuracy is praised in these comments:

"He said he put five shots in about three-quarters of an inch at 100 yards. So that was exceptional for a sporting rifle."

"...five Ruger bolt action rifles from a .458 magnum to a .22-250. None of those rifles has had anything done to them and they'll all shoot under a minute at 100 yards. They're very accurate. They're really good hunting rifles."

Further enhancing the stated desirability of the Ruger are a number of features which are not otherwise available, at least not in this general price class. In order of importance based on frequency of mention those features are:



- integral milled scope mount
- externally adjustable trigger
- tang safety
- hinged floor plate
- angled bolting of action to stock

The most important, integral scope mount, mentioned previously for its dollar value, is also deemed to be a superior type of mounting over screwed-on mounts, which can shift and lose zeroing of the scope.

The externally adjustable trigger is beneficial because it precludes having to remove the stock from the action -- thus disturbing the bedding, which may result in altered accuracy.

The tang safety is cited for its convenience of use, especially while shouldering the rifle. On the other hand, there are two objectors to the tang safety as liable to be disengaged easily when carrying the rifle in the hands, and thus being potentially dangerous.

The hinged floor plate type magazine is liked for its convenient ability to be loaded and unloaded from the bottom of the action without having to work the cartridges through the bolt. A few, while liking the floor plate, complain that it is alloy or pot metal (a quality point).

Other influences. Hardly any purchase of any substantial nature is made without being influenced by ego or pride, personal experiences, and what we've heard or read. These factors are also operative for buyers of Ruger rifles. For some, pride of ownership and perhaps even the snob appeal of something that is not too common is a powerful force and is evident among both our San Antonio and Denver participants:

"Now if I've got a damn Sears and Roebuck \$2.98 special downstairs that I hunt with all the time, I can't have much pride in ownership in that. But if I've got a nice looking Ruger, or a Sako or a Colt Sauer and one of my friends came over... 'look what I've got,' and I can show him that with pride."

"They're (Ruger) not a household word. They're not a Winchester."

Many buyers are greatly influenced by what others (experienced friends, the media, dealers) have to say, and often seek out their advice. The impact of this advice is evident even when claiming an open mind:

"I went out looking, completely open minded. There was a real good article in the 1978 Gun Digest about the Ruger 77. That had some bearing on it. One of the big bearings was I talked to friends who owned a Model 77 and had hunted with it. That was a very big deciding factor."

"I just went to a guy that I work with who owns a lot of guns and asked him, 'If you were going out to buy a brand new gun today, what would you buy?'"

Finally, personal experience is a positive force for Ruger owners, engendering repeat purchase. Not one negative Ruger ownership experience is voiced in either group. Indeed, in one case, the respondent's regret is that he had sold his Ruger. Note these comments:

"The first Ruger I bought for the caliber. I didn't have it but about a year and then I sold it. Then I bought a Remington and then I started wishing I had my Ruger back."

"I had two before and they never failed me. The gun does everything I've ever asked it to do."

#### Test Model Preference

Four test 700 ADL models reflecting all combinations of two major variables (stock design, stock finish) were presented for examination by the groups. The following configurations were shown:

- Monte Carlo stock\*/glossy finish
- Monte Carlo stock\*/satin finish
- Straight stock/satin finish
- Straight stock/glossy finish

\*With cheek piece also.

Preference. To encourage an honest preference, the respondents were offered the model of their choice in a drawing to be held among the 20 participants. The tally of the preferences show a unanimous preference for the satin finish and an almost 2 to 1 preference for the straight stock.

	<u>Total</u>	<u>TX</u>	<u>CO</u>
	(20)	( 9)	(11)
Straight stock/satin finish	13	8	5
Monte Carlo stock/satin finish	7	1	6

Interestingly, a (small) majority of the Colorado group opted for the Monte Carlo/cheek piece. In a separate preference test conducted in the same cities via individual interviews, an even larger majority of Ruger owners (69%) also opted for the Monte Carlo stock, which of course is not available on the Ruger 77.

Other reactions. In addition to the finish and stock design, a number of other points draw the attention of the respondents. Consistent with earlier comments regarding well liked Ruger 77 features, generally positive reaction is registered for the hand-cut checkering, the hinged floor plate, and the tang safety. Some negative commentary is directed at the "laminated" plastic finish (gloss models), inconsistent wood-to-metal fit, noisy, unsmooth actions, and inconsistent blueing. On balance, though, the test models are well received and deemed to be of good quality.

## THE PERSONAL INTERVIEWS

### Foreword

This section contains a narrative tabular back-up for the 51 personal interviews conducted in Step One -- 16 Ruger Model 77 purchasers, 20 Remington Model 700 purchasers, and 15 "all others."

The main purpose of these interviews was to conduct a preference test\* of two stock configurations for a new Remington Model 700 ADL -- Monte Carlo versus straight -- and two styles of finish -- satin versus gloss. Four models were used in the test, reflecting each possible combination and identified as follows:

Model Q - Monte Carlo stock/glossy finish
Model S - Monte Carlo stock/satin finish
Model P - Straight stock/satin finish
Model M - Straight stock/glossy finish

A rotation schedule for exposure was used, giving consideration to both test variables and aimed at randomizing order bias. Additional information about why the respondents bought the gun they did, other brands considered and rejected, where they purchased, and the extent of any dealer influence was also sought.

### Final Preference

In this "harder" research procedure, the Monte Carlo stock is clearly preferred over the straight stock -- by three-quarters of the overall sample, and two-thirds of the Ruger owners. With respect to finish, the glossy finish is preferred by half the overall sample but by less than two-fifths of the Ruger owners. The single most preferred model is Q (Monte Carlo/

---

\*More definitive than the informal exposure of the test models in the group sessions.

glossy) -- preferred by about 40 percent of the sample,\* though lower among Ruger owners. There are some differences between the Ruger owners in Texas (5) and those in Colorado (11), the most notable of which is with respect to finish preference: The Texas group prefers the glossy finish and the Colorado group prefers the satin.\*\*

#### Reasons for Purchasing Their Brand

Price is the most frequently mentioned factor influencing any particular purchase decision -- and even more so among Ruger than non-Ruger buyers.

Other factors mentioned by Ruger owners include:

- reputation/brand
- quality
- action
- overall appearance
- finish
- extractor/Mauser extractor
- advice

Among the non-Ruger owners, ballistic performance or caliber is the primary reason cited. Other important factors are:

- price
- reputation/brand
- quality
- overall appearance
- reliability

#### Other Brands Considered

Eight out of ten Ruger buyers say they also considered a Remington at the time of purchase, with slightly more than half rejecting the Remington as too expensive. One-fifth report rejecting the Remington because of its glossy finish. Winchester also was considered by some respondents, and, less often, Browning, Marlin, and Sako as well. Only 13 percent reportedly did not consider any other brand.

\*Monte Carlo/satin is a close second, preferred by one-third of the sample.

\*\*Because of the small cells, these and other differences noted in this section should be viewed with caution.

Among the non-Ruger owners (54% Remington owners), one-third also considered Winchester (rejected mainly on price) and a little less than one-quarter considered Remington (usually rejected on other than price grounds, although price is mentioned by some). Interestingly, only about 10 percent of this group also considered the Ruger. About 30 percent did not consider any other brand.

Where Purchased/Dealer Influence

The large majority of Ruger owners bought their gun through a dealer, but only one-fifth of these buyers say that the dealer had any influence on their decision.

A little less than half of the non-Ruger owners purchased their gun through a dealer; however, this group was twice as likely to be influenced by the dealer.

\* \* \*

Tabular support for the foregoing summary appears in the following pages. Percentages are used, for reader convenience in making comparisons; but, again, caution is advised because of the small numbers.

Final Preference

	<u>Total</u> (51)	<u>Ruger</u>			<u>Non-Ruger</u>		
		<u>Total</u> (16)	<u>TX</u> ( 5)	<u>CO</u> (11)	<u>Total</u> (35)	<u>TX</u> (21)	<u>CO</u> (14)
Model Q Monte Carlo*/ glossy	41%	38%	60%	27%	43%	42%	43%
Model S Monte Carlo*/ satin	33	31	-	45	34	29	43
Model P Straight/ satin	16	31	40	27	9	10	7
Model M Straight/ glossy	10	-	-	-	14	19	7
<hr/>							
Total Monte Carlo*	74	69	60	73	77	71	86
Total Straight	26	31	40	27	23	29	14
Total Satin	49	63	40	73	43	38	50
Total Glossy	51	38	60	27	57	62	50

\*With cheek piece also.

Reasons for Final Preference - Model Q\* \*\*

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Ruger</u>	<u>Non-Ruger</u>
	(21)	( 6)	(15)
Monte Carlo stock	62%	67%	60%
Gloss finish/a better finish/prattier/ eye catching/would hold up better/ looks more expensive	57	67	53
Overall appearance/best looking/ impressive/can show off/sportier	29	17	33
Action/smooth/bolt slides easier	14	17	13
Wood/nice grain/better wood	10	-	13
Checkering/cleaner	10	17	7
Lighter weight/not heavy	10	-	13
Quality/workmanship	10	-	13
Cherry-wood grip cap/fore-end	5	-	7
Textured bolt	5	-	7
Blueing/dark	5	-	7
Safety/feels better than the others	5	-	7
Additional features	5	-	7
The most expensive of the four	5	17	-

\*Multiple response

\*\*This and following tables not broken by area because of small numbers.



Reasons for Final Preference - Model S\*

	<u>Total.</u> (17)	<u>Ruger</u> ( 5)	<u>Non-Ruger</u> (12)
Satin finish/richer looking/oil finish/doesn't show scratches as readily	82%	100%	75%
Monte Carlo stock/cheek piece/ better with a scope/more comfortable	82	80	83
Pistol grip/fits hand	24	20	25
Action/smooth/easier bolt	18	20	17
Checkering/good/fancier cutting	12	20	8
Lighter weight	12	-	17
Wood/nice grain/color	12	-	17
Fit/gun fits me better	6	-	8

\*Multiple response

Reasons for Final Preference - Model P\*

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Ruger</u>	<u>Non-Ruger</u>
	( 8 )	( 5 )	( 3 )
Satin finish/oil finish	100%	100%	100%
Straight stock/no cheek piece/ more classic style	75	60	100
Action/best of the four/a good action	25	40	-
Bluing/looks better	13	20	-
Wood/darker wood	13	20	-
Easy to load	13	20	-
Balance/better feel	13	-	33
Lighter weight	13	-	33

\*Multiple response

Reasons for Final Preference - Model M\*

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Ruger</u>	<u>Non-Ruger</u>
	( 5)	( -)	( 5)
Gloss finish/prettier/looks more expensive	100%	-%	100%
Straight stock/streamlined/ the design	60	-	60
Action is freer	20	-	20
Better feel	20	-	20
Lighter	20	-	20
Fits better	20	-	20

\*Multiple response

Model Q - Likes\*

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Ruger</u>	<u>Non-Ruger</u>
	(51)	(16)	(35)
Monte Carlo stock/cheek piece/ good with a scope	41%	44%	40%
Gloss finish/prettier/more expensive looking/longer lasting	27	25	29
Wood/prettier/better grain/stronger	16	6	20
Action/smoothier/tighter	14	13	14
Safety/convenient/good location	12	-	17
Light weight/feels lighter	12	-	17
Checkering/feels nice/checkering on the grips	10	13	9
Attractive/nice looking/a pretty gun	6	6	6
Balance/well balanced/fits good	6	6	6
Floor plate/easy to unload	6	6	6
Blueing/deep/better blueing	6	6	9
Trigger/more sensitive/wide/textured	6	6	6
Bolt texture	4	6	3
Other	10	-	14

\*Multiple response.

Model Q - Dislikes\*

	<u>Total</u> (51)	<u>Ruger</u> (16)	<u>Non-Ruger</u> (35)
Gloss finish/too glossy/chips/ scratches easily/hard to fix/ reflects light	37%	38%	37%
No recoil pad	16	19	14
Monte Carlo stock	12	13	11
Bolt action/sloppy/rattles/stiff/ sticky/bolt comes right out/don't like Remington bolts	12	19	9
Blueing/not dark enough/poor	6	6	6
Bedding inconsistent/wood to metal fit poor	6	13	3
Trigger/too heavy/too creepy	6	13	3
Pistol grip smaller/doesn't fit my hand	4	6	3
Heavy/seems a little heavier	4	-	6
No sights	4	-	6
Floor plate/don't care for/release inside trigger guard	4	-	6
Other	18	25	14
None	20	19	18

\*Multiple response

Model S - Likes\*

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Ruger</u>	<u>Non-Ruger</u>
	(51)	(16)	(35)
Monte Carlo stock/the cheek piece/ easier to sight/nice shape	35%	50%	29%
Satin finish/doesn't show wear/less shiny/more practical/no glare/ a more finished look	35	44	31
Action/smooth/easier to work/crisper	14	19	11
Wood/grain/pattern/pretty/lighter color/good grain for strength	14	19	11
Safety/easy to reach/convenient	14	13	14
Checkering/nice pattern/deep/ right amount	10	19	6
Light weight/a little lighter/ good weight	10	6	11
Good blueing/better polish	8	19	3
Good workmanship/well made/wood-to- metal fit good	6	6	6
Balance/better balance	4	6	3
Pistol grip/good/fits hand nice	4	6	3
Trigger/positive/not creepy	4	6	3
Good lines/nice appearance	4	6	3
Bolt texturing	4	6	3
Drilled and tapped for scope	4	-	6
Other	6	-	9

\*Multiple response

Model S - Dislikes\*

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Ruger</u>	<u>Non-Ruger</u>
	(51)	(16)	(35)
Satin finish/no sheen/dull/won't last as long/not as much protection/not as good as Ruger's	22%	13%	26%
Monte Carlo stock/cheek piece not needed	20	25	17
No recoil pad	20	25	17
Bolt action/noisy/sloppy/hard to maneuver/hard to get back in/don't like Remington bolts	12	31	3
No sights/requires a scope	10	13	9
Wood/not a good grain/doesn't run lengthwise	10	6	11
Too heavy	6	6	6
Safety is noisy/not a good one/can't open bolt	6	-	9
Workmanship doesn't meet the price/doesn't compare to Sako	4	6	3
Stock too short/feels a little shorter	4	-	6
Blueing inconsistent/dull in places	4	6	3
Checkering - not fine and sharp/slippery to grip	4	-	6
Other	20	13	20
None	8	6	9

\*Multiple response

Model P - Likes\*

	<u>Total</u> (51)	<u>Ruger</u> (16)	<u>Non-Ruger</u> (35)
Satin finish/natural/looks hand rubbed/no glare/a more rugged look/not too pretty	25%	44%	17%
Straight stock/no cheek piece/more classic/thinner	20	19	20
Action/smooth/freer/a good action	12	13	11
Checkering/sharper/crisp/more distinct/stands out	10	13	9
Bolt handle/textured/shape	8	13	6
Wood/nice grain/a good stock/darker	8	13	6
Safety/location/convenient/locks bolt	8	6	9
Balance	6	6	6
Pistol grip fits/nice grip	6	-	9
Blueing/good blueing/better	4	13	-
Light weight/nice weight	4	-	6
Other	12	19	9

\*Multiple response



Model P - Dislikes\*

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Ruger</u>	<u>Non-Ruger</u>
	(51)	(16)	(35)
Straight stock/no cheek piece/ more difficult to sight	18%	13%	20%
Bolt action/a little loose/stiff/ noisy/not as smooth/not a claw extractor	18	19	17
Satin finish/not as nice looking/ have to keep more oil on it/ prefer shiny	16	6	20
Too heavy/too much weight on front	14	19	11
No sights	12	13	11
Wood/grain not as attractive/color	10	19	6
Trigger/no slack/too quick/too heavy/creepy	8	6	9
No recoil pad	8	6	9
Safety/location/noisy/not red	8	13	6
Metal finish/matte/barrel finish not as good	6	6	6
Stock/too short/seems shorter	4	6	3
Bottom of the line/cheapest 700	4	-	6
Bedding inconsistent/goes down too far	4	13	-
Other	12	19	9
None	2	6	-

\*Multiple response

Model M - Likes\*

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Ruger</u>	<u>Non-Ruger</u>
	(51)	(16)	(35)
Glossy finish/shiny/attractive/ prettier/a better finish/a hard finish	33%	25%	37%
Safety/location/convenient/easy to use/easy to reach	18	19	17
Trigger/smooth/easy/crisper/ feels good	14	13	14
Checkering/nice/feels different/ better	12	13	11
Action/smooth/bolt a little freer	12	19	9
Floor plate/easy to load, unload/ like this type magazine	12	13	11
Quality of stock/better finishing/ craftsmanship/a greater degree of workmanship	10	13	9
Balance/well balanced/comfortable/ easier to handle	8	13	6
Wood/nice patterning/good grain/color	8	-	11
Straight stock/streamlined/no hump	6	-	9
Blueing/nice/shiny	6	13	3
Lightweight/seems to be lighter	6	6	6
Sling mounts included	6	13	3
Good grip/fits thumb and palm	4	-	6
Attractive/nice looking	4	6	3
Other	10	6	11

\*Multiple response

Model M - Dislikes\*

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Ruger</u>	<u>Non-Ruger</u>
	(51)	(16)	(35)
Glossy finish/hard to cover scratches/ less functional/would cause a glare/ not as good as Q	43%	50%	40%
Straight stock/no cheek piece/ plain cut	18	6	23
Heavy/too heavy	12	13	11
No recoil pad	12	13	11
Bolt action/sloppy/loose/not as smooth/not a Finnbear type/not a Mauser	10	13	9
Safety/awkward/the way it protrudes/ no red dot/noisy	8	-	11
Trigger/no slack/too quick/rough	6	6	6
Bedding/not consistent/needs to be free floated	6	6	6
Wood/could be better/grain not as nice	6	6	6
No sights	6	-	9
Floorplate/broken	4	-	6
No scope mount/prefer Ruger mount	4	6	3
Grip too small/doesn't fit	4	6	3
Exposed screws/fine touch missing	4	13	-
Other	20	25	17
None	6	6	6

\*Multiple response

Reasons for Purchase of Current Gun\*

	<u>Total</u> (51)	<u>Ruger</u> (16)	<u>Non-Ruger</u> (35)
Price/attractive price/reasonable/ waited for sale/got a deal	45%	69%	34%
Reputation/the name/the brand	33	31	34
Caliber/ballistics/desired caliber not available in preferred brand(s)	29	6	40
Quality/craftsmanship/built better	25	31	23
Overall appearance/the look of the gun/prettiness/attractive	24	31	20
Action/type/tried and true/the way it worked/smooth	22	31	17
Reliability/the most reliable/ dependable/durable	18	13	20
Balance/feel/fit of stock/comfort	16	13	17
Finish/stock finish	14	31	6
Advice of friends/family/dealer/ article	14	25	9
Accuracy	14	6	17
Style of stock/design	12	19	9
Past experience/prior ownership/use	12	13	11
Checkering quality/attractive	10	19	6
Bigger extractor/Mauser extractor/ claw extractor/better bolt	8	25	-
Lightweight/good for carrying/ lighter for my son	8	19	3

(continued)

\*Multiple response

Reasons for Purchase\* (cont'd)

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Ruger</u>	<u>Non-Ruger</u>
	(51)	(16)	(35)
An investment/value going up/got last one made	8%	6%	9%
Loading, unloading procedure/floor plate	6	19	-
Wood quality/pretty wood	4	6	3
Safety location	4	13	-
3 position safety/very positive	4	-	6
Blueing quality/impressive	4	13	-
Metal finish	4	13	-
Recoil not heavy/less kick	4	-	6
Included scope mount/rings	4	13	-
Other	16	31	9

\*Multiple response

Other Brands Considered\*

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Ruger</u>	<u>Non-Ruger</u>
	(51)	(16)	(35)
Remington	41%	81%	23%
Winchester	37	44	34
Browning	12	19	9
Weatherby	10	6	11
Ruger	8	-	11
Marlin	6	13	3
Sako	6	13	3
Colt	4	-	6
Golden Eagle	4	6	3
Ithaca	2	-	3
Mausser	2	-	3
Mossberg	2	-	3
Savage	2	-	3
Sears	2	-	3
Stevens	2	-	3
None	24	13	29

\*Multiple response

Reasons for Rejecting Other Brands\*

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Ruger</u>	<u>Non-Ruger</u>
<u>Remington (net)</u>	(21)	(13)	( 8)
Price/more expensive/too high	43%	54%	25%
Glossy stock	14	23	-
Action/bolt/extractor	14	15	13
Not available in desired caliber	14	8	25
Trigger/not adjustable/feel	10	15	13
Workmanship/poor checkering	10	8	13
Brand not as good/everybody has one	10	8	13
Other	24	23	25

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Ruger</u>	<u>Non-Ruger</u>
<u>Winchester (net)</u>	(19)	( 7)	(12)
Price/too high/got a better deal	47%	29%	58%
Action/stiff/sloppy	16	29	8
Recommendations	16	14	16
Feel/fit	11	-	16
Not available in desired caliber	11	14	8
Other	21	29	16

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Ruger</u>	<u>Non-Ruger</u>
<u>Browning (net)</u>	( 6)	( 3)	( 3)
Price/too expensive	66%	67%	67%
Remington a better name	17	-	33
Quality going down	17	33	-

(continued)

\*Multiple response

Reasons for Rejecting Other Brands\* (cont'd)

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Ruger</u>	<u>Non-Ruger</u>
<u>Weatherby (net)</u>	( 5)	( 1)	( 4)
Price/too expensive/didn't have enough at the time	60%	-%	75%
Poor quality	20	100	-
Too fancy	20	-	25
Fewer lands in barrel	20	-	25
	<u>Total</u>	<u>Ruger</u>	<u>Non-Ruger</u>
<u>Ruger (net)</u>	( 4)	( -)	( 4)
Price/too expensive/not available at discount	50%	-%	50%
Stock design	25	-	25
Recoil excessive	25	-	25
Not available in desired caliber	25	-	25
Looks	25	-	25

\*Multiple response



Where Purchased

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Ruger</u>	<u>Non-Ruger</u>
	(51)	(16)	(35)
Dealer	60%	87%	49%
Discount store	18	13	20
Department store	12	-	17
Other	10	-	14

Dealer Influence

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Ruger</u>	<u>Non-Ruger</u>
	(31)	(14)	(17)
Very influential	16%	7%	24%
Slightly influential	16	14	18
Not at all influential	52	72	34
No answer	16	7	24

Demographics

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Ruger</u>	<u>Non-Ruger</u>
<u>Marital Status</u>	(51)	(16)	(35)
Single	24%	25%	23%
Married	76	75	77
<u>Age</u>			
30 or under	35%	44%	31%
31-40	35	44	31
41-50	16	12	17
51-60	12	-	17
Over 60	2	-	2
<u>Education</u>			
High school or less	29%	25%	31%
Some college	24	6	31
College graduate	45	63	38
Technical/trade school	2	6	-
<u>Occupation</u>			
White collar	53%	63%	48%
Blue collar	35	31	38
Retired/student/unemployed	12	6	14
<u>Household Income</u>			
Less than \$10,000	6%	6%	6%
\$10,000 - \$14,999	10	-	14
\$15,000 - \$19,999	6	-	9
\$20,000 - \$24,999	22	25	20
\$25,000 - \$29,999	16	25	11
\$30,000 or more	40	44	40
<u>Use Scope*</u>			
Yes	90%	94%	89%
No	10	6	11

\*On the rifle for which they were interviewed.

STEP TWO

## INTRODUCTION

### Purpose

The purposes of Step Two were: primarily, to determine consumers' overall preference between a revised Remington Model 700 ADL prototype -- satin finished Monte Carlo stock configuration (selected on the basis of the Step One results) -- versus a standard Ruger 77; and secondarily, specifically to explore consumers' preference between the two guns' scope mounting systems.\*

### Method

The research was conducted via personal interviews, including a "hands on" evaluation of two rifles, in Houston, Seattle, and Pittsburgh. A total of 75 men (25 in each city) were interviewed and evaluated the two rifles. The sample was selected from recent purchasers (within the past 5 years) of bolt action, center fire rifles, and was screened to include Ruger 77 purchasers (one-third to one-half), Remington 700 purchasers (one-third to one-half) and the remainder to be "other" brands. The final sample make-up was:

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Houston</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	<u>Pittsburgh</u>
	(75)	(25)	(25)	(25)
Ruger 77 purchasers	22	8	6	8
Remington 700 purchasers	28	8	11	9
Other purchasers**	25	9	8	8

Some changes were made in the questionnaire content after completion of the first city (Houston): a strength of preference scale and a question on cheek piece influence were added; price expectation was deleted; a price was given for whichever model a respondent did not prefer (\$300); and projected price increments were increased for the model he did prefer. Accordingly, on those issues, the "total" sample numbers are necessarily lower than the overall sample total of 75.

\*Prototype rings and mounts were developed for the test.

\*\*Includes eight Remington non-700 purchasers.

### PREFERENCE

Respondents were given ample opportunity to handle, inspect and evaluate each of the two models. As noted, one model is a redesign of the Remington 700 ADL, with a satin finished Monte Carlo/cheek piece stock (and with a number of other, "detail" type modifications as well -- e.g., butt pad, deeper blueing, floor plate, cut checkering, anti-bind follower). The other model is a current production model Ruger 77 (satin finished straight stock)\*. Each participant was queried as to his likes, dislikes, preference and willingness to pay more for his preferred model.

#### Model Preference

The results indicate that the Ruger is favored by a small majority of respondents.

<u>Preferred Model</u>	<u>Total</u>
	(75)
Ruger	55%
Remington	45

Analysis also reveals that preference appears to be influenced by brand/model loyalty, as preference is markedly stronger for the brand already owned. "Other" brand owners are split almost evenly.

<u>Preferred Model</u>	<u>Own Ruger</u>	<u>Own Remington 700</u>	<u>Own Other</u>
	(22)	(28)	(25)
Ruger	91%	29%	52%
Remington	9	71	48

Profile of preference. In the following profile, Ruger preference tends to be higher in the younger, less educated, lower income groups; Remington preference trends somewhat the other way. This parallels the Step One finding that price (or price/value) is a major reason for purchasing a Ruger.

\*It should be noted in passing that any changes Ruger might be considering for the coming model year of course are not included in the test.

Also, Ruger preference is appreciably higher than average in Pittsburgh -- this, too, perhaps a result of the perceived price advantage in an economically depressed area.

	<u>Preferred Model*</u>	
	<u>Ruger</u>	<u>Remington</u>
<u>Total</u> (75)	55%	45%
<u>Age</u>		
Under 30 (26)	69%	31%
31-40 (16)	31	69
41-50 (24)	54	46
51-60 ( 5)	80	20
Over 60 ( 4)	25	75
	47%	55%
<u>Education</u>		
No college (32)	62%	38%
Some college (25)	52	48
College graduate (18)	44	56
<u>Occupation</u>		
Blue collar (44)	59%	41%
White collar (25)	48	52
Non-working ( 6)	50	50
<u>Household Income</u>		
Under \$20,000 ( 9)	67%	33%
\$20,000 - \$24,999 ( 9)	67	33
\$25,000 - \$29,999 (12)	58	42
\$30,000 - \$34,999 (15)	53	47
\$35,000 - \$39,999 ( 7)	43	57
\$40,000 or more (21)	48	52
<u>Area</u>		
Houston	52%	48%
Seattle	48	52
Pittsburgh	64	36

\*Read percentages across.

Reasons for preference - Ruger\*. Three of the reasons given for preferring the Ruger are mentioned by at least one out of four respondents. A strong influence (for more than a third) is Ruger's reputation...

"Because I've heard and read so many good things (about Ruger) -- but I really like this stock (wood) on the Remington." (Ruger 77 owner)

"Ruger is just my favorite overall gun. Maybe its reputation could be just in my head; I don't know, but it is just the gun for me." (Ruger 77 owner)

"The Ruger because of the popularity and more widely sold brand." (Remington BDL owner)

...usually combined with ownership experience:

"The history of Ruger. I bought my first one 20 some odd years ago. I've always had good luck with it but I have nothing against the Remington." (Ruger 77 owner)

"Ruger backs up its products as good as any and better than most.... There isn't anything wrong with the Remington. I guess it's just a matter of personal prejudice. I own a Ruger pistol and I've fired several Ruger rifles." (Winchester 70 owner)

"Because it's a Ruger and they are what I like. I also have a .357 Ruger pistol. I just like the Rugers." (Ruger 77 owner)

More than a quarter cite the convenient tang safety...

"I like the safety -- it's a thumb tang safety -- because you can flip it off faster." (Ruger 77 owner)

"I like the safety; it's all within reach of one hand." (Remington "other" owner)

\*Preference was elicited in the context of "given equal price." Thus, note that respondents' reasons for Ruger preference do not include price. However, we have seen in the profile of preference, above, that the price issue probably is operating, at least indirectly.

"The Ruger has a convenient safety. Remington has a silly toggle." (Ruger 77 owner)

...and almost as many like the smoother, tighter action:

"The bolt seems tighter and doesn't have as much play in it as the Remington...the way the bolt works, it seems easier to handle, as if all your motions would be more fluid." (Remington BDL owner)

"Better machining on the slide and on the bolt action, a better fit. I'm not satisfied with the Remington at all; it's a piece of junk." (Ruger 77 owner)

"The action, the way it works. The bolt is smooth... the bolt ways work so smoothly." (Winchester 70 owner.)

Feel, fit, balance and lighter weight are mentioned quite often, as are Ruger quality (or Remington's lack) and the scope mounting system (sturdier, easier, better). Additional points which are mentioned less often can be found in the following table.



Reasons for Preferring the Ruger Model\*

	<u>Total</u>
	(41)
Reputation/have heard and read so many good things/ more popular, widely sold brand/I own other Rugers/ my favorite/a good name	37%
Safety/tang safety/convenient/easy to release/ has S and F markings	27
Action/smooth/more fluid/ease of the action/ tighter/better	24
Feel of the gun/feels better/fits better/more comfortable/more wood in the grip	20
Weight/lighter/Remington (stock) is heavier	15
Quality is excellent/built better/a better made gun/ better machining/not impressed with the Remington/ the Remington's a piece of junk/better blueing	15
Scope mount - sturdier/like the system of mounting/ slotted receiver/easier/can remove scope without taking out of rings/location of mount	15
Balance/better balance/handling	10
Bolt release/prefer the Ruger style/Mauser type release/easier to remove for cleaning	10
Straight stock/classic/streamlined	7
Wood/a better grade/nice grain/would worry about the other one breaking	7
Shell release/magazine release	5
Recoil pad/rubber/cushionier	5
Trigger/lighter	5
Will stand up better/built sturdier (general)	5
Stronger action/stronger design/a better Mauser design	5
Less expensive/the Remington is just a more expensive version of the ADL	5
Other: shorter lift on bolt/bedding system - less chance of breakage/most value for the dollar/ accurate/to try a different gun/Ruger service, parts availability	15

\*Multiple response

Reasons for preference - Remington. The Remington is preferred for a wider variety of reasons of somewhat less intensity. Here only reputation (again, influenced by ownership) and better wood (presumably an "accidental" test variable) are mentioned by more than 15 percent of the preferrers:

"The reputation and experience I've had with Remington - a proven weapon." (Remington BDL owner)

"Remington is the better gun - the experience of the people behind it.... Because of the name. It's a very old gun maker and all are still being made in this country." (Remington BDL owner)

"I know a little bit more about Remington and I've heard more about Remington than Ruger. Ruger is a good gun but I really don't think there is that much difference so I'd pick what I know best." (Winchester 70 owner)

"In my experience with them, I've had less problems with Remington." (Remington BDL owner)

Frequently cited are feel/fit attributes...

"General appearance and feel. A weapon has to feel light. Smooth operation. I'm just completely impressed with it. It's a well made weapon - balance, texture and feel." (Remington ADL owner)

"The Ruger doesn't have a high enough cheek rest for me. I'm off on the sight line.... The Remington just fits me better. Nice looking gun (Ruger) but basically I'm for the fit of the gun." (Mannlicher owner)

...and somewhat less often but with equal incidence are the satin finish, smooth action, accuracy, quality, Monte Carlo cheek piece and convenient, more positive safety. Refer to the following table for additional, less frequently mentioned reasons.

Reasons for Preferring the Remington Model\*

	<u>Total</u>
	(34)
Reputation/prior experience/have shot them all my life/I'm a Remington fan/would buy another/know them the best	35%
Feel/fit/fits me better/feels more comfortable/slimmer/flatter hand hold/fits my small hands	21
Finish on the stock/I like the finish/Ruger's looks fake/can't see much difference other than the finish	15
Action/smooth/ease of operation	15
Accurate/group consistently/shoot well	15
Wood/better wood/a better grade/a little fancier	15
A better made gun/looks better made/better workmanship/machining is better	15
Monte Carlo cheek piece	15
Safety/more convenient on the side/in a better position/a lever type/more positive/can leave on while operating bolt	15
Blueing is better	12
Thicker barrel/heavier barrel/less barrel whip	12
Checkering is better/texture	12
Trigger/smooth/no play/ribbed/I have heard Ruger triggers are bad	12
Strong action/better tolerance for reloading/thicker metal	9
Nice stock/I like the stock (general)	6
Recoil pad/not hard plastic	6
Jeweled bolt	6
Can use different scopes/a better way of mounting	6
Balance/ease of handling	6
Floor plate release is out of the way	6
General appearance	6
Other: bolt slide easier to clean/checkered bolt handle/dependable/available in left-handed model	15

\*Multiple response

Comparison of main reasons for preference. For reader convenience, a summary comparison of the main reasons for preference (15% or more for either model) is presented below:

Main Reasons for Preference - Comparative\*

	<u>Prefer Ruger</u> (41)	<u>Prefer Remington</u> (34)
Reputation/familiarity	37%	35%
Safety: convenience/location/function	27	15
Action: smooth/tight/sure	24	15
Feel/fit/comfort	20	21
Weight: lighter	15	-
Quality: better made/better machined	15	15
Scope mount: sturdier/better system	15	-
Monte Carlo/cheek piece Straight stock/classic		
Better wood/stock finish	7	30

\*Multiple response

Influence of cheek piece on preference. Respondents in Seattle and Pittsburgh were asked specifically if the Monte Carlo cheek piece influenced their preference one way or the other; and if so, how. The majority claim they were not influenced by the cheek piece, whereas a little less than two-fifths are.

	<u>Total</u>
	(50)
Not influenced by the cheek piece	62%
Yes, influenced by the cheek piece	38

Of those who are influenced, three-quarters prefer the Remington. Three out of the five Ruger preferrers who are influenced mention a dislike of the cheek piece.

	<u>Cheek Piece Influence</u>	
<u>Model Preference</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
	(19)	(31)
Ruger	26%	74%
Remington	74	26

The major factor by far is the opinion that the cheek piece contributes to a better, more comfortable fit. Also the cheek piece is perceived to sight better, more automatically, and to be better looking. Interestingly, a few Ruger preferrers who were not influenced volunteered that they liked the cheek piece, but (apparently) not enough to offset their preference (two like the Ruger scope mounting system, the other cites Ruger's reputation and action).

#### Strength of Preference

The men in Seattle and Pittsburgh were asked to indicate their strength of preference. As can be seen below, the degree of preference for either model is consistently (though not greatly) more moderate than strong. On the other hand, only rarely is the degree of preference slight.

<u>Strength of Preference</u>	<u>Preferred Model</u>		
	<u>Total</u>	<u>Ruger</u>	<u>Remington</u>
	(50)	(28)	(22)
I prefer it a lot	42%	43%	41%
I prefer it somewhat	52	53	50
I prefer it only very slightly	6	4	9

While recognizing that the base numbers are extremely small, a more detailed breakdown by model preference and owner type suggests that strong preference for the Ruger model is more influenced by Ruger ownership than strong Remington preference is influenced by Remington ownership.

<u>Strength of Preference</u>	<u>Owner Type and Model Preference</u>					
	<u>Ruger</u>		<u>Remington 700</u>		<u>Other</u>	
	<u>Ruger</u>	<u>Remington</u>	<u>Ruger</u>	<u>Remington</u>	<u>Ruger</u>	<u>Remington</u>
	(13)	(1)	(6)	(14)	(9)	(7)
I prefer it a lot	62%	-%	17%	43%	33%	43%
I prefer it somewhat	38	100	66	43	67	57
I prefer it only very slightly	-	-	17	14	-	-

#### Price/Value of Preferred Model

In order to get a "cross fix" on strength of preference, respondents in Houston were asked how much more they would be willing to pay for their preferred model, in terms of given increments of \$30, \$20, \$10 and \$5. No baseline retail price was stated.

Because even the highest incremental price tested proved to fall short of the threshold for meaningful discrimination (i.e., the great majority would pay it for their preferred gun), in the remaining two cities higher price increments of \$60, \$40, \$20 and \$10 were used. Also, respondents were asked to assume that their non-preferred model retailed for \$300.

As it turns out, even (in fact, especially) when the incremental "ante" is raised, Remington preferrers appear willing to pay more for their choice than Ruger preferrers are for theirs -- perhaps a further reflection of the relatively greater price consciousness of the Ruger market, as discussed earlier.

Houston

	<u>Preferred Model</u>	
	<u>Ruger</u>	<u>Remington</u>
<u>Willing to Pay</u>	(13)	(12)
\$30 more	77%	84%
\$20 more	-	8
\$10 more	15	-
No more	8	8

Seattle/Pittsburgh

	<u>Preferred Model</u>	
	<u>Ruger</u>	<u>Remington</u>
<u>Willing to Pay</u>	(28)	(22)
\$60 more	65%	85%
\$40 more	14	5
\$20 more	21	5
\$10 more	-	5

Reasons would pay more. The reasoning offered for willingness to pay more is wide-ranging and varies somewhat between the two models preferred. Those preferring the Remington mention reputation most frequently, and then any of a number of specific features -- e.g., the safety location and type. Also more important are Remington's quality and personal preference (would pay more for what I like). The most frequent mentions (equally) for Ruger preferers are feel/fit attributes and personal preference; and then, as with the Remington but more so, any of a number of particular features. No one aspect or point seems to carry the day for either model; "value" appears to derive from a collective or cumulative impression.

(SEE TABLE ON NEXT PAGE)



Reasons Willing to Pay More for Preferred Model\*

	<u>Total</u> (73)**	<u>Preferred Model</u>	
		<u>Ruger</u> (40)	<u>Remington</u> (33)
Reputation/a proven brand/prior experience, ownership/collect Remingtons	25%	15%	36%
Willing to pay more for what I like/would be worth it/it's a lifetime investment/not that much difference	19	18	21
Better feel or fit/the gun fits me/comfort/ease of handling/balance/stock is easier to grip	18	18	18
I buy the best/better quality/workmanship/a better piece of equipment/an all around better gun/a good standard rifle	18	15	21
Stock style/aesthetic value/nice lines	10	13	6
Reliability/will last the rest of my life	7	10	3
Features (non-specific)/the finer points	7	10	3
Cosmetics/appearance/overall looks are better/looks good	7	3	12
Bolt/liked the bolt better/the bolt design/the type bolt	5	8	3
Location of the safety	5	8	3
Scope mount/a better scope mount	5	5	6
Like the safety (general)	4	5	3
Accuracy/more accurate	4	-	9
Action/like the action better/a Mauser action	3	5	-
Scope mount/easy to remount/quick release	3	5	-
Lighter weight	3	5	-
Ruger service/no problems getting repairs	3	5	-
Will hold its value/doesn't depreciate	3	3	3

(continued)

\*Multiple response

\*\*Two people were not willing to pay more for their preferred model.

Reasons Willing to Pay More for Preferred Model\* (cont'd)

	<u>Total</u> (73)**	<u>Preferred Model</u>	
		<u>Ruger</u> (40)	<u>Remington</u> (33)
Trigger/better trigger	3%	3%	3%
Jeweled bolt	3	-	6
Wood/better quality/darker	3	-	6
Finish/nicer/better	3	-	6
Other: <u>Ruger</u> : stock looks sturdier/ adjustable trigger/stock adjustment screw/ better rifling/rings come with it/scope mount is adjustable			
<u>Remington</u> : more checkering on forearm/bolt slides easier to clean/can get a left-handed model/a more advanced design/aluminum rings are better/blueing/ lever type safety/quieter safety/can open bolt with safety on	18	13	24

\*Multiple response

\*\*Two people were not willing to pay more for their preferred model

DETAILED LIKES AND DISLIKES OF THE MODELS

Both models are very well received, with positive mentions outnumbering negatives six or seven fold. On balance, the Remington draws a bit more attention, both positively and negatively. As could be expected, the aspects of weighting, balance, feel and fit play a major part, particularly for the Ruger, although the majority of reactions relate to design/performance aspects. Quality related points, while mentioned less frequently, are still considerable, and more so for the Remington model. Also attracting more mentions for the Remington are appearance attributes, whereas reputation comments are about equal for the two models.

Remington

On an overall basis, the best liked attributes concern the safety, feel/fit, appearance, blueing (superior to previous models), action (smooth), and the Monte Carlo stock. As can be seen in the accompanying table, several of these aspects are cited by respondents from more than one perspective. Also of interest are the satin finish, checkering (better quality, deep), reputation/prior experience and the wood (better grade/prettier). The rank order of these points, with the exception of the action and reputation/prior experience, varies somewhat based on the preferred model. The Remington action and reputation/prior experience issues are not significant for the Ruger preferers. Generally, any specific point is cited by a greater proportion of those preferring the model being evaluated.

On the negative side, the Remington again draws a bit more attention than the Ruger, although not by any consequential amount. The most disliked aspect, primarily among the Ruger preferers, is the Remington action, which is characterized as sloppy and closing stiffly. The safety (both functioning and location) is also mentioned by some. The generally favorable reaction to the test gun is underscored by the fact that better than two-fifths of the sample find nothing at all to criticize.

Ruger

Among all respondents, the most favored points -- differing quite a bit

from the Remington -- are the feel/fit (more comfortable, lighter), action (smooth, tighter), safety (location), and reputation/prior experience. Additional points of more than passing interest are the workmanship, slotted receiver, blueing, trigger (crisp release, softer pull) and appearance. As with the Remington, the rank order varies somewhat depending on model preference. Among the Remington preferrers, the Ruger reputation/experience is not significant, nor is the slotted receiver.

Dislikes of the Ruger, as with the Remington, reflect little intensity. However, preferrers of both models cite the location of the safety as their biggest complaint. Among Remington preferrers, complaints about the Ruger trigger (heavy) and the feel/fit of the rifle are voiced. Overall, though, this gun too is very favorably regarded, with nearly half the sample registering no dislikes.

Detailed tables of all positive and negative reactions to each model by total sample and preferred model are presented in the following pages.

\* \* \*

Positive Reactions to Remington Model\*

	<u>Total</u> (75)	<u>Preferred Model</u>	
		<u>Ruger</u> (41)	<u>Remington</u> (34)
Blueing - good/better/more finished/ superior to previous models	23%	12%	35%
Monte Carlo stock/cheek piece/shape is better/more streamlined/styling	21	17	26
Reputation/Remington is a proven product/ know them best/have had Remingtons before	19	2	38
Finish/satin finish/oil finish/has a good finish	19	10	29
Appearance/beautiful/prettier/finer looking/smooth lines	19	12	26
Checkering/good/better/better quality/ raised/deep/like the texture	19	17	21
Wood/better wood/prettier/fancier/more detail in the grain/darker	17	12	24
Action/feels smoother/works better/nice action/I love the action	16	2	32
Safety location/more handy/like I'm used to	16	7	26
Workmanship/quality/well made/better made/nicely finished/rifling is better	15	10	21
Feel/fit/feels comfortable/feels good	12	2	24
Bolt is jeweled/classy looking	12	7	18
Remingtons are more accurate/shoot good	9	5	15
Stock is nicer/prettier	9	5	15
Safety action, type/a lever type/more positive/less apt to slip/easier to operate	9	10	9
Safety (general)/like the safety/ a good safety	8	7	9
Grip/thinner/small/narrow/a nice grip/ more comfortable/a flatter hand hold/like shape of the fore end/slimmer stock	8	2	15
Action is very strong/a good strong bolt/ locking lug/has a better tolerance for reloading/enclosed bolt face	7	-	15

(continued)

\*Multiple response

Positive Reactions to Remington Model\* (cont'd)

	<u>Total</u> (75)	<u>Preferred Model</u>	
		<u>Ruger</u> (41)	<u>Remington</u> (34)
Bolt release/is easier/easily removed	7	2	12
Trigger/sharp/crisp/good let off/ no play	7	2	12
Like the way the rings mount/pre- drilled for scope mount/can use dif- ferent scopes	7	2	12
Floorplate, shell release/good/small/ out of the way	7	7	6
Balance/well balanced/good balance/ ease of handling	7	5	9
Barrel is thicker/heavier	7	5	9
Weight/just right/not too heavy	7	7	6
Recoil pad/has a recoil pad/firm/ fits better	7	7	6
Has a hinged floor plate	5	5	6
Bolt design/shape/flatter - has more clearance for scope	5	5	6
Bolt is checkered/customized	4	5	3
Trigger - like it better/ribber	4	2	6
Scope mount/sturdier/like it better	3	2	3
Other: <u>Ruger</u> : fastener is quiet/rings are included			
<u>Remington</u> : can open bolt while on safe/bolt slides easier to clean/no open sights on barrel/rings look like they are better/availability of triggers/ built for bench rest/comes in left- handed model/a good gun for the money	13	5	24
None/no positive mentions	9	17	-

\*Multiple response

Negative Reactions to Remington Model\*

	<u>Total</u> (75)	<u>Preferred Model</u>	
		<u>Ruger</u> (41)	<u>Remington</u> (34)
Action, bolt is a little sloppy/has more play/is stiff/closes a little stiff/not as good	15	22	6
Trigger is a little heavy/too heavy/don't like it	8	7	9
Safety action - can't tell when firing pin is released/has to be off to unload/locks in the bolt after firing/don't like it/a silly toggle	7	10	3
Grip is too thin/doesn't fit my hand/uncomfortable/stock could fit better/too short/recoil pad doesn't fit shoulder	7	5	9
Rings are not steel/they are aluminum/too light/are cheap	5	5	6
Don't like stock shape/cheek piece/looks like a Remington 700 Classic	4	7	-
Bedding - barrel would slap on stock/is loose/wood-to-metal fit is poor	4	7	-
Floor plate release is awkward/in a bad place/don't like the shell release	4	5	3
Bolt drop feels awkward/bolt closes funny/there's a double motion in the action	4	5	3
Safety location - don't like safety on the side/can catch on something	4	2	6
Mount - not as good as Ruger's/don't like the way they go	3	5	-
Poor workmanship/rifling quality not as good as other guns/a piece of junk	3	5	-
Checkering is a little inconsistent/could be better	3	2	3
Stock finish feels like plastic/stocks on the market are better	3	-	6
Other: <u>Ruger</u> : would be worried that the Remington stock might crack/no open sights/no bolt guide/just a more expensive ADL/the Remington stock is heavier/the Remington model is too light/has a heavier barrel/can't adjust trigger/not as classy looking			
<u>Remington</u> : prefer lighter color wood/recoil pad too solid, should have old style with white line/prefer smooth bolt finish/don't like either one	16	20	12
None/no negative mentions	43	34	53

\*Multiple response

Positive Reactions to Ruger Model\*

	<u>Total</u> (75)	<u>Preferred Model</u>	
		<u>Ruger</u> (41)	<u>Remington</u> (34)
Action is smooth/works better/tighter/ less play/tolerance is better/a good action/has a quicker fall	31%	44%	15%
Reputation/a more popular brand/ex- perienced with/own other Rugers/ my favorite	21	39	-
Feel, fit/fits better/feels more comfortable	20	34	3
Safety - location/tang safety/ within reach of thumb, one hand/ can put off fast	20	27	12
Good workmanship/well crafted/ built better/no better gun made	17	22	12
Balance/well balanced/handles better	17	20	15
Slotted receiver/scope ring attach- ment is better/a better mount/won't move out of focus/a sturdy mount	16	27	3
Safety (general)/a good safety/I like the safety	13	15	12
Blueing/good/better/nice/metal finish more lasting	13	12	15
Trigger/crisp/smooth let-off/ softer/good	12	12	12
Lighter weight/lighter	12	12	12
Appearance/looks good/beautiful	11	12	9
Mauser action is stronger/reliable/ has large extractor	9	17	-
Stock design/a straight stock/a classic stock/like the style/groove in the stock/streamlined (stock?)	9	15	3
A serviceable gun/will take a beating/ will hold up/you can rely on it/dependable/ Rugers are stronger, sturdier	8	15	-
Weight is just right/a little heavier than the Remington	8	10	6
Floor plate, shell release/easy to get to/in a better place	8	10	6

(continued)

\*Multiple response



Positive Reactions to Ruger Model\* (cont'd)

	<u>Total</u> (75)	<u>Preferred Model</u>	
		<u>Ruger</u> (41)	<u>Remington</u> (34)
Checkering is good/deeper/like the design	7%	7%	6%
Bolt release/like the bolt release/ simple	5	10	-
Safety action/has a more positive feel/ can tell when firing pin is released/ has S and F markings/easy to release/ allows bolt to come back	5	7	3
Stock (non-specific)/a better stock	5	7	3
Rubber recoil pad/doesn't hurt your shoulder/cushionier	4	7	-
Floor plate is hinged/has a floor plate	4	5	3
Grip is comfortable/fits my hand	4	5	3
Steel rings are strong/Remington rings are cheap	4	2	6
Wood is a better grade/like the grain	3	5	-
Most value for the dollar/a good gun for the money	3	2	3
Wood-to-metal fit good for today's rifle/is a lot closer	3	2	3
Barrel length - shorter/not too long/ like the overall length	3	2	3
Barrel is smaller (thinner?)/lighter	3	2	3
Scope mounts are lower/location(s) better	3	2	3
Finish/satin finish	3	-	6
Other: <u>Ruger</u> : has a bolt guide/bolt is swept towards hand/quick release of scope/barrel. easier to sight/bedding system/heavy chamber dissipates the heat better/accurate/mounts (rings?) come with it/ <u>Remington</u> : no open sights	12	20	3
None/no positive mentions	4	-	9

\*Multiple response

Negative Reactions to Ruger Model\*

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Preferred Model</u>	
		<u>Ruger</u>	<u>Remington</u>
	(75)	(41)	(34)
Safety action/has to be off to load, unload/hard to tell if on or off/has no red mark/more difficult to grasp/will bind in cold weather/easier to forget	11%	10%	12%
Safety location/can be bumped accidentally/have to change grip/too far back/may get in way of scope	7	5	9
Trigger is heavy/hard/has play in it/have heard of bad triggers on Ruger	5	-	12
Wood not fancy enough/would like Remington's better/looks fake/grain not straight on forearm	5	5	6
Fit/straight stock/cheek rest not high enough/forearm grip a little thin/stock is too short	4	-	9
Action has too much play when open/a little sloppy/is stiff	4	5	3
Checkering/has a little overrun/not as fine as Remington's/is recessed	4	5	3
Heavier	3	-	6
Won't allow use of a scope mounting system/can use only one set of rings	3	-	6
Not as accurate/barrel too thin to hold accuracy	3	-	6
Bedding should be free floated/not bedded well	3	2	3
A light piece/would have more recoil	3	5	-
Floor plate release/shell ejection	3	5	-
Workmanship/wood-to-metal fit poor/rifling quality not as good as older guns	3	5	-
Other: <u>Ruger</u> : bolt not jeweled/no open sights/floor plate should be reinforced/not made for left handers			
<u>Remington</u> : bolt slide harder to clean/archaic bolt design - WWII Japanese/recoil pad not sponge/bolt could be shortened/lines are too square/don't like either one	13	10	18
None/no negative mentions	48	59	35

\*Multiple response

# EVALUATION OF SCOPE MOUNTING SYSTEMS

All respondents were asked to make additional observations of the two differing scope mounting systems. The men were questioned regarding the advantages and disadvantages of each system and their preference for one versus the other.

## Mount Preference

Overall, the Ruger mounting system is favored by almost three to one.

	<u>Total</u>
<u>Preferred Mount</u>	(75)
Ruger	72%
Remington	25
No preference	3

While there is an appreciable difference between Ruger and Remington overall preferers, a (small) majority even of the latter group prefer the Ruger mount.

	<u>Preferred Model</u>	
	<u>Ruger</u>	<u>Remington</u>
<u>Preferred Mount</u>	(41)	(34)
Ruger	85%	56%
Remington	10	44
No preference	5	-

When the issue is analyzed by owner type, the pattern continues to hold true. Even among the Remington 700 owners, preference for the Ruger mount runs two to one.

	<u>Owner Type</u>		
	<u>Ruger</u>	<u>Remington 700</u>	<u>Other</u>
<u>Preferred Mount</u>	(22)	(28)	(25)
Ruger	77%	64%	76%
Remington	18	32	24
No preference	5	4	-

Reasons for preference. The Ruger system is preferred primarily for its convenience of mounting and removing a scope; and for its integrated, (perceived) stronger, more secure design. The Remington system is preferred for a wider variety of reasons and with less enthusiasm. In particular, stability and secureness in a more permanent and stronger mount are the main points.

More than two-fifths of the Ruger preferrers mention the ease of use, which is seen mainly in the user's ability to do it himself without special tools:

"Easier to change your scope or to re-align it. Less work mounting on your gun.... Clips right in. You don't have to fool around with it as much."

"Easier and faster to get off and on. It's quick and you can do it by hand."

"They are easier to remove. The other (Remington) you would need a screwdriver to get them off."

"Because on the Ruger the rings and scope are readily detachable without the use of tools."

"The Remington is a more permanent mounting. You either need a gunsmith or a lot of experience to mount this properly."

About one-third consider the Ruger approach stronger, more rugged, less susceptible to breakage...

"Ruger mounts are a whole lot better, less room for error. I like metal on metal to make it sturdier."

"The mounts have three mechanisms for retention. They are controlled laterally - a lot of metal. The Remington has a very fragile mount."

"The Ruger has an integral base with claw type ring and is a lot more substantial; it won't be knocked off as easy.... The integral part and less susceptible to breakage."

...apparently an inherent benefit of the slotted receiver whereby the mount fits into, not on the receiver...

"With the Ruger system, the integral type system wouldn't break off.... It's made to fit into the system, not on."

"Because the mounting bases are an integral part of the receiver. No chance of, or less chance of, knocking the mountings off the rifle if dropped - the system seems a little huskier."

...and which eliminates the possibility of troublesome drilling and tapping the receiver:

"Because if the Remington strips out on you, you're screwed and you have to have your gun fixed at a shop."

"If you wore out the drilling (threads) on the Remington -- it would cost you a lot of money if one of the holes was stripped."

Additionally, this approach is seen to be more secure and snug:

"The Ruger is machined. It is less likely to shake loose; the threads won't slip."

"It fits snug. I like the four screws to reinforce. More engineering and thought in it. I think it looks more snug and a better fit."

\* \* \*

Most important for nearly one-third of the Remington preferrers is the secureness of the mount...

"More vibration free. The scope would stay in the same position all the time.... A more secure mount - that's the best reason."

"Would be able to tighten them down more securely."

"I prefer the solid mount which is not going to move."

...which is more positive and less likely to come loose:

"Well - with it being drilled and tapped it gives me a sense of security. I have dropped and banged my gun and I've never jarred one loose yet."

"The Ruger has more of a tendency to work loose. The Remington mount is more permanent, stays sighted in better and doesn't work loose."

One-quarter see this approach as being more permanent, not needing to be removed...

"I prefer the permanent mount because once you sight it in it stays set. You can still remove the scope without taking the mounts off.... Every time you take the quick (Ruger) mount off, I feel that you would have to reset the sight."

"Because it is a permanent mount. No other reason. I wish my Ruger had this mounting system."

...and also more rugged and sturdier:

"I prefer a single piece, it's more rugged - better for magnum rounds."

"Because of the mounting procedure it would be sturdier."

\* \* \*

Complete reasons for preference are detailed in the following tables:

Reasons for Preferring Ruger Mount

	<u>Total</u>
	(54)
Easier to mount and remove/easier to change scopes/ don't need a screw driver/tightened easier/de- tachable without tools/can do it with a quarter/ quick/faster	44%
Sturdier/less susceptible to breakage/more rugged/ beefier mounting/other is fragile	33
Machined in/slotted receiver/integral part/fits in not on/clamping will hold better/tapped holes can be stripped, expensive to repair	30
Locks more snugly/fits better/less room for error/ less likely to shake loose/2 screw holes will hold more securely/4 screws holding scope down	26
Steel construction/heavy rings/heavier material/ heavier	7
Can remove scope without removing from rings/ it's always adjusted/stays close to zero	7
Better/built better/a more accurate way	6
Other: can mounted fore or aft of bolt/can use open sights/don't have to buy added hard- ware/simple	7

Reasons for Preferring Remington Mount

	<u>Total</u>
	(19)
Solid mounting/more secure/more positive, less chance of misaligning/won't jar loose	32%
Permanent/more permanent	26
More rugged, single piece mount/feel safer if dropped/sturdier	16
Neater looking/no excess stuff	11
Lighter weight	5
With the other, stuck with same mount	5
Availability of the mount in case of loss or damage	5
Latitude of putting the bases on the rifle	5
Can remove scope without removing mounts	5
Can remove all of the paraphernalia if want to sell the gun	5
Mounts not reversible, can't mount wrong	5
Simpler system	5
Better (non-specific)	5
Quick release	5



Specific Advantages and Disadvantages

As might be expected from its margin of preference, on an overall basis, the Ruger mount system fares considerably better than the Remington system -- attracting twice as many specific positive reactions and half as many negatives.

Ruger system. The most widely played back Ruger advantages are:

- the ease of mounting/demounting (mentioned by three-fourths of those preferring and three-fifths overall);
- strength; sturdiness (half of the preferrers and two-fifths overall)
- slotted receiver, integral base (half of the preferrers and more than one-third overall)
- stable, won't shift.

Although proportionately less so, even respondents preferring the Remington system are in agreement on the first two and the fourth points just mentioned.

Disadvantages in the Ruger system are seen primarily by the Remington mount preferrers. The most significant mention (by nearly half of the Remington preferrers) is the greater likelihood that the Ruger mount would come loose or not hold tight enough. Next in rank order but with considerably fewer mentions are: the heavier weight (of the steel rings?); being limited to one system (on an overall basis); and having to resight every time you remove the scope (Remington preferrers only).

Remington system. On an overall basis (due to the preponderance of Ruger mount preferrers), perceived disadvantages outweigh the advantages; although among the Remington preferrers, of course, the reverse is true.

The biggest disadvantage is the material of the rings (for more than one-third overall), which gives rise to questions as to what the material is\* -- often recognized as not steel. This leads to doubts about the strength and durability of the rings. Most of the remaining negatives center on the inherent problems of screwed-on bases -- i.e., more difficult to mount

\*In fact, aluminum.

(also of concern to some Remington mount preferrers); likely to loosen (but not as much so as the Ruger mount); and a possible source of problems if the screws or holes are damaged in any way.

In spite of the foregoing, the Remington system does have certain advantages with which even some of the Ruger preferrers can agree. The screw-on bases not withstanding, the Remington mount is believed by some to be more stable. Also attracting frequent mention are:

- a more permanent mount
- neater, uncluttered appearance
- stronger
- lighter weight (ranked number two by Ruger preferrers).

Following are tables of detailed positive and negative reactions to both systems.

Positive Reactions to Ruger Mount\*

	<u>Total</u> (75)**	<u>Preferred Mount</u>	
		<u>Ruger</u> (54)	<u>Remington</u> (19)
Easier to mount/easier to put on, take off/quick release/don't have to tear down entire system/can do by hand	63%	74%	32%
Looks more sturdy/stronger/more rugged/ durable/won't break off/heavier/beefier	40	50	11
Integral base/machined in/permanent attachment/tuned to the gun/just slides on/no screws in the receiver/no screws to break off	35	48	-
More stable/won't shift/stays put/more accurate/more snug/locks in/less able to move	24	28	11
All steel rings/heavier rings/hard steel/heavy duty	15	19	5
4 screws are better than 2/especially if lose one/more reinforced	13	17	5
Once adjusted it's always adjusted/ scope stays in the rings	8	11	-
Looks more simple	5	7	-
Can use open sights	4	6	-
Better quality/workmanship is good	3	-	11
Other: same rings can be used from gun to gun/can be adjusted/a little better styled/mount is lower/can be mounted fore or aft of bolt	5	7	-
None/no positive mentions	11	-	42

\*Multiple response

\*\*Two people who preferred neither mount included in the Total column only.

Negative Reactions to Ruger Mount\*

	<u>Total</u> (75)**	<u>Preferred Mount</u>	
		<u>Ruger</u> (54)	<u>Remington</u> (19)
Would come loose easier/more prone to loosening/not as secure/doesn't lock the threads in/would be concerned with getting it tight enough	16%	6%	47%
Heavier	13	9	26
May limit what scopes can be used/ stuck with one system/can't interchange with a different height of mounting/ finding rings if don't like these/hard to get rings to fit	8	6	11
Bulkier/looks clumsy/not pretty/don't like the appearance of the rings	5	4	11
Can't adjust scope/no windage adjustment on the mount	4	2	11
Have to sight in every time you remove and remount scope	4	-	16
Two piece system/too much hardware	3	2	5
Poor finish	3	-	5
Other: clamp-on type/easier to damage/ won't last, will rust/reversable, can throw scope off/screws are hard to replace/have to order the rings	7	4	16
None/no negative mentions	55	72	11

\*Multiple response

\*\*Two people who preferred neither mount we included in the Total column only.

Positive Reactions to Remington Mount\*

	<u>Total</u> (75)**	<u>Preferred Mount</u>	
		<u>Ruger</u> (54)	<u>Remington</u> (19)
A more secure, vibration-free mount/less prone to move/solid, not going to move/more vibration free/will hold tighter/will stay accurate	23%	11%	58%
A more permanent mount	13	7	52
Light weight/very light weight	12	11	16
Neater appearance/eye catching/not as bulky/more streamlined	11	7	21
Can use anyone's (scope?)/a more flexible system/can interchange with a different height mount/can adjust relief	8	4	21
More rugged/single piece, solid mount/sturdier/would feel safer if dropped it/gives me a sense of security	7	2	21
Easy to install/quick/convenient/no gunsmith/a simpler system	7	4	11
Proven to work well/a conventional system	4	-	11
Attached by threaded screws/drilled and tapped	4	-	16
Will hold up better/will last longer/won't rust	4	-	16
Readily available	3	-	5
They sit flush/easier to use without a scope	3	4	-
Better craftsmanship/better finish	3	-	5
Other: single screw (per mount?)/quick release/can't mount wrong/can be removed/made by Remington	7	-	26
None/no positive mentions	39	54	-

\*Multiple response

\*\*Two people who preferred neither mount are included in Total column only.

Negative Reactions to Remington Mount\*

	<u>Total</u> (75)**	<u>Preferred Mount</u>	
		<u>Ruger</u> (54)	<u>Remington</u> (19)
<u>Scope Rings (net)</u>	36%	43%	21%
Material - what is it?/thought were plastic/alloy/pot metal/ prefer steel	20	22	16
Look flimsy/weak/not as strong looking/cheap/rings will crack if drop gun	17	22	5
Lighter/too light	7	7	5
Too thin	1	-	5
More difficult to mount or remove/needs tools/takes more time to change scopes	32	39	11
Screwed on bases subject to jolting/ would loosen more easily/not as accurate	15	19	5
Screws, threads can be damaged/can strip tapped holes/have problems if strip/screws are fragile/screws are small/prefer allen head screws/screws are hard to replace	15	19	5
Have to remove rings to remove scope - lose zero/have to remove scope from rings in order to remove mounts	9	13	-
Single screw in each side - prefer double/one screw per mount	5	7	-
Not adjustable/no windage	4	6	-
Needs four screws/more screws	3	4	-
A permanent mount	3	4	-
Mounts are too high	3	4	-
Other: scope should be locked in/don't like way they sit there/rings are shiny	4	2	11
None/no negative mentions	17	7	42

\*Multiple response

\*\*Two people who preferred neither mount are included in the Total column only.