

REMINGTON ARMS COMPANY, INC.

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

Remington
QUINCYREMINGTON ARMS CO.
BRIDGEPORT, CT

SEP 20 1982

FIREARMS RESEARCH DIVISION

cc: E. J. Conroy
C. A. Riley
L. J. Scott
P. H. Holmberg
E. J. Garrity
W. J. Weeks
O. LibraryBridgeport, CT
June 28, 1982

TO: W. H. FORSON

FROM: J. H. CHAMBERS *JHC*

SUBJECT: M/700 ADL REVITALIZATION STUDY - FINAL REPORT

Recent share declines for the M/700 ADL have been caused, to a large extent we feel, by the growth of the Ruger M/77.

With this in mind, a marketing research study was designed to help understand the reasons for the Ruger M/77's popularity as well as test prototype competitive offerings.

This investigation was conducted in two phases as follows:

Phase I

- Two group sessions with recent Ruger M/77 purchasers
- Preference testing of four prototype Model 700 ADL's which were considered upgraded versions of the current gun.

Phase II

- Preference testing of the winning M/700 ADL prototype in Phase I vs. the Ruger M/77.

The group sessions indicated that Ruger owners feel the M/77 is the best value available in center fire rifles since there are many features built into the gun at no extra cost to the consumer.*

However, even when we put many of these features on a prototype M/700 ADL (e.g., cut checkering, butt pad, floor plate, etc.) and neutralized price as an issue, the prototype M/700 ADL barely achieved parity in terms of consumer acceptance. Obviously there were factors operating for the M/77 which weren't addressed with the M/700 ADL prototype.

*In 1981, according to Trendex, the M/700 ADL sold for \$250 at retail, while the M/77 sold for \$270.

June 28, 1982

The attached table, which deals with a comparison of spontaneous positive comments for both the prototype M/700 ADL and the Ruger M/77 based on the total sample, was developed to help understand why the M/77 still managed to generate a considerable amount of consumer acceptance vis-a-vis the restyled M/700 ADL.

The table indicates that both manufacturers (Remington and Ruger) are equally respected for reputation and workmanship. However, the Ruger M/77 generates more positive comments in the following areas:

- smoother action/works better*
- feels/fits better
- integral scope mount
- light weight**
- Mauser action
- location of safety.

The Remington prototype generated greater consumer acceptance than the Ruger M/77 in the following areas:

- Monte Carlo/cheek piece
- better blueing
- better checkering
- better general looks.

Attached is the final report on the above subject. Should you have any questions, please feel free to discuss them with me.

JHC:hm
Attach.

*Part of Ruger's strength in this area is perhaps due to the ease of cycling the Ruger action. The camming action on the Ruger seems less difficult to operate than the Remington action (has a quicker/easier fall).

**While the guns were actually the same weight, Ruger's tapered barrel gives one the impression of lightness since the extended arm is particularly sensitive to weight.

POSITIVE COMMENTS

(Base)	<u>Ruger</u> (75)	<u>Remington</u> (75)
Smooth action/works better	31	16
Good reputation	21	19
Feels/fits better	20	12
Location of safety	20	16
Good workmanship	17	15
Integral scope mount	16	-
Like blueing/better metal finish	13	23
Light weight	12	-
Looks good/beautiful	11	19
Mauser action	9	-
Like Monte Carlo/cheek piece	-	21
Like checkering	-	19

JHChambers/hm
6/28/82