

2005 – 2006**ACY1112 Suggested Solution***Problem 1*

(1)

	<u>Dello Co.</u>	<u>Miraclesoft Co.</u>
Unit selling price	\$90	\$90
Less: <u>Variable expenses</u>		
Direct materials	\$10	\$5
Direct labor	20	10
Variable manufacturing overheads	5	5
Sales commission	5	2
Variable administrative expense	10	8
Total variable cost	<u>50</u>	<u>30</u>
Contribution Margin per unit	<u><u>\$40</u></u>	<u><u>\$60</u></u>

(2)

	<u>Dello Co.</u>	<u>Miraclesoft Co.</u>
Fixed manufacturing overheads	\$10,000	\$32,000
Fixed sales commission	5,000	4,000
Fixed administrative expense	5,000	6,000
Total fixed costs	<u><u>\$20,000</u></u>	<u><u>\$42,000</u></u>

Breakeven in unit

Dello Co.:

$$\$20,000 \div \$40 = 500 \text{ units}$$

Miraclesoft Co.:

$$\$42,000 \div \$60 = 700 \text{ units}$$

(3a)

Degree of operating leverage (DOL) -

Dello Co. at sales level of 600 units:

$$\frac{600 \times 40}{600 \times 40 - 20,000}$$

$$= \underline{6}$$

Miraclesoft Co. at sales level of 400 units:

$$\frac{400 \times 60}{400 \times 60 - 42,000}$$

$$= \underline{-1.33}$$

The operating leverage of Dello Co. is 6. It implies one dollar increase in sales generates 6 times increase in net operating income.

The operating leverage of Miraclesoft Co. is -1.33. It implies at sales level of 400 units, sales are not able to cover the fixed costs.

(3b)

Firms have the greatest incentive to increase selling quantities at breakeven sales level. So, Dello Co. and Miraclesoft Co. have highest incentive at 500 units and 700 units respectively.

(4)

No. of units sold in year 2003:

$$\text{(Fixed Expenses + Profit)} \div \text{CM per unit}$$

$$= (20,000 + 20,000) \div 40 = 1,000 \text{ units}$$

(5)

We cannot calculate the breakeven sales of Parent Co. To calculate the breakeven sales, we have to know the sales mix of Dello Co. and Miraclesoft Co.'s products.

(6)

CM ratio of Dello Co.: $40 \div 90 = 0.44$ CM ratio of Miraclesoft Co.: $60 \div 90 = 0.66$

Dello Co. has a lower CM ratio that implies a cost structure with higher proportion of variable expenses. Profit increase less rapidly as sales increase. Miraclesoft Co. has a higher CM ratio. It implies a cost structure with high proportion of fixed expenses.

In a good economic situation, sales are steady and high. Miraclesoft Co. has a higher CM ratio, so higher sales will result in higher net operating income. Miraclesoft Co. should be kept while Dello Co. should be dropped.

During recession, Sales drop. Miraclesoft Co. has high proportion of fixed costs. Drop in sales level will cause difficulties in covering fixed costs for Miraclesoft Co. Therefore, Miraclesoft Co. should be dropped in case of recession.

Problem 2

(1)

Unit product cost under absorption costing:

	Year 1	Year 2
Variable Manufacturing Cost	\$10	\$10
Fixed Manufacturing Cost	20*	30*
Unit Product Cost	30	40

*Unit fixed manufacturing cost in year 1: $\$600,000 \div 30,000 \text{ units} = \20 Unit fixed manufacturing cost in year 2: $\$600,000 \div 20,000 \text{ units} = \30

(2)

Wonderful Inc.
Income Statement

	<u>Year 1</u>	<u>Year 2</u>
Sales	\$800,000	\$1,000,000
Variable Expenses		
Variable Cost of Goods Sold		
Beginning Inventory	\$0	\$100,000
Cost of Goods Manufactured (@\$10)	300,000	200,000
Goods available for sales	300,000	300,000
Less: Ending Inventory	100,000	50,000
	<u>200,000</u>	<u>250,000</u>
Variable selling and administrative costs (@\$3)	60,000	75,000
	<u>260,000</u>	<u>325,000</u>
Contribution Margin	540,000	675,000
Fixed Expenses		
Fixed manufacturing costs	600,000	600,000
Fixed selling and administrative costs	50,000	50,000
	<u>650,000</u>	<u>650,000</u>
Total fixed expenses	650,000	650,000
Net Operating Income (Loss)	<u><u>(\$110,000)</u></u>	<u><u>\$25,000</u></u>

(3)

Reconciliation of net operating income under variable costing and absorption costing:

Net operating income under variable costing	(\$110,000)	\$25,000
Add: Fixed manufacturing costs deferred in inventory	200,000	150,000
Less: Fixed manufacturing cost released from inventory		200,000
Net operating income under absorption costing	<u>90,000</u>	<u>(25,000)</u>

(4)

Under absorption costing, fixed manufacturing costs are absorbed in ending inventory and carried forward to next year. Though sales of year 2 have increased when comparing to year 1, there is ending inventory in year 2 than year 1. So, the fixed manufacturing costs released is greater than fixed manufacturing costs absorbed. As sales are not able to cover fixed manufacturing costs released and other fixed costs, net operating loss is resulted.

Problem 3

(1)

Actual cost per unit of product A:

Standard Cost

Direct materials	\$10,080
Direct Labor	6,300
Variable manufacturing overheads	<u>2,520</u>
Total standard cost	\$18,900
No. of units	<u>1,000</u>
Standard cost per unit	\$18.9
Difference between standard and actual cost	<u>(0.09)</u>
Actual cost per unit	<u><u>\$18.81</u></u>

(2)

Total standard quantity of direct materials = $\$10,080 \div \$6 = 1,680$ unitsStandard quantity of direct materials per unit = $1,680 \div 1,000 = 1.68$ units

(3)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Materials quantity variance} &= \text{SP} \times (\text{AQ} - \text{SQ}) \\ 1200 &= \$6 \times (\text{AQ} - \$10,080 \div \$6) \\ 1200 &= \$6 \times (\text{AQ} - 1,680) \\ \text{AQ} &= 1,880 \end{aligned}$$

Actual price per unit of materials = $\$9,400 \div 1,880 = \5

(4)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Materials price variance} &= \text{AQ} \times (\text{SP} - \text{AP}) \\ &= 1,880 \times (\$6 - \$5) \\ &= \$1,880 \end{aligned}$$

Material price variance is \$1,880(F)

(5)

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Standard Variable Manufacturing Overhead} &= \text{SR} \times \text{SH} \\
 \$2520 &= \$3 \times \text{SH} \\
 \text{SH} &= 840 \text{ DLH}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Labor rate variance} &= (\text{AH} \times \text{AR})^* - (\text{AH} \times \text{SR}) \\
 &= \$7250 - [950 \times (\$6300/840)] \\
 &= \$7250 - (950 \times \$7.5) \\
 &= \$125
 \end{aligned}$$

Labour rate variance is \$125 (U)

$$* \text{ Total direct labour rate} = \$18.81 \times 1000 - \$9,400 - \$2,160 = \$7,250$$

(6)

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Labour efficiency variance} &= \text{SR} \times (\text{AH} - \text{SH}) \\
 &= \$7.5 \times (950 - 840) \\
 &= \$825
 \end{aligned}$$

*Labour efficiency variance is \$825(U)

(7)The difference between the actual and standard labour hour is the reason why there is a \$825 unfavorable labour efficiency variance. The possible reasons that may contribute to a increase in labour hour maybe because of the staff haven't had enough training in using the machines, or the materials being used were inferior due to a lower-than-expected price.

Problem 4

(1)

Incremental Revenue		\$720,000
Additional costs:		
Direct materials (@\$110)	\$165,000	
Direct Labor (@\$100)	150,000	
Variable Manufacturing Overheads (@\$80)	120,000	
Variable Shipping and handling	<u>138,000</u>	
Total additional costs		<u>573,000</u>
Increase in net operating income		<u><u>147,000</u></u>

If the special offer is accepted, Great China Company will have \$147,000 increase in net operating income. Therefore, the offer should be accepted.

(2)

Incremental Revenue (2,500 x \$480)		\$1,200,000
Additional costs:		
Direct materials (@\$110)	(\$275,000)	
Direct Labor (@\$100)	(250,000)	
Variable Manufacturing Overheads (@\$80)	(200,000)	
Variable Shipping and handling	<u>(145,000)</u>	(\$870,000)
Lost of sales revenue (12,000 x 8% x \$580)		(556,800)
Variable costs saved:		
Direct materials	\$105,600	
Direct Labor	96,000	
Variable manufacturing overhead	76,800	
Variable Shipping and handling	55,680	
Sales Commission	<u>21,120</u>	\$355,200
Increase in net operating income		<u><u>\$128,400</u></u>

Since there is a \$128,400 increase in net operating income after the offer is accepted, Great China should accept WongMart's order.

(3)

	Differential Cost	
	Make	Buy
Manufacturing Costs:		
Direct Materials	60,000	
Direct Labor	84,000	
Variable Manufacturing Overheads	36,000	
Purchase Costs		288,000
Opportunity Cost - Rental revenue	100,000	
Total Cost	<u>280,000</u>	<u>288,000</u>

If the company chooses to manufacture speakers, $\$288,000 - \$280,000 = \$8,000$ of costs will be saved. So, Great China should not purchase speakers from the outside supplier and continue to make them internally.