## Lecture 5: Exercises

8.11 CVP computations (Adopted by Horngren, C.T., Bhimani, A., Datar, S.M. and Foster, G. (2012). Management and cost accounting. Prentice Hall, 5th eds.)
Fill in the blanks for each of the following independent cases.

| Case | Selling <br> price | Variable <br> costs per <br> unit | Total units <br> sold | Total <br> contribution <br> margin | Total fixed <br> costs | Operating <br> profit/loss |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| a $£ 30$ $£ 20$ 70000 $£ ?$ $£ ?$ $-£ 15000$ <br> b 25 $?$ 180000 900000 800000 $?$ <br> c $?$ 10 150000 300000 220000 $?$ <br> d 20 14 $?$ 120000 $?$ 12000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Suggested Solution

a $\quad$ TCM $=\mathrm{Q}$ (USP-UVC)
$=70000(£ 30-£ 20)$
$=\quad £ 700000$
TFC = TCM - OP/L
$=£ 700000-£ 15000=£ 685000$
b

$$
£ 900000=180000(£ 25-\text { UVC })
$$

UVC = $£ 20$
OP/L = TCM-TFC
$=\quad £ 900000-£ 800000=£ 100000$
C
$T C M=\quad Q(U S P-U V C)$
£300 $000=150000$ (USP - £10)
USP = $£ 12$
OP/L = TCM-TFC
$=\quad £ 300000-£ 220000=£ 80000$
d

$$
Q=\quad T C M \div(U C P-U V C)
$$

$=\quad £ 120000 \div(£ 20-£ 14)$
$=\quad 20000$
TFC $=\quad \mathrm{TCM}-\mathrm{OP} / \mathrm{L}$
$=£ 120000-£ 12000=£ 108000$
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8.22 CVP, income taxes (Adopted by Horngren, C.T., Bhimani, A., Datar, S.M. and Foster, G. (2012). Management and cost accounting. Prentice Hall, 5th eds.)
La Pilotta has two restaurants in Lausanne that are open 24 hours a day. Fixed costs for the two restaurants together total SFr 450000 per year. Service varies from a cup of coffee to full meals. The average bill for each customer is SFr 8.00 . The average cost of food and other variable costs for each customer is SFr 3.20. The income tax rate is $30 \%$. Target net profit is SFr 105000.

## Required:

1. Calculate the revenues needed to obtain the target net profit.
2. How much in sales terms is needed (a) to earn net income of SFr 105000 and (b) to break even?
3. Calculate net income if the number of bills is 150000 .

## Suggested Solution

1. 

Variable cost percentage is SFr 3.20/SFr $8.00=40 \%$. Let $\mathrm{R}=$ Revenues needed to obtain target net profit, then:

$$
\begin{array}{rlll}
R-0,40 R-S F r ~ 450000 & & = & S F r 150000 \\
0,60 R & & \text { SFr } 450000 \div \operatorname{SFr} 150000 \\
R & = & \text { SFr } 600000 \div 0.60 \\
& = & \text { SFr } 1000000
\end{array}
$$

| Proof: | Revenues | SFr 1000000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Variable costs (at 40\%) | 400000 |
|  | Contribution margin | 600000 |
|  | Fixed costs | 450000 |
|  | Operating profit | 150000 |
|  | Income taxes (at 30\%) | 45000 |
|  | Net profit | Sfr 105000 |

2. 

a Sales necessary to earn net profit of SFr 105 000:

$$
\frac{\operatorname{SFr} 1000000}{\operatorname{SFr} 8}=125000 \text { sales necessary }
$$

b Sales necessary to break even:
Contribution margin: SFr 8.00 - SFr $3.20=$ SFr 4.80

$$
\frac{\text { SFr } 450000}{\text { SFr } 4.80}=93750 \text { sales necessary }
$$

3. 

Using the short-cut approach described in the chapter:
Change in net profit $=(150000-125000) \times$ SFr $4.80 \times(1-0.30)$

$$
=\text { SFr } 120000 \times 0.7=\text { SFr } 84000
$$

New net profit $=$ SFr $84000 \div$ SFr $105000=$ SFr 189000 athens unversity of lconomics 8 ausiness

| Proof: | Revenues, $150000 \times$ SFr 8.00 | SFr 1200000 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  | Variable costs (at 40\%) | 480000 |
|  | Contribution margin | 720000 |
|  | Fixed costs | 450000 |
|  | Operating profit | 270000 |
|  | Income taxes (at 30\%) | 81 |
|  | Net profit | Sfr 189000 |

9.15 (Adopted by Drury, C. (2012). Management and cost accounting. Cengage Learning Hall, 8th eds.)
A company manufactures three products, $X, Y$ and $Z$. The sales demand and the standard unit selling prices and costs for the next accounting period, period 1 , are estimated as follows:

|  | X | Y | Z |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum demand (000 <br> units) | $4.0 \$$ per unit | $5.5 \$$ per unit | 7.0 \$ per unit |
| Selling price | 28 | 22 | 30 |
| Variable costs: |  |  |  |
| Raw materials $(\$ 1$ per kg) | 5 | 4 | 6 |
| Direct labour (\$12 per hour) | 12 | 9 | 18 |

## Required:

1. Determine the limiting factor, If supplies in period 1 are restricted to 90000 kg of raw material and 18000 hours of direct labour.
2. In period 2 the company will have a shortage of raw materials, but no other resources will be restricted. The standard selling prices and costs and the level of demand will remain unchanged. In what order should the materials be allocated to the products if the company wants to maximize profit?

## Suggested Solution:

1. 

|  | X | Y | Z | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Demand (units) | 4000 | 5500 | 7000 |  |
| Materials (kg) | 20000 | 22000 | 42000 | 84000 |
| Labour (hours) | 4000 | 4125 | 10500 | 18625 |

Labour is the limiting factor.
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2.

|  | X | Y | Z |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\$$ | \$ | \$ |
| Selling price | 28 | 22 | 30 |
| Variable cost | 17 | 13 | 24 |
| Contribution | 11 | 9 | 6 |
| kg | 5 | 4 | 6 |
| Contribution perkg (\$) | 2.20 | 2.25 | 1 |
| Ranking | 2 | 1 | 3 |

9.19 (Adopted by Drury, C. (2012). Management and cost accounting. Cengage Learning Hall, 8th eds.)
A company has three shops ( $\mathrm{R}, \mathrm{S}$ and T ) to which the following budgeted information relates:

|  | Shop R | Shop S | Shop T | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | £000 | £000 | £000 | £000 |
| Sales | 400 | 500 | 600 | 1500 |
| Contribution | 100 | 60 | 120 | 280 |
| Less: Fixed costs | (60) | (70) | (70) | (200) |
| Profit/loss | 40 | (10) | 50 | 80 |

Sixty per cent of the total fixed costs are general company overheads. These are apportioned to the shops on the basis of sales value. The other fixed costs are specific to each shop and are avoidable if the shop closes down.

## Required:

1. If shop $S$ closed down and the sales of the other two shops remained unchanged, what would be the revised budgeted profit for the company?

## Suggested Solution:

Apportioned fixed costs = $£ 120000(0.6 \times £ 200000)$
Fixed costs apportioned to Shop S = £40 000 ( $500 / 1500 \times £ 120000$ )
Specific avoidable fixed cost for Shop S = £30 000 ( $£ 70000-£ 40$ 000)
Shop S therefore provides a contribution of $£ 30000$ (variable cost contribution of $£ 60$ 000 less specific fixed costs of $£ 30000$ ) to general apportioned fixed costs. The effect of closing down shop $S$ is that total budgeted profit will decline by the lost contribution from S to $£ 50000$.
9.23 (Adopted by Drury, C. (2012). Management and cost accounting. Cengage Learning Hall, 8th eds.)
WZ is a manufacturing company with two factories. The company's West factory currently produces a number of products. Four of these products use differing quantities of the same resources. Details of these four products and their resource requirements are as follows:

|  | J | K | L | M |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Product | \$/unit | \$/unit | \$/unit | \$/unit |
| Selling price | 56 | 40 | 78 | 96 |
| Direct labour (\$8 per hour) | 20 | 16 | 24 | 20 |
| Direct material A (\$3 per litre) | 6 | 3 | 0 | 9 |
| Direct material B (\$5 per kg) | 10 | 0 | 15 | 20 |
| Variable overhead (see note 1) |  |  |  |  |
| Labour related | 1.25 | 1 | 1.50 | 1.25 |
| Machine related | 1.25 | 2 | 0.75 | 1 |
| Total variable cost | 38.50 | 22 | 41.25 | 51.25 |
| Other data: |  |  |  |  |
| Machine hours per unit | 5 | 8 | 3 | 4 |
| Maximum demand per week | 1000 | 3500 | 2800 | 4500 |

Notes:
1 An analyses of the variable overhead shows that some of it is caused by the number of labour hours and the remainder is caused by the number of machine hours.
2 Currently WZ purchases a component P from an external supplier for $\$ 35$ per component. A single unit of this component is used in producing N the company's only other product. Product N is produced in WZ's other factory and does not use any of the resources identified above. Product N currently yields a positive contribution. WZ could manufacture the component in its West factory, but to do so would require: 1 hour of direct labour, 0.5 machine hours, and 2 kgs of direct material B. WZ purchases 500 components per week. WZ could not produce the component in its other factory.
3 The purchasing director has recently advised you that the availability of direct materials $A$ and $B$ is to be restricted to 21000 litres and 24000 kgs per week respectively. This restriction is unlikely to change for at least 10 weeks. No restrictions aree expected on any other resources.
4 WZ does not hold inventory of either finished goods or raw materials.
5 WZ has already signed a contract, which must be fulfilled, to deliver the following units of its products each week for the next 10 weeks:

| Product | Contract units |
| :---: | :---: |
| J | 100 |
| K | 200 |
| L | 150 |
| M | 250 |
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These quantities are in addition to the maximum demand identified above.

## Required:

1. Calculate whether WZ should continue to purchase the component P or whether it should manufacture it internally during the next 10 weeks.

## Suggested Solution:

1. 

If all of the resources required to produce component $P$ are readily available the relevant costs will be as follows:

|  |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Direct labour (1 hour @ \$8/hour) |  |
| Direct material B (2kgs @ \$5/kg) |  |
| Variable overhead (working 1): | $8 / \mathrm{unit}$ |
| Direct labour (1 hour @ \$0.50 / hour) | 8.00 |
| Machine hours (0.5 hours @ \$0.25 / hour) | 10.00 |
|  |  |
|  |  |

W1 Product J requires 2.5 labour hours ( $\$ 20 / \$ 8$ ) so the labour related variable overhead rate is $\$ 0.50$ per hour ( $\$ 1.25 / 2.5$ hours). Product J also requires 1.5 machine hours giving a machine related variable overhead rate of $\$ 0.25$ per hour ( $\$ 1.25 / 5$ machine hours).
Assuming that all of the above resources are readily available the relevant cost of producing component $P$ is less than the purchase price so the component should be produced internally. However, both materials A and B will be in scarce supply over the next 10 weeks so it is necessary to examine how this will influence the optimum production programme of WZ. The following schedule compares the kg required to meet the planned production programme compared with the availability of materials:

| Resource | Available | Total | J | K | L | M | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Direct material <br> A 21000 20150 2200 3700 0 14250 0 <br> Direct material <br> B 24000 31050 2200 0 8850 19000 1000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Note that the above schedule is based on the maximum weekly demand plus existing contractual commitments. Material B is a binding constraint so the optimal production programme should be determined based on the ranking per unit of limiting factor (kg of material B).

|  | J | L | M | P |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| Selling price / buying cost | 56 | 78 | 96 | 35 |
| Direct labour | 20 | 24 | 20 | 8 |
| Material A | 6 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| Material B | 10 | 15 | 20 | 10 |
| Overhead: |  |  |  |  |
| Labour | 1.25 | 1.50 | 1.25 | 0.50 |
| Machinery | 1.25 | 0.75 | 1 | 0.125 |
| Contribution | 17.50 | 36.75 | 44.75 | 16.375 |
| Contribution /kg of material B | 8.75 | 12.25 | 11.19 | 8.19 |
| Rank | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 |

Note that product $K$ is not included in the above ranking because it does not use material B. Therefore, product K can be produced to meet maximum demand. Since the component is the lowest ranked usage of material B then WZ should continue to purchase the component so that the available resources can be used to manufacture products L, M and J.
10.13 Customer profitability, choosing customers (Adopted by Horngren, C.T., Bhimani, A., Datar, S.M. and Foster, G. (2012). Management and cost accounting. Prentice Hall, 5th eds.)
Jours-Daim SA operates a printing press with a monthly capacity of 2000 machine-hours. Jours-Daim has two main customers, Harpes-à-Gonds, SNC and Fourbe-Riz SA. Data on each customer for January follow:

|  | Harpes-à-Gonds | Fourbe-Riz | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Revenues | €120 000 | €80 000 | €200 000 |
| Variable costs | 42000 | 48000 | 90000 |
| Fixed costs (allocated on the basis of revenues) | 60000 | 40000 | 100000 |
| Total operating costs | 102000 | 88000 | 190000 |
| Operating profit | €18000 | €(8000) | €10 000 |
| Machine-hours required | 1500 hours | 500 hours | 2000 hours |

Each of the following requirements refers only to the preceding data; there is no connection between the requirements.
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## Required:

1. Should Jours-Daim drop the Fourbe-Riz business? If Jours-Daim drops the FourbeRiz business, its total fixed costs will decrease by $20 \%$.
2. Fourbe-Riz indicates that it wants Jours-Daim to do an additional $€ 80000$ worth of printing jobs during February. These jobs are identical to the existing business Jours-Daim did for Fourbe-Riz in January in terms of variable costs and machinehours required. Jours-Daim anticipates that the business from Harpes-à-Gonds in February would be the same as that in January. Jours-Daim can choose to accept as much of the Harpes-à-Gonds and Fourbe-Riz business for February as it wants. Assume that total fixed costs for February will be the same as the fixed costs in January. What should Jours-Daim do? What will Jours-Daim's operating profit be in February?

## Suggested Solution:

1. 

Jours-Daim should not drop the Fourbe-Riz business as the following analysis shows: Loss in revenues from dropping Fourbe-Riz
$€(80,000)$
Savings in costs:
Variable costs 48,000

Fixed costs $20 \% \times € 100,000 \quad \underline{20,000}$
Total savings in costs
68,000
Effect on operating income $\quad \underline{\underline{\epsilon}(12,000)}$
Jours-Daim would be worse off by $€ 12,000$ if it drops the Fourbe-Riz business.
2
If Jours-Daim accepts the additional business from Fourbe-Riz, it would take an additional 500 hours of machine time. If Jours-Daim accepts all of Fourbe-Riz's and Harpes-à-Gonds' business for February, it would require 2,500 hours of machine time ( 1,500 hours for Harpes-à-Gonds and 1,000 hours for Fourbe-Riz). Jours-Daim has only 2,000 hours of machine capacity. It must, therefore, choose how much of the Harpes-à-Gonds or FourbeRiz business to accept. If Jours-Daim accepts any additional business from Fourbe-Riz, it must forgo some of Harpes-à-Gonds's business.
To maximise operating income, Jours-Daim should maximise contribution margin per unit of the constrained resource. (Fixed costs will remain unchanged at $€ 100,000$ whatever business Jours-Daim chooses to accept in February, and are therefore irrelevant.) The contribution margin per unit of the constrained resource for each customer in January is:

|  | Harpes-à-Gonds | Fourbe-Riz |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Revenues | $€ 120,000$ | $€ 80,000$ |
| Variable costs | $\underline{42,000}$ | $\underline{~} 48,000$ |
| Contribution margin | $\underline{€ 78,000}$ | $\underline{\underline{€ 2,000}}$ |
| Contribution margin per machine-hour | $\underline{€ 78,000}=€ 52$ | $\underline{€ 32,000}=€ 64$ |
|  | 1,500 | 500 |

Since the $€ 80,000$ of additional Fourbe-Riz business in February is identical to jobs done in January, it will also have a contribution margin of $€ 64$ per machine-hour, which is greater than the contribution margin of $€ 52$ per machine-hour from Harpes-à-Gonds. To maximise operating income, Jours-Daim should first allocate all the capacity needed to take the Fourbe-Riz business ( 1,000 machine-hours) and then allocate the remaining 1,000 (2,000-1,000) machine-hours to Harpes-à-Gonds. Jours-Daim's operating income in February would then be $€ 16,000$ as shown below, greater than the $€ 10,000$ operating income in January.

|  | Harpes-à-Gonds | Fourbe-Riz | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Contribution margin per machine-hour | $€ 52$ | $€ 64$ |  |
| Machine-hours to be worked | 1,000 | 1,000 |  |
| Contribution margin | $€ 52,000$ | $€ 64,000$ | $€ 116,000$ |
| Fixed costs |  |  | $\underline{100,000}$ |
| Operating income |  |  | $€ 16,000$ |

Alternatively, we could present Jours-Daim's operating income by taking two-thirds (1,000 $\div 1,500$ machine-hours) of Harpes-à-Gonds's January revenues and variable costs and doubling ( $1,000 \div 500$ machine-hours) Fourbe-Riz's January revenues and variable costs.

|  | Harpes-à-Gonds | Fourbe-Riz | Total |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | :---: |
| Revenues | $€ 80,000$ | $€ 160,000$ | $€ 240,000$ |
| Variable costs | $\underline{28,000}$ | $\underline{96,000}$ | $\underline{124,000}$ |
| Contribution margin | 52,000 | 64,000 | 116,000 |
| Fixed costs |  | $\underline{100,000}$ |  |
| Operating income |  | $\underline{€ 16,000}$ |  |

The problem indicated that Jours-Daim could choose to accept as much of the Harpes-àGonds and Fourbe-Riz business for February as it wants. However, some students may raise the question that Jours-Daim should think more strategically before deciding what to do. For example, how would Harpes-à-Gonds react to Jours-Daim's inability to satisfy its needs? Will Fourbe-Riz continue to give Jours-Daim $€ 160,000$ of business each month or is the additional $€ 80,000$ of business in February a special order? For example, if Fourbe-Riz's additional work in February is only a special order and Jours-Daim wants to maintain a long-term relationship with Harpes-à-Gonds, it may in fact prefer to turn down the additional Fourbe-Riz business. It may feel that the additional €6,000 in operating income in February is not worth jeopardising its long-term relationship with Harpes-àGonds. Other students may raise the possibility of Jours-Daim accepting all the Harpes-à-
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Gonds and Fourbe-Riz business for February if it can subcontract some of it to another reliable, high-quality printer.
10.14 Relevance of equipment costs (Adopted by Horngren, C.T., Bhimani, A., Datar, S.M. and Foster, G. (2012). Management and cost accounting. Prentice Hall, 5th eds.)

Jääskinen Oy has just today paid for and installed a special machine for polishing cars at one of its several outlets. It is the first day of the company's fiscal year. The machine cost $€ 20000$. Its annual operating costs total $€ 15000$, exclusive of depreciation. The machine will have a four-year useful life and a zero terminal disposal price.
After the machine has been used for a day, a machine salesperson offers a different machine that promises to do the same job at a yearly operating cost of $€ 9000$, exclusive of depreciation. The new machine will cost $€ 24000$ cash, installed. The 'old' machine is unique and can be sold outright for only $€ 10000$, minus $€ 2000$ removal cost. The new machine, like the old one, will have a four-year useful life and zero terminal disposal price. Sales, all in cash, will be $€ 150000$ annually, and other cash costs will be $€ 110000$ annually, regardless of this decision.
For simplicity, ignore income taxes, interest and present-value considerations.

## Required:

1 a Prepare a statement of cash receipts and disbursements for each of the four years under both alternatives. What is the cumulative difference in cash flow for the four years taken together?
b Prepare income statements for each of the four years under both alternatives. Assume straight-line depreciation. What is the cumulative difference in operating profit for the four years taken together?
c What are the irrelevant items in your presentations in requirements (a) and (b)? Why are they irrelevant?

2 Suppose the cost of the 'old' machine was $€ 1$ million rather than $€ 20000$. Nevertheless, the old machine can be sold outright for only $€ 10000$, minus $€ 2000$ removal cost. Would the net differences in requirements 1 and 2 change? Explain.
3 'To avoid a loss, we should keep the old machine.' What is the role of book value in decisions about replacement of machines?

## Suggested Solution:

1. 

1a Statements of cash receipts and disbursements

|  | Keep |  |  | Buy new machine |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Year 1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Years } \\ 2-4 \end{gathered}$ | Four years together | Year 1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Years } \\ 2-4 \end{gathered}$ | Four years together |
| Receipts from operations: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sales | €150,000 | $€ 150,000$ | $€ 600,000$ | €150,000 | €150,000 | €600,000 |
| Deduct disbursements: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other operating costs | $(110,000)$ | $(110,000)$ | $(440,000)$ | $(110,000)$ | $(110,000)$ | $(440,000)$ |
| Operation of machine | $(15,000)$ | $(15,000)$ | $(60,000)$ | $(9,000)$ | $(9,000)$ | $(36,000)$ |
| Purchase of 'old' machine | $(20,000) *$ |  | $(20,000)$ | $(20,000)$ |  | $(20,000)$ |
| Purchase of 'new' equipment |  |  |  | $(24,000)$ |  | $(24,000)$ |
| Cash inflow from sale of old equipment | $\underline{\underline{€ 5,000}}$ | €25,000 | € $¢ 0,000$ | $\underline{8,000}$ $\underline{\underline{\epsilon} 5,000})$ | $€$ € ${ }^{11,000}$ | 8,000 $¢ 88,000$ |
| Net cash inflow |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*Some students ignore this item because it is the same for each alternative. However, note that a statement for the entire year has been requested. Obviously, the $€ 20,000$ would affect Year 1 only under both the 'keep' and 'buy' alternatives.

The difference is $€ 8,000$ for four years taken together. In particular, note that the $€ 20,000$ book value can be omitted from the comparison. Merely cross out the entire line; although the column totals are affected, the net difference is still $€ 8,000$.
Note the motivational factors here. A manager may be reluctant to replace simply because the large loss on disposal severely harms profitability in Year 1. Nevertheless, the cumulative cash flow effects are beneficial to the company as a whole (assuming a world of no income taxes and no interest).
1b Again, the difference is $€ 8,000$ :
Income statements

|  | Keep |  | Buy new machine |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Years | Four years together | Year 1 | Years $2-4$ | Four years together |
| Sales | € 150,000 | €600,000 | € 150,000 | €150,000 | €600,000 |
| Costs (excluding disposal): |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other operating costs | 110,000 | 440,000 | 110,000 | 110,000 | 440,000 |
| Depreciation | 5,000 | 20,000 | 6,000 | 6,000 | 24,000 |
| Operating costs of machine | 15,000 | 60,000 | 9,000 | 9,000 | 36,000 |
| Total costs (excluding disposal) | 130,000 | 20,000 | 125,000 | 125,000 | 500,000 |
| Loss on disposal: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Book value ('cost') | - | - | 20,000 | - | 20,000* |
| Proceeds ('revenue') | - | - | $(8,000)$ | - | $(8,000)$ |
| Loss on disposal | - | - | 12,000 | - | 12,000 |
| Total costs | 130,000 | 520,000 | 137,000 | 125,000 | 512,000 |
| Operating income | $\underline{\underline{€} 20,000}$ | $\underline{¢ 80,000}$ | $\underline{\underline{€ 13,000}}$ | $\underline{\underline{€} 5,000}$ | $\underline{¢ 88,000}$ |
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*As in requirement (1a), the $€ 20,000$ book value may be omitted from the comparison without changing the $€ 8,000$ difference. This adjustment would mean excluding the depreciation item of $€ 5,000$ per year (a cumulative effect of $€ 20,000$ ) under the 'keep' alternative and excluding the book value item of $€ 20,000$ in the loss on disposal calculation under the 'buy' alternative.

1c The $€ 20,000$ purchase cost of the 'old' equipment, the sales and the other costs are irrelevant because their amounts are common to both alternatives.
2 The net difference would be unaffected. Any number may be substituted for the original $€ 20,000$ figure without changing the final answer. Of course, the net cash outflows under both alternatives would be high. The Car Wash manager really blundered. However, keeping the 'old' equipment will increase the cost of the blunder to the cumulative tune of $€ 8,000$ over the next 4 years.
3 Book value is irrelevant in decisions about the replacement of equipment, because it is a past (historical) cost. All past costs are down the drain. Nothing can change what has already been spent or what has already happened. The $€ 20,000$ has been spent. How it is subsequently accounted for is irrelevant. The analysis in requirement (1) clearly shows that we may completely ignore the $€ 20,000$ and still have a correct analysis. The only relevant items are those expected future items that will differ among alternatives.
Despite the economic analysis shown here, many managers would keep the old machine rather than replace it. Why? Because, in many organisations, the income statements of requirement (2) would be a principal means of evaluating performance. Note that the first-year operating income would be higher under the 'keep' alternative. The conventional accrual accounting model might motivate managers towards maximising their first-year reported operating income at the expense of long-run cumulative betterment for the organisation as a whole. This criticism is often made of the accrual accounting model. That is, the action favoured by the 'correct' or 'best' economic decision model may not be taken, either because the performance-evaluation model is inconsistent with the decision model or because the focus is only on the short-run part of the performance-evaluation model.
10.15 Contribution approach, relevant costs (Adopted by Horngren, C.T., Bhimani, A., Datar, S.M. and Foster, G. (2012). Management and cost accounting. Prentice Hall, 5th eds.)

Air Calabria owns a single jet aircraft and operates between Cantazaro and Venice. Flights leave Cantazaro on Mondays and Thursdays and depart from Venice on Wednesdays and Saturdays. Air Calabria cannot offer any more flights between Cantazaro and Venice. Only tourist-class seats are available on its planes. An analyst has collected the following information:

| Seating capacity per plane | 360 passengers |
| :--- | ---: |
| Average number of passengers per flight | 200 passengers |
| Flights per week | 4 flights |
| Flights per year | 208 flights |
| Average one-way fare | $€ 500$ |
| Variable fuel costs | $€ 14000$ per flight |
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| Food and beverage service cost (no charge to passenger) | $€ \in 20$ per passenger |
| :--- | ---: |
| Commission to travel agents paid by Air Calabria (all <br> tickets are booked by travel agents) | $8 \%$ of fare |
| Fixed annual lease costs allocated to each flight | $€ 53000$ per flight |
| Fixed ground services (maintenance, check in, baggage <br> handling) cost allocated to each flight | $€ 7000$ per flight |
| Fixed flight crew salaries allocated to each flight | $€ 4000$ per flight |

For simplicity, assume that fuel costs are unaffected by the actual number of passengers on a flight.

## Required:

1 What is the operating profit that Air Calabria makes on each one-way flight between Cantazaro and Venice?
2 The Market Research Department of Air Calabria indicates that lowering the average one-way fare to $€ 480$ will increase the average number of passengers per flight to 212. Should Air Calabria lower its fare?
3 Cima-Rosa, a tour operator, approaches Air Calabria on the possibility of chartering (renting out) its jet aircraft twice each month, first to take Cima-Rosa's tourists from Cantazaro to Venice and then to bring the tourists back from Venice to Cantazaro. If Air Calabria accepts Cima-Rosa's offer, Air Calabria will be able to offer only 184 (208-24) of its own flights each year. The terms of the charter are as follows: (a) For each one-way flight, Cima-Rosa will pay Air Calabria $€ 75000$ to charter the plane and to use its flight crew and ground service staff; (b) Cima-Rosa will pay for fuel costs; and (c) Cima-Rosa will pay for all food costs. On purely financial considerations, should Air Calabria accept Cima-Rosa's offer? What other factors should Air Calabria consider in deciding whether or not to charter its plane to Cima-Rosa?

## Suggested Solution:

1. 

Average one-way fare per passenger
$€ 500$
Commission at $8 \%$ of $€ 500$ $\qquad$
Net cash to Air Calabria per ticket €460
Average number of passengers per flight
200
Revenues per flight ( $€ 460 \times 200$ )
Food \& beverage cost per flight ( $€ 20 \times 200$ )
Total contribution from passengers
Fuel costs per flight
$€ 92000$

Contribution per flight
4000

Fixed costs allocated to each flight:
Lease costs €53000

Baggage handling 7000
Flight crew 400064000
Operating income per flight
$€ 10000$

2

| If fare is | $€ 480.00$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Commission at $8 \%$ of $€ 480$ | 38.40 |
| Net cash per ticket | 441.60 |
| Food and beverage cost per ticket | 20.00 |
| Contribution per passenger | $€ 421.60$ |

Total contribution margin from passengers ( $£ 421.60 \times 212$ )

All other costs are irrelevant
On the basis of quantitative factors alone, Air Calabria should decrease its fare to $€ 480$ because reducing the fare gives Air Calabria a higher contribution margin from passengers ( $€ 89379.20$ versus $€ 88000$ ).

## 3

In evaluating whether Air Calabria should charter its plane to Cima-Rosa, we compare the charter alternative to the solution in requirement (2) because requirement (2) is preferred to requirement (1).

| Under requirement (2), Air Calabria gets | $€ 89379.20$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Deduct fuel costs | 14000.00 |
| Total contribution per flight |   |

Air Calabria gets $€ 75000$ per flight from chartering the plane to Cima-Rosa. On the basis of quantitative financial factors Air Calabria is better off not chartering the plane and instead lowering its own fares.
Students who compare the $€ 75000$ that Air Calabria earns from chartering its plane to the contribution from passengers in requirement (1) (€74000) will conclude that Air Calabria should charter the plane to Cima-Rosa. Strictly speaking, though, the correct answer must compare the charter fee of $€ 75000$ to the $€ 75379.20$ passenger contribution in requirement (2) since lowering the fare is certainly an alternative available to Air Calabria.
Other qualitative factors that Air Calabria should consider in coming to a decision are:
a The lower risk from chartering its plane relative to the uncertainties regarding the number of passengers it might get on its scheduled flights.
b Chartering to Cima-Rosa means that Air Calabria would not have a regular schedule of flights each week. This arrangement could cause inconvenience to some of its passengers.
c The stability of the relationship between Air Calabria and Cima-Rosa. If this is not a long-term arrangement, Air Calabria may lose current market share and not benefit from sustained charter revenues.
10.23 Special-order decision (Adopted by Horngren, C.T., Bhimani, A., Datar, S.M. and Foster, G. (2012). Management and cost accounting. Prentice Hall, 5th eds.)
Fri-Flask specialises in the manufacture of one-litre plastic bottles. The plastic moulding machines are capable of producing 100 bottles per hour. The firm estimates that the variable cost of producing a plastic bottle is 25 ore. The bottles are sold for 55 ore each.

Management has been approached by a local toy company that would like the firm to produce a moulded plastic toy for them. The toy company is willing to pay DKr 3.00 per unit for the toy. The unit variable cost to manufacture the toy will be DKr 2.40. In addition, Fri-Flask would have to incur a cost of DKr 20000 to construct the mould required exclusively for this order. Because the toy uses more plastic and is of a more intricate shape than a bottle, a moulding machine can produce only 40 units per hour. The customer wants 100000 units. Assume that Fri-Flask has a total capacity of 10000 machine-hours available during the period in which the toy company wants delivery of the toys. The firm's fixed costs, excluding the costs to construct the toy mould, during the same period will be DKr 200000.

## Required:

1 Suppose the demand for its bottles is 750000 units, and the special toy order has to be either taken in full or rejected totally. Should Fri-Flask accept the special toy? Explain your answer.
2 Suppose the demand for its bottles is 850000 units, and the special toy order has to be either taken in full or rejected totally. Should Fri-Flask accept the special toy order? Explain your answer.
3 Suppose the demand for its bottles is 850000 units, and Fri-Flask can accept any quantity of the special toy order. How many bottles and toys should it manufacture?
4 Suppose the demand for its bottles is 900000 units, and the special toy order has to be either taken in full or rejected totally. Should Fri-Flask accept the special toy order? Explain your answer.
5 Suppose the demand for its bottles is 900000 units, and Fri-Flask can accept any quantity of the special toy order. How many bottles and toys should it manufacture?
6 Suppose the demand for its bottles is 950000 units and Fri-Flask can accept any quantity of the special toy order. How many bottles and toys should it manufacture?
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## Suggested Solution:

## 1.

1 Time spent on manufacturing bottles $=\frac{750000 \text { bottles }}{100 \text { bottles per hour }}=7500$ hours
So $10000-7500=2500$ hours available for toys.
The moulded plastic toy requires $\frac{100000 \text { units }}{40}=2500$ hours, so Fri-Flask has enough capacity to accept the toys order. Additional income from accepting the order is:
Revenue DKr3.00 x 100000
Variable costs $2.40 \times 100000$

| DKr300000 |
| ---: |
| 240000 |
| 60000 |
| 20000 |
| DKr40000 |

Contribution margin
Fixed costs
Additional income
So Fri-Flask should accept the order since it has enough excess capacity to make the 100 000 toys.

2 Time spent on manufacturing bottles $=\frac{850000}{100}=8500$ hours
So $10000-8500=1500$ hours available for toys.
From requirement (1) moulded plastic toy requires 2500 hours and generates DKr40000 in operating income.

So if the toy order is accepted, 1000 hours ( 2500 hours required -1500 hours available) of bottle making will be forgone, equal to 100000 bottles ( 100 bottles/hr x 1 000 hrs ).
Operating income from accepting
Forgone contribution margin (100000 bottles x DKr0.30) 30000
Increase in operating income

So Fri-Flask should accept the special order.

3 Without considering the fixed costs of the toy mould, the contribution per machine-hour of the constrained resource for bottles and the special toy are as follows:

|  | Bottles | Toys |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Contribution margin per unit | DKr0.30 | DKr0.60 |
| Multiplied by units made in 1 machine-hour | 100 | 40 |
| Contribution margin per machine-hour | DKr30 | DKr24 |

This suggests that Fri-Flask should make as many bottles as it can rather than the special toys because bottles generate a higher contribution margin per machine-hour.
So if Fri-Flask used the 1500 hours available to it for making toys after using the 8500 hours to make bottles, it would be able to make $1500 \times 40=60000$ toys and earn operating income of:
Contribution margin $60000 \times$ DKr0.60
Fixed mould costs
Increase in operating income

The contribution margin earned covers the fixed costs of the mould, so Fri-Flask should make 850000 bottles and 60000 toys.

4 Time spent on manufacturing bottles $=\frac{900000}{100}=9000$ hours
So $10000-9000=1000$ hours available for toys.
So if the toy order is accepted, then 1500 hours ( 2500 hours required -1000 hours available) of bottle capacity will be forgone $=150000$ bottles
Contribution from accepting toy offer
DKr40 000
Forgone profits on bottles $150000 \times$ DKr0. 30
Increase (decrease) in operating income

So reject the special order.
5 As in requirement (3), Fri-Flask should first use the 9000 hours to make bottles and then consider using the 1000 hours available to it for making toys. It would be able to make 1000 hours $\times 40=40000$ toys and earn operating income of:

Contribution margin $40000 \times$ DKr0.60 DKr24 000
Fixed mould costs
Increase in Operating income
DKr 4000
Fri-Flask should make 900000 bottles and 40000 toys.
6 As in requirements (3) and (5), Fri-Flask should first use 9500 hours to make bottles and then consider using the 500 hours available to it for making toys. It would be able to make 500 hours $\times 40=20000$ toys and earn operating income of
Contribution margin $20000 \times$ DKr0. 60 DKrI2 000
Fixed mould costs
Increase (decrease) in operating income
So Fri-Flask should refuse to make any of the plastic toys. If it tried to make the toy product more profitable by making more toys, it would have to give up the plastic bottles. This trade-off is not worthwhile because Fri-Flask makes DKr24 per hour from the toys and would lose DKr30 per hour from the plastic bottles.

