

GROUP ASSIGNMENT MEMO

CONVENTIONAL versus ABC COSTING ANALYSIS

TOTAL MARKS 65

Question 1

(22)

Conventional versus activity-based costing analyses; relevant costs: manufacturer

1.1 Costs that will be avoided if Cowes's offer is accepted:

Direct materials	R244 000	✓
Direct labour	135 000	✓
Variable overhead	90 000	✓
Fixed overhead:		
supervisory salaries	60 000	✓
machinery depreciation	<u>21 000</u>	✓
Total avoidable costs	<u>R550 000</u>	

(5)

1.2 Costs that will be avoided using the ABC data:

Activity costs:

Product level

Product development ($R75 \times 1$)	R75	✓
Supervision ($R30 \times 10$)	300	✓

Batch level

Material handling ($R15 \times 2\,000$)	30 000	✓
Inspection ($R24 \times 2\,000$)	48 000	✓
Set-up metal press ($R75 \times 2\,000$)	150 000	✓

Unit level

Metal pressing ($R0.10 \times 760\,000$)	76 000	✓
Canister printing ($R0.05 \times 760\,000$)	<u>380 000</u>	✓

Total activity costs	R684 375	✓
Direct materials	<u>244 000</u>	✓
Total avoidable costs	<u>R928 375</u>	✓

(10)

1.3 Total avoidable costs:	R928 375	
Cost of purchasing (760 000 × R0.75)	<u>570 000</u>	✓✓
Additional costs of purchasing	<u>R 358 375</u>	✓✓

The company will save R385 375 if the canisters are purchased, rather than manufactured. Based on the financial data, the company should purchase the canisters. ✓✓

(5)

- 1.4 The analysis of costs using conventional and ABC costs yield different conclusion.

This is because the ABC analysis recognises more accurately the extent to which non-volume related costs will be avoided by purchasing, rather than manufacturing. ✓✓

(2)

Question 2

(43)

Drop a product line: manufacturer

1. Memorandum

Date: Today

To: Maria Levitt, President, Levitt Corporation

From: I.M. Student

Subject: Suggested revision of product-line income statement

- (a) The product-line income statement presented is not suitable for analysis and decision making. The statement does not **distinguish between variable and fixed costs**, which hinders any analysis on the impact of volume changes on profit. In addition, the statement does not distinguish between costs that are **directly related (traceable)** to a product line from those that are shared among all products.

(3)

- (b) An alternative income statement format that would be more suitable for analysis and decision making would incorporate the **contribution approach**. Expenses would be classified in terms of **variability and controllability**, such as: variable manufacturing, variable selling, administrative, direct fixed controllable by segment, direct fixed controllable by others, and common fixed. The **common fixed** costs would not be assigned to the product lines because such an allocation would be arbitrary. The contribution approach is more suitable for analysis and decision making because there is a meaningful **assignment of costs to product lines**.

(4)

The suggested discontinuance of the S-pumps would be cost effective, but the suggestions relating to F-pumps and R-pumps would not be cost effective. These conclusions are based on the following quarterly analysis.

2(a)

(22)

	F-Pump		R-Pump		S-Pump
Unit selling price	R270		R600		R540
Unit variable costs					
Raw material	R51		R 93		R150
Direct labour	60		120		180
Variable manufacturing overhead	90		135		180
Shipping expenses	<u>12</u>		<u>30</u>		<u>30</u>
Total	<u>213</u>	✓✓	<u>378</u>	✓✓	<u>540</u>
Unit contribution margin	R 57	✓✓	R222	✓✓	R 0
Increase (decrease) in units*					
F-pump: 10 000 × 50%	× (5 000)	✓			
R-pump: 8000 × 15%			× 1 200	✓	
S-pump: 5000 × 100%					× (5 000)
Increase (decrease) in total contribution margin	R(285 000)	✓✓	R266 400	✓✓	R 0
Decrease (increase) in fixed costs	<u>240 000</u>	†✓✓	<u>(300 000)</u>	✓	<u>120 000</u>
Increase (decrease) in segment contribution	<u>R (45 000)</u>	✓✓	<u>R (33 600)</u>	✓✓	<u>R120 000</u>

* Unit sales = sales dollars ÷ unit sales price

† \$300 000 – \$60 000

(8)

(7)

(7)

- 2(b) Yes, the president was correct in eliminating the S-pumps. The S-pump sales price covers only its variable cost and does not contribute anything to manufacturing overhead or promotion costs. Thus, the S-pump has a zero contribution margin. (3)

- 2(c) Yes, the president was correct in promoting the R-pump line rather than the F-pump line, because the unit contribution margin and contribution per labour dollar is greater for the R-pump line as follows:

	F-Pump	R-Pump
Unit contribution	R57,00	R222,00
Contribution per direct-labour rand	,95	1,85

However, the president's decisions regarding promotion expense do not seem well conceived. The decreased promotion on the F-pump line and the increased promotion on the R-pump line do not produce sufficient contribution to offset the promotional costs. (5)

- 2(d) No. The proposed course of action does not make effective use of capacity. The 15 per cent increase in production volume on the R pump line will not require all of the capacity that has been released by discontinuing the S-pump line or reducing the F-pump line by 50 per cent. (3)

- 3 Yes. The qualitative factors that management should consider before it decides whether to drop the S-pump line include:

- *Customer relations*. The sale of F-pumps and R-pumps may be related to the sale of S-pumps.
- *Labour relations*. Reducing employment may create labour problems.

(3)