CHIJ KATONG CONVENT

Prelim Examination 2022 Secondary 4 Express / 5 Normal Suggested Answer Scheme - Paper 1 & 2

				Tota
•	pense reported on the 1] – 850 [1] + 1030 [1		financial perform	ance
		Journal	55 (4)	
2022		_	DR (\$)	CR (\$)
Apr 30	Wages expense	E+	1 030 [1]	
	Wages payable	L+		1 030 [1]
Working				
	owed to staff is adjusted	1	<u> </u>	staff is NOT adjusted
Journal er	ntries raised:		No journal entri	es are raised.
Wages ex	Dr pense E+ 1030	Cr		
Wages pa	•	1030		
Profit = In	ncome – Expenses = 0 –	(+1030) = -1030	Profit = Income -	- Expenses = 0 – 0 = 0
Profit will adjusted.	be overstated [1] by S	\$1030 <mark>[1]</mark> if wa	ages owed to staff	on 30 April 2022 is no
payment i	ess had provided the s in the last period. Hen d is reversed in this pe	ice, the comm	•	d not yet received the of \$570 adjusted in the
The busin	ess received a cheque	of \$9760 for	commission incom	ie.
	ess had provided the in the next period.	service in this	period but would	be receiving the
Accrual bas Business ac whether ca Hence, con	of the following] sis of accounting [1] ctivities are to be record ash is paid or received in mission for services all this year's income. [1]	the same peri	od or not [or the de	finition found in the TB]

Revenue recognition [1]

Revenue is earned when goods have been delivered, or services have been provided. Hence, commission for services already provided this year should be included in this year's income.

[1] OR

Matching concept [1]

Income should be recorded in the period it is earned and expenses recorded in the period it is incurred. Hence, commission for services earned this year should be included in this year's income. [1]

(a) [Trend] [3]

Total [5]

Gross profit margin has worsened by 7% from 2021 to 2022.

The business has become less efficient in trading in 2022.

[Cause]

This could be because the business reduced its selling price in 2022 to clear slow-moving goods.

The business also might have bought goods at a higher price in 2022 when Pitas reduced amount bought and did not enjoy trade discount.

(b) [Trend] [2]

Profit margin has improved by 3% from 2021 to 2022.

The business has become more efficient in managing its expenses.

[Cause]

The improvement in profit is not caused by higher gross profit since gross profit margin has worsened. The improvement is therefore due to a better management of expenses in 2022.

The business could have laid off excess staff in 2022 to reduce salaries / relocated to a location with cheaper rental, etc.

Total [9]

(a) Invoice [1]

(b) Pieces of yoga pants sold in May 2022 = 36 [2]

Applying FIFO, these yoga pants sold were from the beginning inventory (22 pieces) and inventory bought on 4 May (14 pieces).

Thus, cost of sales in May 2022 = 528 [1] + 364 [1] = \$892

Gross profit margin

= Gross profit / Sales revenue

= 223 / 1115 x 100 = 20% [1]

NRV of damaged yoga mats = \$136

Since cost > NRV, therefore value of damaged yoga mats should be \$136 (NRV).

Cost of undamaged yoga mats = \$2160

NRV of undamaged yoga mats = \$2592

Since cost < NRV, therefore value of undamaged yoga mats should be \$2160 (Cost).

Thus, value of yoga mats on 31 Dec 2021 = 136 [1] + 2160 [1] = \$2296

(e) [2]

If adjustment to damaged goods	If adjustment to damaged goods
is made	is <i>NOT</i> made
Journal entry raised:	
Dr Cr	
Impairment loss on inventory E+ 88	
Inventory L+ 88	
Cost 224 – NRV 136 = \$88	
Equity = Beginning capital + (Income – Expenses) – Drawings Equity = $0 + 0 - (+88) - 0 = -88$	Equity = Beginning capital + (Income – Expenses) – Drawings Equity = $0 + 0 - 0 - 0 = -0$

If the damaged yoga mats are not adjusted, equity will be overstated [1] by \$88 [1].

(b)

(c)

(d)

(e)

	Total	[14]
(a)		[3]

		DR (\$)	CR (\$)	Balance (\$)	_
2021					
July 31	Balance b/d			42 Cr [1]	
July 31	Bicol [860 – 680]	180 [1]			
July 31	Bank charges		35 [1]	103 Dr	
2021					
Aug 1	Balance b/d			103 Dr	
					[4]
		Macleod	4 1 2024		
	Bank Reconciliation S	statement as at 3	1 July 2021 \$		-
Ralance as	per bank statement	257	Ş		
	ues in-transit	237			
•	ales revenue	172	11		
	ues not presented yet	_,_ [-,		
•	amal (cheque 1249)	(326)	1]		
Balance as	per updated cash at bank	103 [1]		
[1] for co	rrecting identify both cheque	es in transit and c	heques not pre	esented yet.	
Transacti	ons should be recorded at th	eir original cost.			
[Anv one	of the following]				
To enTo enTo con	sure that cash and assets are sure transactions related to mply with law and regulation cept 'To deter fraud' but not	cash and assets a ns	re recorded aco	curately	
	1.21 = \$20 000 4.21 = 20000 – 5000 (repay	ment on 31.3.21)	= \$15 000		
	rom 1.1.21 to 31.3.21 = 3/12 rom 1.4.21 to 31.12.21 = 9/1		= =		
Interest e	expense for year ended 31.12	2.21 = 200 + 450 =	: \$650		

(a) Total – 8 marks

Mario Limited		
Statement of financial performance for the year ended 31 Ma	rch 2022	
	\$	\$
Sales revenue	180950	
Less: Sales returns	17200	
Net sales revenue		163750
Less: Cost of sales		92100
Gross Profit		71650 <mark>0</mark>
Add: Other income		
Commission income [5450 + 1000] [6450
Less: Other expenses		
Interest on loan [4% x 80000] or [3200 + 400] [3200	
Rent expense [18000 - 2000] [16000	
General expenses	13460	
Wages and salaries	20560	
Impairment loss on trade receivables [2066 - 1500]	566	
Depreciation on machinery [10% x (120000 - 6000)] [11400	
Depreciation on fixtures and fittings [(19000 - 2000) / 5] [3400	68586
Profit for the year		9514
Frontion the year		3314

(b) Total – 12 marks

Mario Limited			
Statement of financial position as at 31 March 2021	1		
	\$	\$	\$
	Cost	Accumulated	Net book
		Depreciation	value
ASSETS			
Non-current assets			
Machinery (-6000 - 11400)	120000	17400	102600
Fixtures and Fittings	19000	3400	15600
			118200
<u>Current assets</u>			
Inventory		21000	
Trade receivables [42120 – 800] [41320		
Less: Allowance for impairment of trade receivables	2066	39254	
(5% x 41320) [
Cash at bank (12900 + 800 + 15000) [28700	
Commission income receivable		1000 🛚	
Prepaid rent expense		2000 🛚	91954
Total assets			210154
EQUITY AND LIABILITIES			
Shareholders' equity			
Share capital, 90 000 ordinary shares [96000 + (10000 x 1.5)]		111000	
Retained earnings (3900 + 9514 OF - 2700) ☐		10714	121714
Non-current liabilities			
Long-term borrowing (80000 x 3/4)			60000 🛚
Current liabilities			
Trade payables		5340	_
Interest on loan payable (3200 - 2800)		400 🛚	
Dividends payable (90000 x 0.03)		2700 🛚	
Current portion of long-term borrowing (80000 x 1/4)		20000 🛚	28440
Total equity and liabilities			210154

(a)(i)

2022			Dr (\$)	Cr (\$)	
May 15	Cash at bank (1600 x 0.3)	A+	480		
	Trade receivable – Eden	A-		480	
	Allowance for impairment of trade receivables	A+	1120		
	(1600 - 480)				
	Trade receivable – Eden	A-		1120	

(a)(ii)

2022		Dr (\$)	Cr (\$)
Jun 30	Impairment loss on trade receivables E+	544 🛚	
	Allowance for impairment on trade receivables A-		544 🛚

Working

1 Jul 2021		30 Jun 2022
Allowance	Adjusted beginning allowance = -1200 + 1120 (Eden	Adjusted TR = 12000 – 1600
= - 1200	written-off) = -80	(Eden) = 10400
	Adj beginning allow + change = Ending allow	Allowance = - (6% x 10400)
	-80 = change = -624	= -624
	change = -544	
	Allowance becomes more negative, hence impairment	Note: Qn mentions that the
	loss is E+	transaction with Eden was
		not recorded yet. Hence,
		ending TR must be
		adjusted.

(b)(i)

Trade receivables on 30 Jun 2022

= 12000 – 1600 (amount received from Eden and amount owed from Eden written-off) = \$10400 [

(b)(ii)

Allowance for impairment on trade receivables on 30 Jun 2022

= 6% x 10400 = \$624 □

(c)

On 30 Jun 2022, impairment loss on trade receivables is an E+, hence...

Profit would decrease [] by \$544 []

(d)

Prudence theory []

The accounting treatment chosen should be the one that least overstates assets and profits, and least understates liabilities and losses.

Hence, at financial year-end, allowance for impairment on trade receivables for amounts that may not be collectible in the future is deducted from trade receivables so as not to overstate assets and profit.

□

(a)(i)

Working capital

- = Current assets Current liabilities
- $= (56500 + 47000 + 7230) (33000 + 28040) \square = 110730 \square 61040 \square = 49690

(a)(ii)

Working capital ratio

= Current assets / Current liabilities = 110 730 / 61 040 = 1.81

(a)(iii)

Quick ratio

- = (Total current assets Inventory Prepayments) / Current liabilities
- = (110730 56500 7230) / 61 040 = 47 000 / 61 040 = 0.77

OR

Quick ratio

- = (Receivables + Cash at bank + Cash in hand) / Current liabilities
- = 47 000 / 61 040 = 0.77 **[]**

(b)

	2020	2021	2022
Working capital	\$76750	\$50170	\$49690
Current ratio	4.43	3.24	1.81
Quick ratio	2.24	1.02	0.77

[6 unique comments on trend and reason – 6 marks; Students' answer must be in correct 'direction'.] The working capital of Cindy's business has worsened from \$76 750 in 2020 to \$50 170 in 2021 to \$49 690 in 2022.

The current ratio has also worsened from 4.43 in 2020 to 3.24 in 2021 to 1.81 in 2022.

The current ratio was above the general benchmark of 2 in 2020 and 2021 but fell below the general benchmark in 2022.

The quick ratio has also worsened from 2.24 in 2020 to 1.02 in 2021 to 0.77 in 2022.

The quick ratio also was above the general benchmark of 1 2020 and 2021 but fell below the general benchmark in 2022. In 2022, the business has less than \$1 of quick assets to pay off \$1 of current liability.

Inventory has increased every year from \$32 050 in 2020 to \$56 500 in 2022. This suggests that the business was overstocking thus depleting its cash / unable to sell its goods quickly to get cash.

The cash position has also worsened from \$18 200 in 2020 to \$5 000 in 2021 and finally to a bank overdraft of \$28 040 in 2022. This suggests that cash was used up and the business resorted to borrow short-term loan to cover its cash outflow.

Trade receivables increased from \$32 050 in 2020 to \$47 000 in 2022. Increasing trade receivables could indicate that the business didn't monitor its credit customers ensure that they pay promptly / business didn't scrutinise whether credit customers were able to pay before granting credit to them.

Trade payables increased every year from \$22 400 in 2020 to \$33 000 in 2022. Increasing trade payables suggests that the business has difficulty paying its suppliers on time.

(c) [2 unique reasons, 1m each]

Liquidity is important to a business:

- to pay for day-to-day operating expenses (ie. salaries, rent);
- to pay short-term debts (ie. trade payables, salaries payable, bank overdraft);
- to take advantage of cash discounts offered by trade payables; and (any other valid reasons)

(d) [2 unique reasons, 1m each]

- Have owner contribute cash capital [Note: must state 'cash']
- Obtain long-term loan [Note: must state 'long-term']
- Sell off inventory to get cash
- Convert business into a company and issue shares to get cash
- Negotiate for longer credit period from supplier to delay cash payment (any 2 valid reasons)

(a)

Working

1.10.2020 Buy MV

Depreciation of MV for 1st year

Y/e 30.6.2021

1.4.2022 Sell MV

No depreciation of MV in 2nd year as no depreciation is charged in the

year of sale.

Y/e 30.6.2022

Depreciation for year ended 30.6.21 = 30% x 50000 = \$15,000

Depreciation for year ended 30.6.22 = 0 (no depreciation in year of sale)

Accumulated depreciation on 1.4.2022 = \$15,000

NBV on 1.4.2022 = Original cost – Accumulated depreciation on 1.4.2022 = 50000 - 15000 = 35000 Selling price on 1.4.2022 = 30000 (sold on credit)

Loss on sale of non-current asset = 35000 - 30000 = 5000

Date 2022		Dr(\$)	Cr(\$)	
Apr 1	Sale of non-current asset Motor vehicles	50000	50000	
Apr 1	Accumulated depreciation - motor vehicles Sale of non-current asset	15000	15000	
Apr 1	Other receivable – Eva Sale of non-current asset	30000	30000	
June 30	Income summary Sale of non-current asset	5000	5000	

(b)

It is a loss on sale of non-current asset

Shown in the Expenses section on the statement of performance [

Evidence: Price is \$98 000 and is cheaper than Jissan model by \$12000 (ie. 110000 – 98000). Development: With the price being lower than the other model, Adam can use the cash saving to pay for other expenses such as salaries and rental in the business. Evidence: Vonda's fuel efficiency is at 10 litres per 100 km, which is 2 litres less than the Jissan model. Development: Being more efficient in fuel consumption, the business would have a lower petrol expense. The business should buy the van from Jissan Evidence Jissen can carry up to 2000 kgs of food, which is 500 kgs more than Vonda. Development: As the capacity of the vehicle is larger, this indicates that the business can reach out to more customers. This would increase its sales revenue. Evidence: It comes with a warranty of 5 years, which is 2 more years longer than that from Vonda. Development: Thus, the business can be assured that any wornout parts in the van will be repaired expertly by the supplier. This will also save the business repair expense.
Price is \$98 000 and is cheaper than Jissan model by \$12000 (ie. 110000 – 98000). Development: With the price being lower than the other model, Adam can use the cash saving to pay for other expenses such as salaries and rental in the business. Evidence: Vonda's fuel efficiency is at 10 litres per 100 km, which is 2 litres less than the Jissan model. Development: Being more efficient in fuel consumption, the business would have a lower petrol expense. Jissen can carry up to 2000 kgs of food, which is 500 kgs more than Vonda. Development: As the capacity of the vehicle is larger, this indicates that the business can reach out to more customers. This would increase its sales revenue. Evidence: It comes with a warranty of 5 years, which is 2 more years longer than that from Vonda. Development: Thus, the business can be assured that any wornout parts in the van will be repaired expertly by the supplier. This will also save the business
by \$12000 (ie. 110000 – 98000). Development: With the price being lower than the other model, Adam can use the cash saving to pay for other expenses such as salaries and rental in the business. Evidence: Vonda's fuel efficiency is at 10 litres per 100 km, which is 2 litres less than the Jissan model. Development: Being more efficient in fuel consumption, the business would have a lower petrol expense. 500 kgs more than Vonda. Development: As the capacity of the vehicle is larger, this indicates that the business can reach out to more customers. This would increase its sales revenue. Evidence: It comes with a warranty of 5 years, which is 2 more years longer than that from Vonda. Development: Thus, the business can be assured that any wornout parts in the van will be repaired expertly by the supplier. This will also save the business
Development: With the price being lower than the other model, Adam can use the cash saving to pay for other expenses such as salaries and rental in the business. Evidence: Vonda's fuel efficiency is at 10 litres per 100 km, which is 2 litres less than the Jissan model. Development: Being more efficient in fuel consumption, the business would have a lower petrol expense. Development: As the capacity of the vehicle is larger, this indicates that the business can reach out to more customers. This would increase its sales revenue. Evidence: It comes with a warranty of 5 years, which is 2 more years longer than that from Vonda. Development: Thus, the business can be assured that any worn- out parts in the van will be repaired expertly by the supplier. This will also save the business
With the price being lower than the other model, Adam can use the cash saving to pay for other expenses such as salaries and rental in the business. Evidence: Vonda's fuel efficiency is at 10 litres per 100 km, which is 2 litres less than the Jissan model. Development: Being more efficient in fuel consumption, the business would have a lower petrol expense. As the capacity of the vehicle is larger, this indicates that the business can reach out to more customers. This would increase its sales revenue. Evidence: It comes with a warranty of 5 years, which is 2 more years longer than that from Vonda. Development: Thus, the business can be assured that any wornout parts in the van will be repaired expertly by the supplier. This will also save the business
Adam can use the cash saving to pay for other expenses such as salaries and rental in the business. Evidence: Vonda's fuel efficiency is at 10 litres per 100 km, which is 2 litres less than the Jissan model. Development: Being more efficient in fuel consumption, the business would have a lower petrol expense. Indicates that the business can reach out to more customers. This would increase its sales revenue. Evidence: It comes with a warranty of 5 years, which is 2 more years longer than that from Vonda. Development: Thus, the business can be assured that any wornout parts in the van will be repaired expertly by the supplier. This will also save the business
expenses such as salaries and rental in the business. Evidence: Vonda's fuel efficiency is at 10 litres per 100 km, which is 2 litres less than the Jissan model. Development: Being more efficient in fuel consumption, the business would have a lower petrol expense. Evidence: It comes with a warranty of 5 years, which is 2 more years longer than that from Vonda. Development: Thus, the business can be assured that any wornout parts in the van will be repaired expertly by the supplier. This will also save the business
business. Evidence: Vonda's fuel efficiency is at 10 litres per 100 km, which is 2 litres less than the Jissan model. Development: Being more efficient in fuel consumption, the business would have a lower petrol expense. Evidence: It comes with a warranty of 5 years, which is 2 more years longer than that from Vonda. Development: Thus, the business can be assured that any wornout parts in the van will be repaired expertly by the supplier. This will also save the business
Evidence: Vonda's fuel efficiency is at 10 litres per 100 km, which is 2 litres less than the Jissan model. Development: Being more efficient in fuel consumption, the business would have a lower petrol expense. Evidence: It comes with a warranty of 5 years, which is 2 more years longer than that from Vonda. Development: Thus, the business can be assured that any wornout parts in the van will be repaired expertly by the supplier. This will also save the business
Vonda's fuel efficiency is at 10 litres per 100 km, which is 2 litres less than the Jissan model. Development: Being more efficient in fuel consumption, the business would have a lower petrol expense. It comes with a warranty of 5 years, which is 2 more years longer than that from Vonda. Development: Thus, the business can be assured that any wornout parts in the van will be repaired expertly by the supplier. This will also save the business
which is 2 litres less than the Jissan model. Development: Being more efficient in fuel consumption, the business would have a lower petrol expense. more years longer than that from Vonda. Development: Thus, the business can be assured that any wornout parts in the van will be repaired expertly by the supplier. This will also save the business
Development: Being more efficient in fuel consumption, the business would have a lower petrol expense. Development: Thus, the business can be assured that any wornout parts in the van will be repaired expertly by the supplier. This will also save the business
Being more efficient in fuel consumption, the business would have a lower petrol expense. Thus, the business can be assured that any wornout parts in the van will be repaired expertly by the supplier. This will also save the business
business would have a lower petrol expense. out parts in the van will be repaired expertly by the supplier. This will also save the business
the supplier. This will also save the business
repair expense.
Evidence: Evidence:
Annual depreciation on Vonda model The feedback on Nissen is that its after sales
= (98000-20000)/10 = \$7800 service is better than expected
Annual depreciation on Nissen model Development:
= (110000-28000)/10 = \$8200 The business can be assured that it will receive
Lower annual depreciation by \$400 with Vonda help quickly and therefore disruption to
model. operations will be kept to the minimal.
Development:
The business will have a lower depreciation
expense and thus a higher profit if the sales
revenue is achieved in both models.
Evidence:
Serving cost chargeable on Vonda model (10 yrs)
= (200x2x9 yrs) – 300 petrol voucher = \$3300
Serving cost chargeable on Jissen model (10 yrs)
= (250x2x7 yrs) = \$3500
Saving of \$200
Development:
The business would be able to save on serving
fees and petrol over 10 years.