

**CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS**

Cambridge International Advanced Level

## **MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2015 series**

### **9706 ACCOUNTING**

**9706/43**

Paper 4 (Problem solving – Supplement),  
maximum raw mark 120

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2015 series for most Cambridge IGCSE®, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

1 (a)

Plantin plc  
Retained earnings at 31 March 2015

	\$000	
Retained earnings at 1 April 2014	110	(1)
Profit for the year	<u>52</u>	(1)
	162	
Preference dividend paid	<u>(4)</u>	(1)
Retained earnings at 31 March 2015	<u>158</u>	(1)OF

[4]

(b)

Plantin plc  
Note to the statement of financial position at 31 March 2015.

Property, plant and equipment	Land and buildings \$000	Plant and equipment \$000	Total \$000	
<b>Cost</b>				
Balance at 1 April 2014	260	152	412	(1)
Purchases	<u>80</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>160</u>	(1)
Balance at 31 March 2015	<u>340</u>	<u>232</u>	<u>572</u>	(1)OF
<b>Depreciation</b>				
Balance at 1 April 2014	90	87	177	(1)
Charge for the year	<u>28</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>61</u>	(1)
Balance at 31 March 2015	<u>118</u>	<u>120</u>	<u>238</u>	(1)OF
<b>Net book value</b>				
Balance at 31 March 2015	<u>222</u>	<u>112</u>	<u>334</u>	}(1)OF BOTH
Balance at 31 March 2014	<u>170</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>235</u>	

[7]

(c)

Plantin plc  
Statement of Financial Position at 31 March 2015

\$000

**Non-current assets**

**Tangible**

**Property, plant and equipment**

Land and buildings	222	(1)OF
Plant and equipment	<u>112</u>	(1)OF
	334	
Investments	<u>55</u>	(1)
	389	

**Intangible (1)**

Goodwill (80 – 20)	<u>60</u>	(1)
	<u>449</u>	

**Current assets**

Inventories (45 (1) + 30 (1))	75	
Trade and other receivables (56 (1) + 40 (1))	<u>96</u>	
	<u>171</u>	
<b>Total assets</b>	<u>620</u>	(1)OF

**Equity**

Ordinary share capital (\$1 shares)(100 (1) + 50(1))	150	
Non-redeemable \$1 preference shares (80 + 20)	100	(1) + (1)
Share premium	30	(1)
Retained earnings	<u>158</u>	(1)OF
	<u>438</u>	

**Non-current liabilities**

5% debentures	<u>50</u>	(1)
---------------	-----------	-----

**Current liabilities**

Trade and other payables (24 (1) + 30 (1))	54	
Taxation	15	(1)
Cash and cash equivalents	<u>63</u>	(1)
	<u>132</u>	
<b>Total equity and liabilities</b>	<u>620</u>	

[21]

- (d) (i) In this case, revenue (1), profit for the year (1), trade receivables (1) and retained earnings (1) have all been overstated by \$30 000. [4]
- (ii) IAS 8 states that where an error is discovered a business must correct material errors (1) from prior periods (1) in the next set of financial statements (1). Comparative amounts from prior periods must be restated (1). [4]
- [Total: 40]



(d)

	Richards Limited		Sobers Limited	
Current ratio	1.61 : 1	(1)	2.11 : 1	(1)
Return on capital employed	19.13%	(1)	15.74%	(1)
Gearing ratio	21.74%	(1)	32.79%	(1)
Income gearing	9.09%	(1)	16.67%	(1)
Earnings per share	\$0.20	(1)	\$0.20	(1)
Price earnings ratio	9.00	(1)	12.00	(1)
Dividend yield	3.33%	(1)	3.75%	(1)

[14]

(e) Both companies have a return far in excess of the debenture rate so are feasible. (1)  
Richards Limited has the higher return therefore based on this would make the better investment. (1)

Both companies have low gearing being less than 50%. (1)

Richards Limited again has the 'better' ratio. (1)

Although neither company causes concern with income gearing Richards Limited again has the better ratio as it can pay interest 11 times from profit from operations (compared to 6 times). (1)

All of these ratios indicate that Richards Limited would be a better investment. (1)

[6]

[Total: 40]

3 (a) (i)  $24 + 20 + 4 + 9 = 57$  (1)

[1]

(ii)  $684\ 000 (1) \div 57 (1) \text{OF} = 12\ 000 (1) \text{OF}$

[3]

(b) (i)

	Process 1				
	\$			\$	
Direct material $12\ 000 \times 24$	288 000	(1)OF	Process 2	684 000	(1)
Direct material $12\ 000 \times 20$	240 000	(1)OF			
Variable overhead $12\ 000 \times 4$	48 000	(1)OF			
Fixed overhead $12\ 000 \times 9$	108 000	(1)OF			
	<u>684 000</u>			<u>684 000</u>	

[5]

(ii)

	Process 2				
	\$				
Process 1	684 000	(1)	Scrap $1200 \times 50$	60 000	(2)OF
Direct material $12\ 000 \times 10$	120 000	(1)OF	Process 3	1 152 000	(1)OF
Direct labour $12\ 000 \times 24$	288 000	(1)OF			
Variable overhead $12\ 000 \times 4$	48 000	(1)OF			
Fixed overhead $12\ 000 \times 6$	72 000	(1)OF			
	<u>1 212 000</u>			<u>1 212 000</u>	

[8]

Scrap  $1200 (1) \text{OF} \times 50 = 60\ 000 (1) \text{OF}$

(c) (i)  $12\,000 \times 90\%$  (1) = 10 800 (1)OF

(ii)  $1\,152\,000$  (1)OF  $\div$  10 800 (1)OF = \$106.67

(d)

	\$	
Existing P2 cost	1 212 000	(1)OF
Extra material cost $12\,000 \times 2 \times 3$	<u>72 000</u>	(1)
Gross cost	1 284 000	(1)OF
Scrap	<u>(30 000)</u>	(1)OF
Net cost	1 254 000	(1)OF
Divided by units	<u>11 400</u>	(1)OF
Cost per unit	<u>\$110</u>	(1)OF

Cost per unit has increased (1)OF

New materials should not be used (1)OF

[9]

(e) Work-in-progress

	\$	
Process 2	320 000	(1) OF
Direct materials	6 750	(1)
Direct labour	31 500	(1)
Variable overhead	<u>4 500</u>	(1)
	<u>362 750</u>	(1) OF

[5]

(f) Costs to date

Expected costs to completion

Estimated total costs

Percentage complete at report date

Time analysis of costs

Other reasonable point (1 each to max 5)

[5]

[Total: 40]