

**EXERCISE 6-9**

	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Market</u>	<u>Lower -of-Cost -or-Market:</u>
<b>Cameras</b>			
Minolta	\$ 850	\$ 780	\$ 780
Canon	<u>900</u>	<u>912</u>	900
<b>Total</b>	<u>1,750</u>	<u>1,692</u>	
<b>Light meters</b>			
Vivitar	1,500	1,380	1,380
Kodak	<u>1,680</u>	<u>1,890</u>	<u>1,680</u>
<b>Total</b>	<u>3,180</u>	<u>3,270</u>	
<b>Total inventory</b>	<u>\$4,930</u>	<u>\$4,962</u>	<u>\$4,740</u>

**EXERCISE 6-10**

	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Market</u>	<u>Lower -of-Cost- or-Market:</u>
<b>Cameras</b>	\$ 6,500	\$ 7,100	\$ 6,500
<b>DVD players</b>	11,250	10,050	10,050
<b>Ipods</b>	<u>10,000</u>	<u>9,750</u>	<u>9,750</u>
<b>Total inventory</b>	<u>\$27,750</u>	<u>\$26,900</u>	<u>\$26,300</u>

**EXERCISE 6-11**

	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
<b>Beginning inventory</b> .....	\$ 20,000	\$ 27,000
<b>Cost of goods purchased</b> .....	<u>150,000</u>	<u>175,000</u>
<b>Cost of goods available for sale</b> .....	170,000	202,000
<b>Corrected ending inventory</b> .....	<u>27,000<sup>a</sup></u>	<u>41,000<sup>b</sup></u>
<b>Cost of goods sold</b> .....	<u>\$143,000</u>	<u>\$161,000</u>

<sup>a</sup>\$30,000 – \$3,000 = \$27,000.

<sup>b</sup>\$35,000 + \$6,000 = \$41,000.

**EXERCISE 6-14**

(a)	<u>Alpha Company</u>	<u>Omega Company</u>
<b>Inventory Turnover</b>	\$190,000	\$292,000
	( <u>\$45,000 + \$55,000</u> )/2	( <u>\$71,000 + \$69,000</u> )/2
	= <u>3.80</u>	= <u>4.17</u>

Days in Inventory

$$365/3.80 = \underline{96 \text{ days}}$$

$$365/4.17 = \underline{88 \text{ days}}$$

- (b) Omega Company is moving its inventory more quickly, since its inventory turnover is higher, and its days in inventory is lower.

<b>PROBLEM 6-1A</b>
---------------------

- (a) The sale will be recorded on February 26. The goods (cost, \$800) should be excluded from Austin's February 28 inventory.
- (b) Austin owns the goods once they are shipped on February 26. Include inventory of \$480.
- (c) Include \$650 in inventory.
- (d) Exclude the items from Austin's inventory. Title remains with the consignor.
- (e) Title of the goods does not transfer to Austin until March 2. Exclude this amount from the February 28 inventory.
- (f) Title to the goods does not transfer to the customer until March 2. The \$200 cost should be included in ending inventory.

**PROBLEM 6-2A**

**(a) COST OF GOODS AVAILABLE FOR SALE**

Date	Explanation	Units	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Oct. 1	Beginning Inventory	2,000	\$7	\$ 14,000
3	Purchase	2,500	8	20,000
9	Purchase	3,500	9	31,500
19	Purchase	3,000	10	30,000
25	Purchase	4,000	11	44,000
	<b>Total</b>	<b>15,000</b>		<b>\$139,500</b>

**(b) FIFO**

(1) Ending Inventory			(2) Cost of Goods Sold		
Date	Units	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Cost of goods available for sale	
Oct. 25	4,000	\$11	\$44,000	\$139,500	
19	100	10	1,000	Less: Ending inventory	45,000
	<u>4,100*</u>		<u>\$45,000</u>	Cost of goods sold	<u>\$ 94,500</u>

\*15,000 – 10,900 = 4,100

**Proof of Cost of Goods Sold**

Date	Units	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Oct. 1	2,000	\$7	\$14,000
3	2,500	8	20,000
9	3,500	9	31,500
19	2,900	10	29,000
	<u>10,900</u>		<u>\$94,500</u>

**LIFO**

(1) Ending Inventory			(2) Cost of Goods Sold		
Date	Units	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Cost of goods available for sale	
Oct. 1	2,000	\$7	\$14,000	\$139,500	
3	2,100	8	16,800	Less: Ending inventory	30,800
	<u>4,100</u>		<u>\$30,800</u>	Cost of goods sold	<u>\$108,700</u>

**PROBLEM 6-2A (Continued)**

**Proof of Cost of Goods Sold**

<u>Date</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Unit Cost</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>
Oct. 25	4,000	\$11	\$ 44,000
19	3,000	10	30,000
9	3,500	9	31,500
3	<u>400</u>	8	<u>3,200</u>
	<u>10,900</u>		<u>\$108,700</u>

**AVERAGE COST**

<b>(1) Ending Inventory</b>			<b>(2) Cost of Goods Sold</b>	
$\$139,500 \div 15,000 = \underline{\$9.30}$			Cost of goods available for sale	\$139,500
<u>Units</u>	<u>Unit Cost</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>	Less: Ending inventory	<u>38,130</u>
<u>4,100</u>	<u>\$9.30</u>	<u>\$38,130</u>	Cost of goods sold	<u>\$101,370</u>

- (c) (1) FIFO results in the highest inventory amount for the balance sheet, \$45,000.
- (2) LIFO results in the highest cost of goods sold, \$108,700.

**PROBLEM 6-3A**

**(a) COST OF GOODS AVAILABLE FOR SALE**

<u>Date</u>	<u>Explanation</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Unit Cost</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>
1/1	Beginning Inventory	150	\$20	\$ 3,000
3/15	Purchase	400	23	9,200
7/20	Purchase	250	24	6,000
9/4	Purchase	350	26	9,100
12/2	Purchase	100	29	2,900
	<b>Total</b>	<u>1,250</u>		<u>\$30,200</u>

**(b) FIFO**

<u>(1) Ending Inventory</u>				<u>(2) Cost of Goods Sold</u>	
<u>Date</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Unit Cost</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>		
12/2	100	\$29	\$2,900	Cost of goods available for sale	\$30,200
9/4	150	26	3,900	Less: Ending inventory	6,800
	<u>250</u>		<u>\$6,800</u>	Cost of goods sold	<u>\$23,400</u>

**Proof of Cost of Goods Sold**

<u>Date</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Unit Cost</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>
1/1	150	\$20	\$ 3,000
3/15	400	23	9,200
7/20	250	24	6,000
9/4	200	26	5,200
	<u>1,000</u>		<u>\$23,400</u>

**LIFO**

<u>(1) Ending Inventory</u>				<u>(2) Cost of Goods Sold</u>	
<u>Date</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Unit Cost</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>		
1/1	150	\$20	\$3,000	Cost of goods available for sale	\$30,200
3/15	100	23	2,300	Less: Ending inventory	5,300
	<u>250</u>		<u>\$5,300</u>	Cost of goods sold	<u>\$24,900</u>

**PROBLEM 6-3A (Continued)**

**Proof of Cost of Goods Sold**

<u>Date</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Unit Cost</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>
12/2	100	\$29	\$ 2,900
9/4	350	26	9,100
7/20	250	24	6,000
3/15	300	23	6,900
	<u>1,000</u>		<u>\$24,900</u>

**AVERAGE COST**

<b>(1) Ending Inventory</b>			<b>(2) Cost of Goods Sold</b>	
$\$30,200 \div 1,250 = \underline{\$24.16}$			Cost of goods available for sale	\$30,200
<u>Units</u>	<u>Unit Cost</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>	Less: Ending inventory	<u>6,040</u>
<u>250</u>	<u>\$24.16</u>	<u>\$6,040</u>	Cost of goods sold	<u>\$24,160</u>

**Proof of Cost of Goods Sold**

$1,000 \text{ units} \times \$24.16 = \$24,160$

- (c) (1) FIFO results in the highest inventory amount, \$6,800, as shown in (b) above.
- (2) LIFO produces the highest cost of goods sold, \$24,900 as shown in (b) above.

**PROBLEM 6-4A**

(a)

**Felipe INC.  
Condensed Income Statements  
For the Year Ended December 31, 2014**

	FIFO	LIFO
Sales revenue .....	<u>\$747,000</u>	<u>\$747,000</u>
Cost of goods sold		
Beginning inventory .....	14,000	14,000
Cost of goods purchased .....	<u>466,000</u>	<u>466,000</u>
Cost of goods available for sale .....	480,000	480,000
Ending inventory .....	<u>45,900<sup>a</sup></u>	<u>36,000<sup>b</sup></u>
Cost of goods sold .....	<u>434,100</u>	<u>444,000</u>
Gross profit .....	312,900	303,000
Operating expenses .....	<u>130,000</u>	<u>130,000</u>
Income before income taxes .....	182,900	173,000
Income tax expense (40%) .....	<u>73,160</u>	<u>69,200</u>
Net income .....	<u>\$109,740</u>	<u>\$103,800</u>

<sup>a</sup>17,000 X \$2.70 = \$45,900.

<sup>b</sup>\$14,000 + (10,000 X \$2.20) = \$36,000.

- (b) (1) The FIFO method produces the most meaningful inventory amount for the balance sheet because the units are costed at the most recent purchase prices.
- (2) The LIFO method produces the most meaningful net income because the cost of the most recent purchases are matched against sales.
- (3) The FIFO method is most likely to approximate actual physical flow because the oldest goods are usually sold first to minimize spoilage and obsolescence.
- (4) There will be \$3,960 additional cash available under LIFO because income taxes are \$69,200 under LIFO and \$73,160 under FIFO.
- (5) Gross profit under the average cost method will be: (a) lower than FIFO and (b) higher than LIFO.

**PROBLEM 6-5A**

**(a) Cost of Goods Available for Sale**

<u>Date</u>	<u>Explanation</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Unit Cost</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>
June 1	Beginning Inventory	40	\$40	\$ 1,600
June 4	Purchase	135	44	5,940
June 18	Purchase	55	46	2,530
June 18	Purchase return	(10)	46	(460)
June 28	Purchase	30	50	1,500
	<b>Total</b>	<b><u>250</u></b>		<b><u>\$11,110</u></b>

**Ending Inventory in Units:**

Units available for sale	250
Sales (110 – 15 + 65)	<u>160</u>
Units remaining in ending inventory	<u>90</u>

**Sales Revenue**

<u>Date</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Unit Price</u>	<u>Total Sales</u>
June 10	110	\$70	\$ 7,700
11	(15)	70	(1,050)
25	65	75	4,875
	<b><u>160</u></b>		<b><u>\$11,525</u></b>

**(1) LIFO**

**(i) Ending Inventory**

June 1	40 @ \$40	\$1,600
4	<u>50 @ 44</u>	<u>2,200</u>
	<u>90</u>	<u>\$3,800</u>

**(ii) Cost of Goods Sold**

Cost of goods available for sale	\$11,110
Less: Ending inventory	<u>3,800</u>
Cost of goods sold	<u>\$ 7,310</u>

**(iii) Gross Profit**

Sales revenue	\$11,525
Cost of goods sold	<u>7,310</u>
Gross profit	<u>\$ 4,215</u>

**(iv) Gross Profit Rate**

<u>Gross profit</u>	\$ 4,215	= 36.6%
<u>Net sales</u>	\$11,525	

**PROBLEM 6-5A (Continued)**

**(2) FIFO**

**(i) Ending Inventory**

June 28	30 @ \$50	\$1,500
18	45 @ \$46	2,070
4	15 @ \$44	660
	<u>90</u>	<u>\$4,230</u>

**(ii) Cost of Goods Sold**

Cost of goods available for sale	\$11,110
Less: Ending inventory	<u>4,230</u>
Cost of goods sold	<u>\$ 6,880</u>

**(iii) Gross Profit**

Sales revenue	\$11,525
Cost of goods sold	<u>6,880</u>
Gross profit	<u>\$ 4,645</u>

**(iv) Gross Profit Rate**

Gross profit	\$ 4,645	= 40.3%
Net sales	\$11,525	

**(3) Average-Cost**

Weighted-average cost per unit:

<u>Cost of goods available for sale</u>	= \$44.44
Units available for sale	
$\frac{\$11,110}{250}$	

**(i) Ending Inventory**

90 units @ \$44.44	<u>3,999.60</u>
--------------------	-----------------

**(ii) Cost of Goods Sold**

Cost of goods available for sale	\$11,110.00
Less: Ending inventory	<u>3,999.60</u>
Cost of goods sold	<u>\$ 7,110.40</u>

**(iii) Gross Profit**

Sales revenue	\$11,525.00
Cost of goods sold	<u>7,110.40</u>
Gross profit	<u>\$ 4,414.60</u>

**(iv) Gross Profit Rate**

Gross profit	\$ 4,414.60	= 38.3%
Net sales	\$11,525.00	

**(b) In this period of rising prices, LIFO gives the highest cost of goods sold and the lowest gross profit. FIFO gives the lowest cost of goods sold and the highest gross profit.**

**PROBLEM 6-6A**

(a)

**BARTON INC.**  
**Income Statement (partial)**  
**For the Year Ended December 31, 2014**

	<u>Specific Identification</u>	<u>FIFO</u>	<u>LIFO</u>
Sales revenue <sup>a</sup>	<u>\$8,915</u>	<u>\$8,915</u>	<u>\$8,915</u>
Beginning inventory	1,200	1,200	1,200
Purchases <sup>b</sup>	<u>6,505</u>	<u>6,505</u>	<u>6,505</u>
Cost of goods available for sale	7,705	7,705	7,705
Ending inventory <sup>c</sup>	<u>2,505</u>	<u>2,720</u>	<u>2,175</u>
Cost of goods sold	<u>5,200</u>	<u>4,985</u>	<u>5,530</u>
Gross profit	<u>\$3,715</u>	<u>\$3,930</u>	<u>\$3,385</u>

<sup>(a)</sup>(2,300 @ \$1.05) + (5,200 @ \$1.25)

<sup>(b)</sup>(2,500 @ \$ .65) + (4,000 @ \$.72) + (2,500 @ \$.80)

<sup>(c)</sup>Specific identification ending inventory consists of:

Beginning inventory (2,000 liters – 1,000 – 450)	550 @ \$.60	\$ 330.00
March 3 purchase (2,500 liters – 1,300 – 550)	650 @ \$.65	422.50
March 10 purchase (4,000 liters – 2,900)	1,100 @ \$.72	792.00
March 20 purchase (2,500 liters – 1,300)	<u>1,200 @ \$.80</u>	<u>960.00</u>
	<u>3,500 liters</u>	<u>\$2,504.50</u>

FIFO ending inventory consists of:

March 20 purchase	2,500 @ \$.80	\$2,000
March 10 purchase	<u>1,000 @ \$.72</u>	<u>720</u>
	<u>3,500 liters</u>	<u>\$2,720</u>

LIFO ending inventory consists of:

Beginning inventory	2,000 @ \$.60	\$1,200
March 3 purchase	<u>1,500 @ \$.65</u>	<u>975</u>
	<u>3,500 liters</u>	<u>\$2,175</u>

(b) Companies can choose a cost flow method that produces the highest possible cost of goods sold and lowest gross profit to justify price increases. In this example, LIFO produces the lowest gross profit and best support to increase selling prices.

**PROBLEM 6-7A**

(a)

**Sherlynn CO.  
Condensed Income Statement  
For the Year Ended December 31, 2014**

	<u>FIFO</u>	<u>LIFO</u>
Sales revenue .....	<u>\$700,000</u>	<u>\$700,000</u>
Cost of goods sold		
Beginning inventory .....	45,000	45,000
Cost of goods purchased.....	<u>532,000</u>	<u>532,000</u>
Cost of goods available for sale .....	<u>577,000</u>	<u>577,000</u>
Ending inventory .....	<u>168,000<sup>a</sup></u>	<u>147,000<sup>b</sup></u>
Cost of goods sold .....	<u>409,000</u>	<u>430,000</u>
Gross profit .....	291,000	270,000
Operating expenses.....	<u>140,000</u>	<u>140,000</u>
Income before income taxes .....	151,000	130,000
Income tax expense (30%).....	<u>45,300</u>	<u>39,000</u>
Net income.....	<u>\$105,700</u>	<u>\$ 91,000</u>

<sup>a</sup>(30,000 @ \$5.60) = \$168,000.

<sup>b</sup>(10,000 @ \$4.50) + (20,000 @ \$5.10) = \$147,000.

(b) Answers to questions:

- (1) The FIFO method produces the most meaningful inventory amount for the balance sheet because the units are costed at the most recent purchase prices.
- (2) The LIFO method produces the most meaningful net income because the costs of the most recent purchases are matched against sales.
- (3) The FIFO method is most likely to approximate actual physical flow because the oldest goods are usually sold first to minimize spoilage and obsolescence.
- (4) There will be \$6,300 additional cash available under LIFO because income taxes are \$39,000 under LIFO and \$45,300 under FIFO.
- (5) The illusory gross profit is \$21,000 or (\$291,000 – \$270,000). Under LIFO, Sherlynn Co. has recovered the current replacement cost of the units (\$430,000), whereas under FIFO, it has only recovered the earlier costs (\$409,000). This means that, under FIFO, the company must reinvest at least \$21,000 of the gross profit to replace the units used.