

**SS-8 Determination—Determination for Public Inspection**

Occupation 02ABT.27 Accounting/TxPrepWkr	Determination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor
UILC	Third Party Communication: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Yes

**Facts of Case**

Information provided indicated the firm is a car dealership. The worker performed services as a bookkeeper for the firm for tax years 2014 through 2016. The firm reported the income on Form 1099-MISC. The firm stated the worker performed services at first on a part time basis, and then eventually moved to a more full time position. The firm felt she was an independent contractor as she was free to set her own hours, but generally worked 40 hours and could work from home. They stated they were never sure if she was considered an employee or a subcontractor once she moved into more hours. They indicated they had moved her to an employee position (this must have been in 2016 as it is not reflected for 2015). The firm stated no training was given. She received work assignments verbally from management. She determined, with CPA support, how to perform the work assignments. She was required to perform her services personally. The firm indicated they provided the software, office space and supplies. The worker was paid by the hour. The customer paid the firm. No additional benefits were provided. The firm indicated the worker quit.

The worker has indicated she was provided with all training, as she knew nothing about car business when she started working there. She agreed work assignments were received from management. She contacted the owners if there were issues that needed resolution. She provided end of the month reports via the firm's software program. She indicated all work was performed at the firm's office locations (██████████). Meetings were attended when asked. The firm hired and paid all workers. The firm provided all equipment and space. She agreed she was paid by the hour and the customer paid the firm. She indicated ██████████ and paid holidays were provided. Either party could terminate the work relationship without incurring a penalty or liability. She stated she was represented as an employee. The worker indicated she was fired.

The question of whether an individual is an independent contractor or an employee is one that is determined through consideration of the facts of a particular case along with the application of law and regulations for worker classification issues, known as "common law." Common law flows chiefly from court decisions and is a major part of the justice system of the United States. Under the common law, the treatment of a worker as an independent contractor or an employee originates from the legal definitions developed in the law and it depends on the payer's right to direct and control the worker in the performance of his or her duties. Section 3121(d)(2) of the Code provides that the term "employee" means any individual defined as an employee by using the usual common law rules.

Generally, the relationship of employer and employee exists when the person for whom the services are performed has the right to control and direct the individual who performs the services, not only as to what is to be done, but also how it is to be done. It is not necessary that the employer actually direct or control the individual, it is sufficient if he or she has the right to do so.

In determining whether an individual is an employee or an independent contractor under the common law, all evidence of both control and lack of control or independence must be considered. We must examine the relationship of the worker and the business. We consider facts that show a right to direct or control how the worker performs the specific tasks for which he or she is hired, who controls the financial aspects of the worker's activities, and how the parties perceive their relationship. The degree of importance of each factor varies depending on the occupation and the context in which the services are performed.

Therefore, your statement that the worker was an independent contractor pursuant to an agreement is without merit. For federal employment tax purposes, it is the actual working relationship that is controlling and not the terms of the contract (oral or written) between the parties.

**ANALYSIS**

A worker who is required to comply with another person's instructions about when, where, and how he or she is to work is ordinarily an employee. This control factor is present if the person or persons for whom the services are performed have the right to require compliance with instructions. Some employees may work without receiving instructions because they are highly proficient and conscientious workers or because the duties are so simple or familiar to them. Furthermore, the instructions, that show how to reach the desired results, may have been oral and given only once at the beginning of the relationship.

Training a worker by requiring an experienced employee to work with the worker, by corresponding with the worker, by requiring the worker to attend meetings, or by using other methods, indicates that the person or persons for whom the services are performed want the services performed in a particular method or manner. This is true even if the training was only given once at the beginning of the work relationship.

---

## Analysis

---

Payment by the hour, week, or month generally points to an employer-employee relationship, provided that this method of payment is not just a convenient way of paying a lump sum agreed upon as the cost of a job. In such instances, the firm assumes the hazard that the services of the worker will be proportionate to the regular payments. This action warrants the assumption that, to protect its investment, the firm has the right to direct and control the performance of the workers. Also, workers are assumed to be employees if they are guaranteed a minimum salary or are given a drawing account of a specified amount that need not be repaid when it exceeds earnings.

We have applied the above law to the information submitted. As is the case in almost all worker classification cases, some facts point to an employment relationship while other facts indicate independent contractor status. The determination of the worker's status, then, rests on the weight given to the factors, keeping in mind that no one factor rules. The degree of importance of each factor varies depending on the occupation and the circumstances.

Evidence of control generally falls into three categories: behavioral control, financial control, and relationship of the parties, which are collectively referred to as the categories of evidence. In weighing the evidence, careful consideration has been given to the factors outlined below.

Factors that illustrate whether there is a right to control how a worker performs a task include training and instructions. In this case, you retained the right to change the worker's methods and to direct the worker to the extent necessary to protect your financial investment.

Factors that illustrate whether there is a right to direct and control the financial aspects of the worker's activities include significant investment, unreimbursed expenses, the methods of payment, and the opportunity for profit or loss. In this case, the worker did not invest capital or assume business risks, and therefore, did not have the opportunity to realize a profit or incur a loss as a result of the services provided.

Factors that illustrate how the parties perceive their relationship include the intent of the parties as expressed in written contracts; the provision of, or lack of employee benefits; the right of the parties to terminate the relationship; the permanency of the relationship; and whether the services performed are part of the service recipient's regular business activities. In this case, the worker was not engaged in an independent enterprise, but rather the services performed by the worker were a necessary and integral part of your business. Both parties retained the right to terminate the work relationship at any time without incurring a liability.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the above analysis, we conclude that the firm had the right to exercise direction and control over the worker to the degree necessary to establish that the worker was a common law employee, and not an independent contractor operating a trade or business. Information provided indicated all services were performed as assigned by the firm. Whether the services were performed part time or full time, if they were performed under the direction of the firm, utilizing the firm's premises and equipment, they are employees. The fact the firm had indicated they had converted the worker to employee status, to continue the same services, indicates all income paid for prior services should also have been treated as wages and reported on Form W-2 with applicable withholdings. (And should be corrected as such.)