

# SS-8 Determination—Determination for Public Inspection

Occupation 02COM.11 Communicator	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

The worker initiated the request for a determination of his work status as a dispatcher; he was responsible for taking calls from customers and road clubs, dispatching trucks/equipment to take care of customer needs in tax years 2012 through 2014. The firm's business is described as towing, transport, used car sales and trucking. The worker continues to work at the firm business.

The firm's response was signed by [REDACTED], manager. The firm's business is described as towing and transport company, providing a variety of services to private and public sector customers. The worker performed services as a dispatcher and has since come into a managerial role. The worker has since been converted to an 'employee' after a determination was made by the state [REDACTED]. The firm indicated that from June 2010 to December 2011 the worker provided services on a part-time basis – there were no changes to the job duties performed.

According to the firm, the worker was trained on the computer system and how calls were to be taken and dispatched. The assignments are determined by customer calls and are now based on the firm's needs; the firm determines the methods by which the worker performed his duties. The worker would contact the firm if he had any problems or complaints that required resolution. The worker performed his duties Monday through Friday from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. at the firm's location. The worker was not required to perform the services personally.

Both parties acknowledged that the firm provided office space, computer, printer, internet, telephone, fax, email; the worker furnished a cell phone, computer, and internet for his home office. The firm paid the worker a salary and commission. The customer paid the firm. The firm carried worker's compensation insurance coverage. The worker did not establish the level of payment for services provided.

The firm extended benefits of paid vacations, personal days, and bonuses. Either party could terminate the work relationship without incurring a liability or penalty. The worker was not performing same or similar services for others during the same time frame.

---

## 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.

A continuing relationship between the worker and the person or persons for whom the services are performed indicates that an employer-employee relationship exists. A continuing relationship may exist where work is performed in frequently recurring although irregular intervals.

If the work is performed on the premises of the person or persons for whom the services are performed, that factor suggests control over the worker, especially if the work could be done elsewhere. Work done off the premises of the person or persons receiving the services, such as at the office of the worker, indicates some freedom from control. However, this fact by itself does not mean that the worker is not an employee. The importance of this factor depends on the nature of the service involved and the extent to which an employer generally would require that employees perform such services on the employer's premises.

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.

A person who can realize a profit or suffer a loss as a result of his or her services is generally an independent contractor, while the person who cannot is an employee. "Profit or loss" implies the use of capital by a person in an independent business of his or her own. The risk that a worker will not receive payment for his or her services, however, is common to both independent contractors and employees and, thus, does not constitute a sufficient economic risk to support treatment as an independent contractor. If a worker loses payment from the firm's customer for poor work, the firm shares the risk of such loss. Control of the firm over the worker would be necessary in order to reduce the risk of financial loss to the firm. The opportunity for higher earnings or of gain or loss from a commission arrangement is not considered profit or loss.

We have considered the information provided by both parties and have applied the above law to this work relationship. In this case, the firm retained the right to change the worker's methods and to direct the worker to the extent necessary to protect its financial investment and business reputation and to ensure its customers' satisfaction and that its contractual obligations were met. The worker was not operating a separate and distinct business; 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. Integration of the worker's services into the business operations generally shows that the worker is subject to direction and control. When the success or continuation of a business depends to an appreciable degree upon the performance of certain services, the workers who perform those services must necessarily be subject to a certain amount of control by the owner of the business. 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 the firm's business.

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.