

## SS-8 Determination—Determination for Public Inspection

Occupation

02COO Coordinators

Determination:

☒ Employee

☐ Contractor

UILC

Third Party Communication:

☒ None

☐ Yes

I have read Notice 441 and am requesting:

☐ Additional redactions based on categories listed in section entitled "Deletions We May Have Made to Your Original Determination Letter"

☐ Delay based on an on-going transaction

☐ 90 day delay

**For IRS Use Only:**

### Facts of Case

The worker submitted a request for a determination of worker status in regard to services performed for the firm, from June 2018 to February 2019, as a marketing coordinator. The firm issued the worker Form 1099-MISC for the years in question. The worker filed Form SS-8 as he believes he received Form 1099-MISC in error.

The firm's response states its business specializes in after-school programs for young people. The firm stated that the worker performed services as marketing coordinator. The worker was classified as an independent contractor. There was a written agreement between the two parties.

The firm did not provide specific initial training or instruction to the worker. Work assignments were provided to the worker from the firm. The firm determined the methods by which assignments were performed. The firm was responsible for problem or complaint resolution. The worker's schedule was 8:00 am to 5:00 pm (M-F) at the firm's premise. The firm was responsible for the hiring of substitutes or helpers. The parties disagree on if reports were needed and if services were required to be performed personally.

The firm provided all supplies, equipment, material, and property. The worker did not lease equipment, space, or a facility. The worker did not incur any expenses in the performance of services for the firm. The firm paid the worker a salary; a drawing account for advances was not allowed. The firm did not carry workers compensation insurance on the worker. The firm established the level of payment for the services provided and customers paid the firm.

The work relationship could be terminated without liability or penalty. The worker did not perform similar services for others; the firm's approval was not required for him to do so. The firm represented the worker as its media coordinator to its customers. The worker ended the work relationship. The parties disagree on if benefits were made available to the worker.

---

## Analysis

---

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 they have the right to do so.

Section 31.3121(d)-1(a)(3) of the regulations provides that if the relationship of an employer and employee exists, the designation or description of the parties as anything other than that of employer and employee is immaterial. Thus, if an employer-employee relationship exists, any contractual designation of the employee as a partner, co-adventurer, agent, or independent contractor must be disregarded. Furthermore, whether there is an employment relationship is a question of fact and not subject to negotiation between the parties.

Therefore, the payer's statement that the worker was an independent contractor 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.

Training a worker is characterized 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. The training of a worker 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. In this case, The firm ultimately determined the methods by which assignments were performed and assumed responsibility for problem resolution. These facts evidence the firm retained the right to direct and control the worker to the extent necessary to ensure satisfactory job performance in a manner acceptable to the firm. Based on the worker's education, past work experience, and work ethic the firm may not have needed to frequently exercise its right to direct and control the worker; however, the facts evidence the firm retained the right to do so if needed.

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 payer 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 payer 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. In this case, the worker did not invest capital or assume business risks. The term "significant investment" does not include tools, instruments, and clothing commonly provided by employees in their trade; nor does it include education, experience, or training. Based on the rate of pay arrangement the worker could not realize a profit or incur a loss.

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 the payer's business. Both parties retained the right to terminate the work relationship at any time without incurring a liability. There is no evidence to suggest the worker performed similar services for others as an independent contractor or advertised business services to the general public during the term of this work relationship. The classification of a worker as an independent contractor should not be based primarily on the fact that a worker's services may be used on a temporary, part-time, or as-needed basis. As noted above, common law factors are considered when examining the worker classification issue.

Based on the above analysis, we conclude that the payer 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.

The payer can obtain additional information related to worker classification online at [www.irs.gov](http://www.irs.gov); Publication 4341.