

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

Occupation

02OFF Intern

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 January 2017 to August 2017 as an intern. The work done by the worker included working in the firm's main office to assist in phone calls to interpreters and working with the firm's interpreting scheduling system and spreadsheets. The firm issued the worker Form 1099-MISC for the year in question. The worker filed Form SS-8 as she believes she erroneously received Form 1099-MISC. The worker believes she was an employee as she received on-the-job training and performed services under the firm's business name when communicating with others.

The firm is a linguistics services agency.

The firm stated it does not provide formal training to workers. It provides work assignments and assumes responsibility for problem resolution; however, workers determine the methods by which assignments are performed, set their own work schedule, and select the projects worked on. Services performed, such as filing, updating records, printing proposals, data entry, etc., are not integral to the firm's business. Services are performed at the firm's premises. The firm requires workers to personally perform services. The firm is responsible for hiring and paying additional personnel. The worker stated she received on-the-job training related to telephone calls, use of the firm's spreadsheets and scheduling system, and creating/sending emails under the firm's email address. The firm's management, including other interns with higher experience, determined the methods by which assignments were performed. The worker's daily routine consisted of clocking in/out, to include lunch breaks, logging hours into a spreadsheet, and other duties as assigned.

The firm stated it provides limited office equipment. Workers do not lease equipment or space and they do not incur expenses in the performance of services for the firm. Customers pay the firm. The firm pays workers an hourly rate of pay. The worker stated she did not incur economic loss or financial risk in connection with this work relationship. The firm established the level of payment for the services provided.

The firm stated work relationships can be terminated without penalty. It is unknown if workers advertise. Worker agree to the terms of the firm's mutual non-disclosure agreement. The firm represents workers as contractors to its customers. The worker stated she did not perform similar services for others or advertise. The firm represented her as an intern/employee to its customers. Services were performed under the firm's business name.

---

## 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 he or she has 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, coadventurer, agent, or independent contractor must be disregarded.

Therefore, a statement that a worker is an independent contractor pursuant to a written or verbal 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.

If the services must be rendered personally, presumably the person or persons for whom the services are performed are interested in the methods used to accomplish the work as well as in the results. In this case, the firm required the worker to personally perform services. Furthermore, the services performed by the worker were integral to the administrative support of the firm's business operation. The firm provided work assignments 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 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. 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 hourly 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 firm'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 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.

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