

# SS-8 Determination—Determination for Public Inspection

Occupation 02OFF.215 AdministrativeAssist	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 firm is a law practice. The worker was engaged to provide administrative services. She received a Form 1099-MISC for her services in 2013, 2014, and 2015. There was no written agreement.

The worker indicated that she was told how to organize the client files, how to file documents with the courts and how to schedule meetings. She received her assignments verbally from the firm's office manager/legal assistant or the firm's owner. Both parties noted that the firm determined the methods by which the assignments were performed and that the firm would be contacted if any problems or issues arose. There were no required reports. The worker worked set scheduled hours, even if convenient to her, performing administrative tasks assigned by her supervisor; the firm noted that her work schedule was negotiated. Only the worker mentioned that there were occasional meetings to attend. The firm noted that the worker was required to provide the services personally.

Both the firm and the worker agreed that the firm provided the desk, computer and supplies. Both parties also agreed that the worker was paid an hourly rate and had no other economic risk. The customer paid the firm. The firm established the level of payment for services.

Both the firm and the worker agreed that there were no benefits and that either party could terminate the relationship without incurring a liability. The worker did not perform similar services for others. The relationship ended when the worker quit.

---

## Analysis

---

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. The relationship of the worker and the business must be examined. 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 should be considered. 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.

Factors that illustrate whether there is a right to control how a worker performs a task include training and instructions. 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. The firm provided the worker with instructions and her assigned duties. She performed her services according to the firm's scheduled work hours and days even if based on her availability and were convenient to her. 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. In addition, the worker provided her services on a continuous basis throughout the time period involved even if on a part-time basis. 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.

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. The firm provided the office, workspace, furnishings, equipment, and supplies. The worker simply received an hourly rate of pay and had no other economic risk. 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.

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. There were no benefits and there was no written agreement. The worker was engaged as an administrative assistant for the firm's law office. This was not an indication that she was involved in an independent business venture. Instead, her services were part of the necessary activities of the firm's office operations. 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.

The firm indicated that the worker agreed to the independent contractor status. However, in *Bartels v. Birmingham*, 332 U.S. 126, 1947-2 C. B.174, the Supreme Court stated that whether there is an employment relationship is a question of fact and not subject to negotiation between the parties.

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.

Please see Publication 4341 for guidance and instructions for firm compliance.