

SS-8 Determination—Determination for Public Inspection

Occupation 03TRA.170 Tradesperson	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 requested a determination of employment status or services performed for the firm in 2014 and 2015 as a master carpenter. The firm responded to our request for information as follows:

The firm is in the business of house renovations. The worker was engaged as a contract remodeler. He was responsible to complete jobs, interior trim, tile, flooring, install cabinetry, and all handyman things. The firm believes the worker was treating correctly as an independent contractor because he was assigned a job to complete, had to provide his own tools to complete the job, no supervision was provided and he was paid per job. There was no written agreement. The worker did not receive any training. He was contacted by phone and he would decide whether or not to accept the assignment. He determined his own methods. If problems occurred he would contact the owners of the firm for resolution. He requested payment by invoices show the percentage of the work completed. The worker performed his services at the firm's customer locations. The firm provided the material to perform the work. The worker provided equipment and tools. The firm reimbursed the worker for any materials purchased. The worker was paid per job and customers paid the firm directly. Either party could have terminated without liability.

Analysis

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.

A 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.

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 business interests. 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. The worker received his assignments from the firm and reported to the firm when problems occurred. The worker was experienced and did not need training.

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.

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. Lack of significant investment by a person in facilities or equipment used in performing services for another indicates dependence on the employer and, accordingly, the existence of an employer-employee relationship. 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. The firm provided the materials. The worker had no investment in the business and was paid per invoice which appears to be a weekly amount of \$900 paid biweekly.

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. The worker had no investment in the firm's business and could not suffer a loss. He acted as a representative of the firm to the firm's customers.

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.

Firm: For further information please go to www.irs.gov Publication 4341