

# SS-8 Determination—Determination for Public Inspection

Occupation

03TRA.184 Tradesperson

Determination:

Employee

Contractor

UILC

Third Party Communication:

None

Yes

## Facts of Case

The worker requested a determination of employment status for services performed for the firm as a mason. The firm is a masonry company and responded to our request for information. The firm provided the following information:

The firm stated the worker has always been an independent contractor. He was paid per job, by the square foot, for his masonry work. The worker was contracted by the job. He put in bids for each job and the price was agreed between the parties. He worked on his own terms and own time. The firm had no control. No reports were required. The worker performed his services at various job sites. The firm provided supplies and the worker provided tools, equipment and labor. Customers paid the firm. He received no benefits. 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.

Therefore, 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. 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 job assignments from the firm. He was experienced and did not need training.

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.

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. There was no evidence submitted to show the worker was operating his own business performing these services for the public. The worker performed his services 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](http://www.irs.gov) Publication 4341