

SS-8 Determination—Determination for Public Inspection

Occupation

05PRW.7 PublicRelationsWkr

Determination:

☒ Employee☐ Contractor

UILC

Third Party Communication:

☒ None☐ Yes**Facts of Case**

Information provided indicates the firm operates under the trade name [REDACTED] and provides online advertising for businesses in the ski industry. The worker had been retained by the firm for tax years 2011 through 2012 to perform sales and set up the firm's CRM system, and collection services and any and all additional tasks assigned by the firm (per the contract). An independent contract agreement was signed by both parties for tax year 2010, the term of this contract was for one year (item 16 of contract).

The firm indicated the worker was given minimal instruction on what needed to be performed. A training manual is reviewed with the "contractor" to provide an understanding of their industry and the firm's proprietary web software. The firm stated she would have contacted the owner if there were any issues, however she was to resolve herself. The firm stated she set her own hours, she prospected and solicited potential advertisers/and clients over the phone. The firm stated services were performed on firm premises, utilizing their computer, phone (she had the option to use her own phone and computer. The worker is paid bi-weekly on a commission basis. The worker is allowed cash advances. The customer paid the firm. No additional benefits are provided. Either party can terminate the work relationship without incurring a penalty or liability. She is referred to as the firm's representative. The firm stated the worker terminated the work relationship.

The worker indicated she was trained by the owner as to company protocols and procedures. Ongoing training was given as policies changed. She stated no new contracts were signed for 2011 or 2012. Assignments were given by the owner on a daily basis. She indicated the owner was responsible for resolution of any issues. The owner would pull reports from phone lines to track the number of call made per day. She was required to make a minimum number of calls each day. He also assigned territories to work as well as which businesses to contact. She indicated she was required to be in the office during business hours Monday through Friday. She generally opened and closed the office. Other employees would call her if they were not coming in. She was required to call or e-mail the owner if she was not going to be in. Daily meetings were held with the owner. She was required to perform her services personally. The worker stated she was given a salary. The customer paid the firm. She indicated she was given paid vacations and personal days. Either party could terminate the work relationship without incurring a penalty or liability. She was represented as an employee of the company. She agreed she resigned.

The question of whether an individual is an independent contractor or an employee is one that is determined through consideration of the facts of a particular case along with the application of law and regulations for worker classification issues, known as "common law." Common law flows chiefly from court decisions and is a major part of the justice system of the United States. Under the common law, the treatment of a worker as an independent contractor or an employee originates from the legal definitions developed in the law and it depends on the payer's right to direct and control the worker in the performance of his or her duties. Section 3121(d)(2) of the Code provides that the term "employee" means any individual defined as an employee by using the usual common law rules.

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.

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. We must examine the relationship of the worker and the business. We consider 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. The degree of importance of each factor varies depending on the occupation and the context in which the services are performed.

Therefore, your 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.

ANALYSIS

-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

Analysis

beginning of the relationship. See, for example, Rev. Rul. 68-598, 1968-2 C.B. 464, and RRev. Rul. 66-381, 1966-2 C.B. 449.

-Training a worker 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, 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. See Rev. Rul. 70-630, 1970-2 C.B. 229.

-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.

-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.

-The establishment of set hours of work by the person or persons for whom the services are performed is a factor indicating control. If the nature of the occupation makes fixed hours impractical, a requirement that workers be on the job at certain times is an element of control. See Rev. Rul. 73-591, 1973-2 C.B. 337.

-The term "full-time" may vary with the intent of the parties and the nature of the occupation since it does not necessarily mean working an eight hour day or a five or six day week. If the worker must devote substantially full-time to the business of the person or persons for whom the services are performed, such person or persons have control over the amount of time the worker spends working and, therefore, the worker is restricted from doing other gainful work. An independent contractor, on the other hand, is free to work when and for whom he or she chooses. See Rev. Rul. 56-694, 1956-2 C.B. 694.

-If the work is performed on the premises of the person or persons for whom the services are performed, that factor suggests control over the worker, especially if the work could be done elsewhere. See Rev. Rul. 56-660, 1956-2 C.B. 693.

-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. See Rev. Rul. 74-389, 1974-2 C.B. 330.

-The fact that the person or persons for whom the services are performed furnish significant tools, materials, and other equipment tends to show the existence of an employer-employee relationship. 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.

We have applied the above law to the information submitted. 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.

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 financial investment.

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.

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 your business. Both parties retained the right to terminate the work relationship at any time without incurring a liability.

CONCLUSION

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.