

SS-8 Determination—Determination for Public Inspection

Occupation

06MPX Dental Hygienist

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 firm is a dental office. The worker was engaged to perform services as a dental hygienist. The worker answered the firm's help wanted advertising for a temporary hygienist to fill in for the firm's regular hygienist. The firm treated the worker status as independent contractor, and issued to the worker a Form 1099-MISC at year-end to report the monies received for her services as non-employee compensation.

The firm provided the worker with instructions on what services were to be performed on the patients assigned to her. The firm determined the work methods by which to perform the services. The worker was required to report problems and complaints to the firm for resolution purposes. The firm required the worker to perform her services personally at its location, following the firm's business hours. The firm required the worker to report any findings that may have indicated the presence of dental disease.

The firm provided the worker with the facilities, equipment, tools, and supplies needed to perform her services. The worker did not incur expenses. The firm paid the worker on an hourly wage basis for her services. Patients made payment to the firm for services rendered. The worker did not incur economic loss or financial risks related to the services she performed for the firm.

The firm covered the worker under workers' compensation insurance. Employment benefits were not made available to the worker. There was no information provided to evidence that the worker advertised as being available to perform similar services for others while she was engaged by the firm. The work relationship could have been terminated by either party at any time without incurring liabilities.

Analysis

The facts provided for this case do not evidence the worker's behavioral control of the work relationship. The worker followed the firm's instructions, work methods, schedule, and routine in the performance of her services. The worker's services were performed personally, at the firm's location. The worker used the firm's facilities, equipment, tools, and supplies. She represented the firm's business operations in the performance of her services. As a result, the firm retained the right to direct and control the worker to the extent necessary to protect its investment, and the reputation of its business operations.

The facts provided for this case do not evidence the worker's financial control of the work relationship. The worker's remuneration was established by the firm. The worker had no opportunity for profit or loss as a result of the services performed for the firm. "Profit or loss" implies the use of capital by a person in an independent business of his or her own. The worker did not have a significant investment in the facilities, equipment, tools, or supplies used to perform her services for the firm. 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. Also, if the firm has the right to control the equipment, it is unlikely the worker had an investment in facilities.

The worker performed services as requested by the firm, and both parties retained the right to terminate the work relationship at any time without incurring liabilities. The facts provided for this case do not evidence that the worker was engaged in an independent enterprise, but rather show that she performed her services as a necessary and integral part of the firm's business 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.

Based on common law principles, the worker shall be found to be an employee for Federal employment tax purposes. For correction assistance, you may refer to Publication 4341, which can be obtained at www.irs.gov