

SS-8 Determination—Determination for Public Inspection

Occupation

03TRA.189 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 concrete worker. The firm is a concrete company and responded to our request for information as follows:

The firm operates as a concrete contractor. The firm trained the worker on how to grade concrete. He received his assignments from the firm. Services were personally performed at the firm's customer locations. The firm provided what the worker needed. The worker incurred no expenses. The worker was paid on a piecework basis and customers paid the firm directly. The worker did not receive any benefits. Either party could have terminated without liability. The worker stated the following on his SS-8 request:

The worker helped out where needed doing concrete work. He was taught by the firm. The firm told him what to do each day. The firm determined his methods and he reported to firm with problems. No reports were required. The worker personally performed his services at the firm's customer locations. The firm provided everything the worker needed. The worker incurred no expenses. The worker received an hourly rate and customers paid the firm. 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 would be 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 firm stated that the worker was trained by the firm on how to grade concrete.

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 is a concrete business and the worker was a concrete worker representing the firm.

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. Also, if the firm has the right to control the equipment, it is unlikely the worker had an investment in facilities. There was no evidence submitted that the worker was performing any services of an independent nature.

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. The worker performed his services under the firm's instruction, 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