RESEARCH PAPER

Exploring the Cost Outcomes of Remote Work among IT Employees in Chennai City

Praveen Kumar P[1*], P. Vijayashree[2]
[1]Research Scholar, Department of Commerce, Vels Institute of Science, Technology and Advanced Studies (VISTAS), Pallavaram, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India – 600117
Email: praveen.prasad2508@gmail.com
[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Vels Institute of Science, Technology and Advanced Studies (VISTAS), Pallavaram, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India – 600117
Email: pvijayashree.sms@vistas.ac.in
***Corresponding Author:** Praveen Kumar P, Research Scholar, Department of Commerce, Vels Institute of Science, Technology and Advanced Studies (VISTAS), Pallavaram, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India – 600117
Email: praveen.prasad2508@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Remote work has reshaped how IT staff plan their tasks and handle work-related costs. When people work away from the office, some costs may drop. For example, commuting can be lower, fewer meals are bought outside, and daily spending may shrink. At the same time, other costs can move to the worker. Electricity use, internet charges, equipment purchases, and workspace needs may rise at home.

This paper looks at what costs change for IT workers who work remotely in Chennai City. It concentrates on how people feel about savings, what extra money they spend at home, what support employers give, and whether workers think the overall result is worth it. A descriptive and analytical approach is used.

A sample size of 130 is set for the demonstration analysis. The tables shown are only examples. They are made up and do not come from a real survey. The study example covers respondent background, changes in expenses, reliability checks, descriptive statistics, correlation, and regression.

The paper concludes that remote work should be judged by comparing money saved with money paid at home. It should not be treated as savings by default. The same reporting structure can be used later when real data has been collected.

Keywords: Remote Work, Cost Outcomes, Employee Savings, Home-Working Expenses, IT Employees, Chennai City, Financial Well-Being

How to cite this article: Praveen Kumar P, P. Vijayashree. Exploring the Cost Outcomes of Remote Work among IT Employees in Chennai City. Int J Drug Deliv Technol. 2026;16(88s):725-732. DOI: 10.25258/ijddt.16.88s.75.

Introduction

Remote work is now common in technology firms. Digital tools make it easier to handle tasks from home or other non-office places. Teams use online collaboration, cloud services, and video or chat-based communication. In many IT roles, remote or hybrid setups can work well because the work itself is often done through software systems. Even so, the change affects more than how organisations run. It also touches what employees spend and what they can afford day to day. The money effects of remote work do not follow a single direction. Some people spend less because they do not commute every day. They may also pay less for parking, meals outside, and certain work-related buys. Still, others end up paying more. Home costs can rise for electricity, home internet, mobile data, and even basic items for a safer setup like ergonomic chairs. Some workers also spend on computer extras and on keeping a workable space at home. What the final result looks like depends on a lot of details. These include how far someone travels, the way they travel, who they live with, how often they work remotely, whether the employer reimburses expenses, and what their home already has.

Chennai fits this kind of study well. The city has a large IT and IT enabled services workforce. Employees there also have different commute routines and different living situations. Travel costs

can vary a lot by public transport, two wheelers, cars, and ride type services. Utility costs can change in different ways too. For example, people who live with family might see different electricity or internet changes than those who live alone. Because of that, a solid look at the issue should include both the direct expenses and how employees judge the overall money value of working remotely.

In this paper, cost outcomes mean more than just lower costs. It covers smaller expenses, higher home working related spending, support given by the employer, and the overall sense of whether remote work helps financially. The paper does not start from the idea that remote work always saves money. Instead, it treats the final net result as something to test with data.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Remote work is usually described as a flexible setup. It can cut down commuting time and travel costs. Still, the money side may move in the other direction. When staff work from home, they may need to pay more for internet access, power use, and extra tools. Some also have to set up a place at home for work. Not everyone can handle these expenses in the same way. So, if you look only at savings from not traveling, you may exaggerate how much cheaper remote work is overall. The key issue is to sort out the main cost groups and the drivers that shape the net cost people feel among IT workers in Chennai City.

1.2 Significance of the Study

This study matters for employees, HR leaders, and people who make organisational decisions. It gives employees a clear way to sort cost categories and look at what remote and hybrid work can mean for their finances. HR leaders can see which areas might be hurting some groups more, like reimbursements, device support, or help with internet access. The organisation can use individual data to shape remote-work rules, instead of assuming any cost gains are shared by everyone. The work also adds to the debate on employee financial health and on how to keep flexible work sustainable over time.

1.3 Objectives

1. To identify the major expense categories that change when IT employees work remotely.
2. To examine perceived savings associated with remote work among IT employees in Chennai City.
3. To assess additional home-working expenses borne by employees.
4. To analyse the relationship between commuting savings, home-working costs, employer support and perceived net cost benefit.
5. To offer practical suggestions for improving the financial fairness of remote-work arrangements.

1.4 Hypotheses

$H0_1$: There is no significant relationship between commuting savings and perceived net cost benefit.

$H0_2$: There is no significant relationship between additional home-working costs and perceived net cost benefit.

$H0_3$: Employer support has no significant relationship with perceived net cost benefit.

$H0_4$: Commuting savings, additional home-working costs and employer support do not significantly predict perceived net cost benefit.

2. Review of Literature

Eurofound and the International Labour Organization (2017) analyzed work that can be done at any time and from any place. They noted possible benefits, like less time spent on commuting and more room for scheduling. They also warned about downsides. These include heavier work demands, blurred separation between work and home, and issues tied to work conditions. This broader view helps when thinking about costs, rather than treating cost as only one number.

Wang, Liu, Qian, and Parker (2021) looked at remote work during COVID-19. They pointed to work design, social help, autonomy, and details of home setups. Their results fit the idea that organisational support matters. They also stress that the home work setting for each employee can shape how remote work turns out.

Barrero, Bloom, and Davis (2021) described how working from home continued after the first pandemic disruption. They also discussed wider effects on the economy. Their discussion helps place remote work as an ongoing part of work. It is not only a short-lived exception.

2.1 Research Gap

Most research on working from home talks about output, job contentment, balance in daily life, and results for organisations. Some reviews mention employee costs, but they usually do not separate savings from the costs that move to workers. For policy planning, it helps to look at both sides in a clear way. Two employees living in the same city can still see different effects. Travel time matters. So do household bills. Some people may need extra gear. Reimbursement rules can also differ. In this paper, I use a cost-category method for the IT sector in Chennai.

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Design, Area and Population

The study uses a descriptive type with an analytical side. It looks at Chennai City in Tamil Nadu. The target group is employees working in IT firms. They must have experience with remote work or a hybrid setup. For this work, each employee counts as the unit of analysis.

3.2 Sample and Sampling

For this demo, 130 people took part. We used a convenience sampling plan since there was no confirmed list of people or sampling frame shared with us. In a proper study, the report should name the exact method used and also describe how participants were found and invited.

3.3 Data Collection Instrument

Information can be gathered with a set questionnaire. It includes questions on age or background and also items about the job. It also has Likert statements. These items ask people how they view cost and value. The form can note what was spent on commuting each month before remote work started. It can also note current spending for working from home. It can include any money paid back by the employer. It can also capture what the person believes about the overall cost benefit. A five-point rating is used. It runs from 1 for strongly disagree to 5 for strongly agree.

3.4 Variables and Measurement

Variable	Operational meaning	Measurement
Commuting savings	Perceived reduction in travel-related spending	Mean of four Likert items
Home-working costs	Additional expenditure on utilities, internet and workspace	Mean of four items; higher score = greater burden
Employer support	Adequacy of equipment, connectivity or reimbursement support	Mean of four items
Perceived net cost benefit	Overall perception that remote work improves financial position	Mean of four items

3.5 Statistical Tools

The study relies on several tests: frequency and percentages, mean and standard deviation, Cronbach's alpha, Pearson correlation, and multiple linear regression. Statistical significance is checked at the 5% level. The tables are meant to show a reporting layout. They should not be treated as results taken from real field data.

4. Data Analysis and Interpretation

4.1 Demographic Profile

Profile	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	72	55.4
	Female	58	44.6
Age	18–25 years	24	18.5
	26–35 years	59	45.4
	36–45 years	35	26.9
	Above 45 years	12	9.2
Education	Undergraduate	31	23.8
	Postgraduate	86	66.2
	Other/professional	13	10.0
Experience	Below 3 years	27	20.8
	3–7 years	49	37.7
	8–12 years	34	26.2
	Above 12 years	20	15.4

The profile lists 72 men, which is 55.4%, and 58 women, which is 44.6%. When it comes to age, the 26–35 group is the biggest, at 45.4%. Education-wise, most people have postgraduate qualifications, 66.2%. For experience, the top range is 3–7 years, with 37.7%. This is a simulated profile only. It should not be taken as proof of the actual demographic makeup of Chennai's IT workforce.

4.2 Remote-Work Pattern

Work arrangement	Frequency	Percentage
Fully remote	29	22.3
Hybrid: 3–4 days remote per week	46	35.4
Hybrid: 1–2 days remote per week	39	30.0
Occasional remote work	16	12.3

Total	130	100.0

Work schedules with three or four remote days per week form the biggest group at 35.4%. The next group is people with one or two remote days, at 30.0%. Fully remote employees are 22.3%. You could also use a real dataset to see if costs change as remote-work levels increase.

4.3 Changes in Major Expense Categories

Expense category	Reduction	No major change	Increase
Commuting/travel	101 (77.7%)	24 (18.5%)	5 (3.8%)
Meals purchased outside	78 (60.0%)	39 (30.0%)	13 (10.0%)
Work clothing/grooming	54 (41.5%)	65 (50.0%)	11 (8.5%)
Electricity at home	8 (6.2%)	34 (26.2%)	88 (67.7%)
Internet/mobile data	17 (13.1%)	71 (54.6%)	42 (32.3%)
Workspace/equipment	12 (9.2%)	75 (57.7%)	43 (33.1%)

Getting to work is the top area people say went down, at 77.7%. Meals bought outside also dropped, reported by 60.0%. On the other hand, 67.7% say home electricity costs rose. Meanwhile, 32.3% report higher bills for internet or mobile data. Taken together, these results suggest you should look at both money that was saved and costs that showed up at home.

4.4 Estimated Monthly Net Cost Change

Monthly cost change (₹)	Frequency	Percentage
Net additional cost	14	10.8
Savings below ₹2,000	27	20.8
Savings ₹2,000–₹4,999	45	34.6
Savings ₹5,000–₹7,999	29	22.3
Savings ₹8,000 or more	15	11.5
Total	130	100.0

In the simulated distribution, 68.5% of respondents are in savings groups where the monthly amount is ₹2,000 or higher. At the same time, 10.8% say they face net extra cost. These numbers come from assumed figures. They reflect both savings and extra spending, treated together in the categories. A field questionnaire should spell out one clear reference period. It also should tell people how to line up costs they had before remote work with costs during remote work.

4.5 Reliability Analysis

Construct	Items	Cronbach's alpha
Commuting savings	4	.842
Home-working costs	4	.801
Employer support	4	.876
Perceived net cost benefit	4	.889
Overall scale	16	.913

The simulated alpha values for the four constructs sit between .801 and .889. The total scale alpha is .913. For most uses, these numbers suggest decent to strong internal consistency. Still, high reliability by itself does not prove that the measure is one dimensional. It also does not confirm construct validity. Factor analysis can also help.

4.6 Descriptive Statistics

Construct	N	Mean	Std. deviation
Commuting savings	130	3.91	.78

Home-working costs	130	3.42	.83
Employer support	130	3.36	.91
Perceived net cost benefit	130	3.74	.76

The item on commuting savings has the top average score at 3.91. Most respondents seem to agree that working from home lowers spending tied to travel. Next, the perceived net cost benefit averages 3.74. This suggests people see a slight overall advantage in costs. Home-working costs come in at 3.42 on average. That points to a middling sense of added cost burden. Employer support is lowest at 3.36. In this example, that looks like the weakest spot. Higher scores for home-working costs mean the cost burden feels heavier.

4.7 Correlation Analysis

Variables	1	2	3	4
1. Commuting savings	1			
2. Home-working costs	−.28**	1		
3. Employer support	.41**	−.19*	1	
4. Perceived net cost benefit	.62**	−.46**	.53**	1

Note: * p < .05; ** p < .01.

The results suggest a fair positive link between commuting savings and net cost benefit. I found r =. 62. Home-working costs line up with lower net benefit. The correlation was r = −.46. Employer support lines up with higher net benefit. That one came out at r =.53. These numbers show association only. They do not prove cause and effect.

4.8 Multiple Regression Analysis

Model statistic	Value
R	.716
R Square	.513
Adjusted R Square	.501
Std. error of estimate	.536
F (3, 126)	44.24
Significance	< .001

Dependent variable: perceived net cost benefit. Predictors: commuting savings, home-working costs and employer support.

Predictor	B	Std. error	Standardised β	t	p
Constant	1.284	.312	—	4.12	<.001
Commuting savings	.382	.071	.392	5.38	<.001
Home-working costs	−.241	.063	−.263	−3.83	<.001
Employer support	.296	.068	.354	4.35	<.001

The analysis shows a clear effect: F (3,126) = 44.24, $p < .001$. It accounts for 51.3% of the spread in perceived net cost benefit ($R^2 = .513$). Commuting savings point in the positive direction ($\beta = .392$). Home-working costs move in the negative direction ($\beta = -.263$). Employer support also trends positive ($\beta = .354$). In this case, commuting savings has the biggest standardised coefficient. Because these are simulated numbers, they do not count as proof for the real population.

4.9 Hypothesis Summary

Hypothesis	Decision	Basis
H01: Commuting savings are not related to perceived net cost benefit	Rejected	r = .62, p < .01
H02: Home-working costs are not related to perceived net cost benefit	Rejected	r = −.46, p < .01
H03: Employer support is not related to perceived net cost benefit	Rejected	r = .53, p < .01
H04: Predictors do not significantly predict perceived net cost benefit	Rejected	F = 44.24, p < .001

The simulated results caused all four null hypotheses to be rejected. This is just a simple example of how decisions are described after statistical testing.

5. Discussion

The findings suggest remote work shifts some employee spending rather than removing costs. The biggest possible savings show up in commuting and in meals eaten away from home. Other items, like power use, internet or connectivity, and the need for a suitable place to work, could add new expenses. This fits what earlier studies on telework often report. Effects seem to vary with how hard people work, how their homes are set up, and how the firm organizes the arrangement. When commuting savings link to higher perceived net benefit, it may mean travel costs are a key part of how people judge the financial outcome. When home-working costs link to lower net benefit, it points to a simple issue. If employees have to pay for the tools and setup needed for remote work, savings can shrink. The link with employer support also matters. It suggests reimbursements, equipment provided by the employer, and help with connectivity may reduce the burden on workers. Remote work will not automatically make every employee better off financially. People with long commutes may end up saving more than those who live close to the office. Household setup can change the utility bill outcomes too. Someone who shares home costs may see smaller changes than a person who keeps a separate workspace. Also, a reported monthly saving does not cover other factors, like the value of time gained, possible changes in childcare needs, or longer-run replacement of equipment.

6. Major Findings

• Most respondents fall in the 26–35 group, and many hold postgraduate qualifications.
• The main work setup shown here is hybrid, usually with three or four remote days each week.
• Spending on commuting and eating out is reported most often as lower.
• Other possible added costs include power, internet or mobile data, and workspace or equipment.
• The examples show reliability values from 0.801 to 0.889 for the four constructs.
• Commuting savings and support from the employer relate positively to the view of net cost benefit, but home-working costs relate in the opposite direction.
• The regression results explain 51.3% of the variation in perceived net cost benefit.

7. Suggestions

- IT firms ought to think about clear rules for home-working support. This should include an allowance or payback for fair internet and device costs.
- Companies should also issue the key tools when the job calls for them. For many roles, that means a proper monitor and a good keyboard.
- Remote-work rules should spell out the difference between fully remote work and hybrid work. How often someone goes to the office can change which costs matter most.
- Staff should get clear notice about what help is on offer. They should also know how to submit a claim for approved expenses.
- HR can ask for anonymous input from time to time. This can cover the money saved from less travel, higher home bills, and what gear people still need.
- Workers should be reminded to set up a safe and comfortable desk area. Do not assume every home can cover big buys on its own.
- More research should look at cost results across commute distance, travel type, how often people work remotely, pay level, and who lives in the home.

8. Limitations and Scope for Further Research

The main issue is that the numbers are simulated, not taken from a real survey. The analysis shows what the structure could look like for N = 130, but it does not let us claim results that hold in general. The use of convenience sampling may also mean the sample is not truly representative. On top of that, expense reports are based on memory, so recall mistakes can happen. The listed

money categories may also miss costs that show up indirectly or over a longer time.A next step could involve a bigger stratified sample drawn from IT firms, with a clear comparison across fully remote staff, hybrid workers, and people based in offices. A longitudinal approach could track spending before and after a shift in work setup. Researchers could also test whether any financial upsides vary by gender, caregiving duties, income level, place of residence, and commuting style. Interviews could add context, for example by clarifying why some people end up with net savings while others report higher overall costs.

9. Conclusion

Remote work shifts where work spending happens and what people spend on. If fewer trips are needed, money tied to travel and meals may drop. But working from home can also raise bills, like power use, internet charges, new devices, and the cost of a dedicated desk or space. Because of that, the value of remote work should be judged by the overall net change, meaning saved costs minus extra costs plus any help the employer provides. The example review with 130 respondents offers a workable way to look at these links for IT staff in Chennai City. It suggests that lower commuting cost and employer support might line up with higher perceived net benefit. At the same time, higher home-work expenses may line up with lower perceived net benefit. Still, these points are not settled. They are only a hypothetical pattern until real survey results confirm them. A fair and steady remote-work approach should note that employee expenses differ. It should back workers in a suitable way. It should not assume that added flexibility will automatically lead to lower costs or clear financial gains.

References

- Allen, T. D., Golden, T. D., & Shockley, K. M. (2015). How effective is telecommuting? Assessing the status of our scientific findings. Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 16(2), 40–68. https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100615593273
- Analysis of three potential savings in e-working expenditure. (2021). Frontiers in Sociology, 6, Article 675530. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2021.675530
- Barrero, J. M., Bloom, N., & Davis, S. J. (2021). Why working from home will stick. National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No. 28731. https://doi.org/10.3386/w28731
- Battisti, E., Alfiero, S., & Leonidou, E. (2022). Remote working and digital transformation during the COVID-19 pandemic: Economic-financial impacts and psychological drivers for employees. Journal of Business Research, 150, 38–50. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.05.010
- Bloom, N., Liang, J., Roberts, J., & Ying, Z. J. (2015). Does working from home work? Evidence from a Chinese experiment. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 130(1), 165–218. https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qju032
- de Vos, D., Meijers, E., & van Ham, M. (2018). Working from home and the willingness to accept a longer commute. The Annals of Regional Science, 61, 375–398. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00168-018-0873-6
- Eurofound, & International Labour Organization. (2017). Working anytime, anywhere: The effects on the world of work. Publications Office of the European Union and International Labour Office.
- Gibbs, M., Mengel, F., & Siemroth, C. (2023). Work from home and productivity: Evidence from personnel and analytics data on information technology professionals. Journal of Political Economy Microeconomics, 1(1). https://doi.org/10.1086/721803
- Nagler, M., Rincke, J., & Winkler, E. (2024). Working from home, commuting, and gender. Journal of Population Economics, 37, Article 58. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00148-024-01035-6
- To what extent does working from home lead to savings in commuting time? A panel analysis using the Australian HILDA Survey. (2024). Travel Behaviour and Society, 37, Article 100839. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tbs.2024.100839
- Wang, B., Liu, Y., Qian, J., & Parker, S. K. (2021). Achieving effective remote working during the COVID-19 pandemic: A work design perspective. Applied Psychology, 70(1), 16–59. https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12290
- Work from home (WFH) as a novel commute mode: An account of costs and benefits. (2026). In Advances in Transport Policy and Planning (Vol. 17, pp. 415–443). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.atpp.2025.11.002

- Working from home: Too much of a good thing? (2024). Regional Science and Urban Economics. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.regsciurbeco.2024.103990