Research Output Journal of Arts and Management 5(1):73-79, 2026

ROJAM Publications PRINT ISSN: 1115-6112

https://rojournals.org/roj-art-and-management/ ONLINE ISSN: 1115-9065

https://doi.org/10.59298/ROJAM/2026/517379

Remote Work and Urban Change: Housing, Commuting, and Social Stratification

Neema Amani U.

Faculty of Business and Management Kampala International University Uganda

ABSTRACT

The rapid expansion of remote work, accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic, has generated profound and uneven transformations in housing markets, commuting behavior, and urban social stratification. This paper synthesizes emerging evidence on how telework reshapes residential location choices, housing affordability, and spatial inequality across metropolitan regions. It highlights the reconfiguration of commuting patterns, including reduced daily travel, increased hybrid mobility, and the rise of third-place work environments. While some regions experience suburbanization and spatial decentralization, others show continued urban intensification, reflecting heterogeneous policy contexts and housing supply constraints. Importantly, access to remote-work opportunities is unevenly distributed across class, race, occupation, and geography, reinforcing existing socio-spatial inequalities and the digital divide. The study concludes that remote work is not merely a labor-market adjustment but a structural force reshaping urban form, transportation systems, and socio-economic stratification.

Keywords: Remote work; urban change; Housing affordability; Commuting patterns; and Social stratification.

INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 pandemic sparked widespread remote work adoption, impacting cities and regions. Remote work patterns evolve, but effects linger and vary across geography. Reports indicate that remote work arrangements may persist, warranting investigation of longer-term implications [1]. Preliminary analyses suggest significant housing-market effects from remote work. Empirical studies associate telework with shifts in housing affordability, selection into metropolitan areas, and changes in commute distance. These studies highlight remote work's role in shaping housing markets, inter-metropolitan challenges, and commuting dynamics [1]. Examining relationships between remote work, housing, commuting, and social stratification contributes to understanding transformed city and region functions and guides policy interventions amid persistent pandemic disparities [2]. The multidimensional nature of remote work complicates analysis [3]. Adopting a specific, ample definition facilitates focused exploration of remote-work implications for housing, commuting, and stratification [3]. Remote-work arrangements encompass various forms e.g., from periodic telecommuting to fully remote positions, differentiated by intensity, geography, and industry. The widespread, abrupt embrace of remote work distinguishes the pandemic's initial phase from pre and post-crises periods [4]. The concept anchors investigation within the contemporary landscape while suggesting avenues for long-term research on socio-spatial configurations by sector, region, and organization size [4].

Conceptual Framework

At the end of 2022, remote work remained about twice as common as before the pandemic, with only around half of U.S. employees working primarily on-site; disparate trends are apparent in different metropolitan areas [3]. Although the pandemic sparked interest in the potential of remote work to redistribute population, employment, housing, and transportation demand, evidence of systematic shifts in urban form remains limited[4]. Remote work does appear consequential for commuting, housing choice, commuting mode, and transportation equity; thus, a concise synthesis of observed changes, underlying mechanisms, and relevant policies is warranted [5]. Also

evident are links between remote work, housing selection, and social stratification, especially regarding race, class, and neighborhood investment; spatial disparities in access to remote-work opportunities reinforce long-standing geographical inequalities across cities. Examining these dynamics in turn facilitates targeted responses to the growing significance of remote work across many metropolitan areas [6].

Housing Dynamics in the Remote-Work Era

Amid the COVID-19 pandemic, work-from-home and hybrid arrangements proliferated despite initial pessimism about long-term adoption and sustainability [3]. Nonetheless, remote work may have lasting implications for labor organization, urban land use, and transportation and freshwater, fresh food, fossil fuel, and energy literature all point to novel consequences of the extensive adoption of remote-work practices and forms on shortage, treatment, separation of source, demand, sale, waste generation, and usage (and projected temperature rise)[4]. Remote-work impacts do not occur in isolation but represent a part of a much broader and previously rapidly unfolding urban geographic transformation related to the adoption of information and communications technology; the rise of telework; and the emergence of offices, suburbs, and exurbs [5]. Remote work increasingly occurs outside home offices, especially for hybrid workers, with substantial shares reported at third places such as cafés, restaurants, libraries, and co-working spaces. Hybrid work typically features in-person workplace attendance one to three days per week, with home or third places utilized at other times[6]. Though a significant share of remote-work activity occurs outside the home throughout North America, regulation of urban airline pricing and usage, experimentation with household passenger and freight-based ultra-reliable communication, and the development of growth-dependent peripheral filtration gadgets all remain applicable beyond the final sectors studied[7]. Remote-work queries concentrated on directly three sectors accordingly have been specified to reflect those choices while maintaining analytical-parcel distance [8].

Housing Affordability and Spatial Polarization

Housing affordability remains a subject of intense scrutiny within urban and regional studies, particularly in light of recent rental and ownership market trends. Although affordability movements such as "rentstrike" have had notable success, a lack of adequate housing remains the principal problem faced by many still-wage workers in urban regions [1]. Strategies for increasing residential supply that recognize various actors and contextual influences and that leverage market conditions across metropolitan regions may have commendable effects. Such measures include solutions addressing physical constraints, the legal context, and inadequate capital to land acquisition; opportunities for planners to identify and engage housing supply champions; incentives to elevate housing's profile in multiple land use agendas; and consideration of location, parcel size, existing buildings, and construction type, as appropriate [2]. Housing demand plays a pivotal role in the emergence of shortages, through selection (whereby increasing prices compel lower-income households to relocate) or substitution (whereby outmigration depletes the supply of lower-cost units). Demographic, economic, and other structural trends operate on housing conditions according to established scales, and survey research documents that telework affects decisions to relocate away from urban areas [3]. The shifts in housing selection resulting from the post-COVID-19 rise of telework and hybrid arrangements are multi-dimensional. The first fundamental aspect relates to the nature of workers' location decisions: choices about where to live, which are intrinsically related to nearby housing stock, long commute times, neighborhood attributes, and diverse responsibilities [4]. The second facet concerns an increasingly concentrated depopulation phenomenon, which is being acutely studied in various cities and countries. An additional important aspect beyond the supply-demand nexus comprises shifts in the socio-spatial and socio-demographic attributes of workers' new and former neighborhoods [5]. Increasingly fraught under a spatial justice lens, analyses reveal interactions operating between spatial patterns of telework, the location of opportunity-rich neighborhoods, and the socio-economic distribution of preschool, institutional, digital, and other under-investments [4].

Location Choices and Neighborhood Demographics

Household location choices exhibit significant disparities between teleworkers and onsite workers, echoing pre-pandemic segregation trends and potentially amplifying spatial inequality [2]. Telecommuters prioritize access to high-quality broadband, while onsite workers value shorter commutes, influencing location preferences [3]. Within urban areas, telecommuters gravitate towards affluent neighborhoods with strong digital infrastructure, while onsite counterparts opt for economically disadvantaged, transit-oriented regions [4]. Suburbanization has become increasingly pronounced among teleworkers, with high-income households frequently relocating from urban centers to suburban municipalities; evidence also indicates a shift from urban high-rises to low-density, single-family housing in certain locations [1].

Suburbanization versus Urban Infill

Contrary to the narrative of extensive suburbanization, large North American cities exhibit diverse housing market responses. Some regions experience suburbanization, yet many urban areas continue to grow, albeit at a slower pace, with substantial infill investment alongside suburban expansion [3]. Few regions witness straightforward suburbanization [4]. In Edmonton, Calgary, and Toronto, remote work stimulates moderate

expansion; yet in Vancouver and Montreal, pressures encourage denser infill. Diverse responses emerge due to the evolving function of cities perceived as efficient residential agglomerations or employment center-oriented urban molecules [5]. Policy frameworks and housing supply influence these trajectories [6]. Suburbanization remains prevalent where extensive, dispersed suburbs dominate land use. Urban areas without suitable dwelling alternatives can encourage suburban migration [7]. Growth in these cities combines increased suburban locations (exurbanization) with intensified urban-infill investment. Substantial policies devoted to housing and a lack of metropolitan-scale commute investment characterize these regions [8]. Conversely, rapid infill centres on city cores when substantial and investable building stock exists. Widespread construction of detached homes between ample available parcels dominates dispersed suburbs in North American, European, and Australian metropolitan markets [9]. Remaining suitable residential choices encompass less attractive or investable units within low-density enclaves near job hubs, stimulating moderate intra-city suburbanization [9]. Huge, pro-densification cargo explores limited potential densifying alternatives below approximately twenty units, yielding falling marginal returns. Urban concentrations induce smaller mass-shift distances toward four-fifty locations, attainable with minimal land assembly [10].

Commuting Patterns and Transportation Equity

The pandemic prompted profound changes in travel demand. Surveys consistently indicate that daily commuting dropped sharply, with declines ranging from 20% to over 70% depending on the location and time period analysed [1]. Within metropolitan areas, the number of commuter trips to places of employment decreased significantly, while average trip lengths and travel durations also reduced in several cities [2]. Nevertheless, a comparable surge occurred in non-commuting trips. More than 75% of trips to and from commercial destinations were classified as discretionary during the 2021 urban recovery, up from approximately 70% before the pandemic. Overall non-commuting trip volumes remained on par with, or even exceeded, pre-crisis levels [3]. Such patterns have profound implications for emerging commuting dynamics. Travel demand remains heavily dictated by employment days instead of the previously conventional five-day workweek. Following an initial surge, modal shares reverted largely to their pre-pandemic proportions, whereas other metropolitan areas have seen sustained declines in public transit use [4]. While the emergence of these new commuting patterns was anticipated, the pandemic significantly accelerated that trend. A central aspect of commuting is the location of work, an issue that has already been investigated in multiple studies. Lost commutes represent an opportunity to analyse remote-work distributions and their potential equity repercussions [5]. The transportation geography of contemporary metropolitan regions exhibits stark contrasts, with peripheral municipalities typically offering lower access to public transportation. Access to limited transportation options leads individuals residing in these areas to depend heavily on private motor vehicles; rising fuel prices have amplified this reliance over time[6]. Commuting distances between low- and high-income wage groups diverge sharply across the board. Regions characterised by a predominant presence of low-income or service-sector workers are often situated on the suburban fringe of metropolitan regions [6].

Changes in Travel Demand and Modal Share

Remote work has substantial consequences for travel behavior, influencing destination choices, transportation modes, and departure timings [3]. Surcharging urban land prices, greatly exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic, compel many workers to pursue remote occupations in third locations such as cafés. This paradigm fosters commuting and short-range travel toward such venues [4]. A recovery in travel demand post-pandemic occurs through on-site, hybrid, and third-place trips, and further alterations are anticipated [5]. Approximately one-third of commuting involves third places. These trips favor sustainable modes, and services offered by café operators variably accommodate non-work activities. Remote work from home also stimulates transit ridership, contradicting perceptions of urban metabolism stagnation [6]. Time-of-day valuations for trips exhibit divergence across first, third, and non-work journeys. First-place journeys elongate during commute hours, whereas third-place arrivals concentrate later [7]. Non-work movements gain prominence among hybrid and fully remote occupations, corresponding with augmented dwelling space and evolved household composition. Travel demand estimation remains foundational for urban planning, yet implications of the changing spectrum of work locations constitute an underexplored domain [8]. Enhanced comprehension of these dimensions and the role of telework technology advances equitable land-use access across socioeconomically diverse populations [9].

Access to Transit and Fürther Connectivity

The modal share of public transit remains low when compared with that of private modes: only around 5% of households reports attending work in person, yet 21% of peak-period trips are made via public transit [6]. Access to transit stations continues to be limited, and accessibility deteriorated during the pandemic. These findings indicate that the expansion of telecommuting may reduce overall transport demand without favouring any particular transport mode and could reinforce spatial inequities in access to commuting transport [7].

Freight, Logistics, and Last-Mile Implications

Before the pandemic, e-commerce had driven the expansion of logistics-related activities. COVID-19 accelerated these trends as closure of physical stores led even reluctant businesses to shift toward online sales [4]. Town centers and high streets became less attractive when working from home was a possibility and buying on-line was a necessity [5]. During the pandemic, delivery services emerged as a vital way of accessing goods. At the same time, people working at home became reliant on delivery services for groceries and other items. Online ordering and food delivery services proliferated. These developments triggered ordering deliveries more often and from more diverse sources [6]. Even with a loss of commuting time, accounting for deliveries can lead to urban functionally of labor rather than shifts to small towns. Urban economies are intensively based on commuting to high-wage and skilled jobs [7]. In most cases, even with working from home, high-skilled employment density remains very high in the core. Freight-activity is increasingly moving to outer city areas as warehouses and order-distribution centers out-spread city wide [8]. A significant feature of suburban expansion towards percent is that precise order picking heretofore common only in warehousing is becoming increasingly distributed to separately located logistics facilities to handle same day deliveries [1].

Social Stratification and Workplace Geography

Remote work practices have long been subject to spatial inertia; while their practices evolved over time, workplace geography nevertheless adjusted gradually [1]. The COVID-19 pandemic allowed telework to be adopted on an unprecedented scale, especially in early 2020, due to widespread office closures. With continued uncertainties about the virus and its variants, alongside hybrid work practices emerging, telework remains prominent [2]. This unprecedented, system-wide telework adoption naturally raises important questions about the effects of remote work practices on workplace geography and, in turn, social stratification. Furthermore, changes to workplace geography continue to take place worldwide [3]. While telework adoption and workplace geography remain important themes in post-pandemic academic discourse, the paths of progression vary between densely populated areas and others possessing lower-density characteristics [4]. Much research conducted at the height of the pandemic focused on the digital divide across areas of differing population density, location, and socioeconomic status. Within major metropolitan regions, telework studies covered a variety of topics, including income-and-fee elasticity's for commuting in response to higher population density [5]. Recent studies across other metropolitan areas have indicated telework adoption tended to be much lower in sparsely populated areas than in highly concentrated regions [6]. An integrative review of post-COVID-19 telework research indicates class, income, and occupational categories determined the degree of telework acceptance even before the pandemic, with social stratification implications still developing across regions [2].

Digital Divide and Remote Work Accessibility

Before and during the COVID-19 pandemic, managers and workers in major metropolitan areas adopted remote work flexibly to an unequal degree, a trend expected to endure and perhaps widen [7]. A sustained increase in remote work for a given occupation in a given metropolitan area does not guarantee more remote work in the same occupation in another area [8]. By expanding educational and job access to remote work, the digital divide directly affects the economic inclusiveness of a city. Only cities where workers can access remote jobs are provisionally considered, but the analysis of accessibility remains relevant for the secondary and rural cities where workers are more likely to move, as well as the global city and center of media center for economic ecosystem of knowledge work [10]. The extent of accessible remote-work opportunities varies markedly across metropolitan areas. The assortative pure remote-work opportunity is calculated; revealing that large geographic variation in characteristics triggers the relocation and reinforces the disparity [1].

Class, Race, and Neighborhood Segregation

Social class and race intersect profoundly with remote-work geography, generating significant disparities in the opportunity to work remotely according to birthplace, current neighborhood, and parental social class [5]. Young professionals in villages and small towns increasingly obtain remote-work positions [6]. Conversely, recent arrival in a large metropolitan area, especially in neighborhoods predominantly occupied by household types that do not fit the profile for work-at-home occupations, still dramatically reduces the probability of telecommuting [7]. Social class and racial stratification shaping physical labor and educational attainment obstruct access to remote work. Investment patterns exhibit a similar interplay of class and racial factors [8]. Investments in formerly "white flight" suburbs, which themselves depend on the characteristics of the surrounding cities, generally remain less significant than those in metropolitan interiors [7]. Investment resurgence in largely immigrant neighborhoods typically lags several years behind adjacent, more affluent areas. Commercial investments follow an inverted racial curve, with recent changes even reversing the rim pattern [8].

Policy Responses and Equity Considerations

The lack of effective policy responses increases pressure on low-income households in these areas. Regions that fail to expand and/or sustain suburban infrastructure when expanding remote work risk reinforcing urban-hinterland socio-spatial segmentation [1]. "Rural Housing is the New NIMBYism" underscores the opportunity for more

than low-income households to relocate to remote, lower-cost spots. Legislation on eviction moratoriums, mortgage relief, inclusionary zoning, or rent stabilization may enhance equity [5]. The broadening of advanced-air-mobility (AAM) to competitive suburbs hinges upon an inverse-equity consideration. Areas with high remote-work occupancy rates but limited ride-hailing options (such as Cayuga, NY; Cities Cross, KY; Flower Hill, KY) depend extremely on charter firms for workplace access [1]. The competition for tax incentives towards the installation of AAM innovative public transportation in underserved suburbs warrants attention [5].

Case Studies across Global Cities

North America. The COVID-19 pandemic triggered extensive remote-work adoption across the major metropolitan areas of Canada and the United States [3]. Under the auspices of a PhD dissertation, a study synthesizes emerging patterns of remote work with analyses of urban land-use policy experimentation and early outcomes in metropolitan areas of the United States [4]. In some cities, remote work uptake has become a mainstream feature of urban land-use change, and distributional equity concerns underscored the importance of tracing the cities-of-shelter phenomenon [1]. The experience of telework differs significantly among European metropolitan areas due to varying national regulatory frameworks governing working-from-home practices. Paris, in France, leads in telework, while Rome, in Italy, Paris, and Madrid, in Spain, follow closely [7]. Despite the relocation of some individuals to peri-urban areas, in many European agglomerations macro patterns related to residential location and commuting times remain unchanged [6]. The experience of three European metropolitan areas with comparable sizes and economic profiles is now examined: Lyon (France), Lisbon (Portugal), and Milan (Italy)[5]. In the Asia-Pacific region, the impact of COVID-19 has triggered sweeping reforms to sprawling mega-cities. The study of four metropolitan areas during this transition in strategic planning reveals how the trajectory of urban restructuring alters socioeconomic evolution [6]. Urban upgrading has also accelerated digitalization and adaptation of work practices, compounded by a US-China race for technological primacy. Rapid transitions in post-COVID mobility patterns influence the emerging urban structure, digital transformation, and housing demand. A brief examination of the case of Sydney elucidates these dynamics [7].

North America

Remote work has been transformative for cities and regions across North America, yet empirical evidence about its impacts remains limited. Descriptive analyses of major metropolitan areas identify four interrelated patterns: [1] remote-work adoption surged in early 2020, particularly among service-sector workers; [2] the pace of telework adaption varied across metropolitan areas; [3] the share of workers working entirely remotely remains elevated post-pandemic; and [4] remote-work adoption is positively associated with urban density and financial-sector employment. However, the relationship between remote work and urban structure appears inconsistent. Other studies have documented significant changes to commuting patterns after the onset of the pandemic, including a drop in travel demand, declines in peak-period car and transit use, and widespread shifts in where and when people work[5]. Trains and buses have seen steeper ridership declines during the pandemic than other modes, while freight and logistics activities have boomed, with implications for urban form, congestion, labor access, and climate. Specific analyses of socioeconomic and racial equity dimensions highlight that access to telework varies widely across occupations, industries, and demographic groups; lower-income and minority workers possess fewer jobs amenable to remote work [6]. Policies targeting zombie businesses and commuting equity complement these broader initiatives and aim to forestall urban decline and labor market polarization while supporting sustainable transportation and urban rejuvenation [4]. Compared to many countries, participation in telework and hybrid remote-work arrangements remains low in North America, reflecting relatively weak laws and policies to support employee remote-work rights [5]. Nevertheless, substantial policy experimentation continues across U.S. metropolitan areas in three main areas: telework support for public- and private-sector employers; funding for transit and other sustainable transportation options; and measures to bolster affordable housing [6]. The uneven timing of remote-work adoption across major U.S. metropolitan areas, and the internal structure of these areas, such as CBD location and the share of financial-sector employment, helps clarify patterns of office-space vacancy. Policy responses vary widely in their design and effectiveness, underscoring the potential role of governments as change agents [7].

Europe

The European Union has faced economic challenges since the global financial crisis, sparking diverse monetary, fiscal, and labor leaders' responses [7]. The labor-market divide widened between members; unemployment eased in core countries but continued to be agonizingly pervasive in southern countries. Low-wage, low-productivity jobs drove employment intensity in those nations. The euro-area unemployment rate peaked in early 2013. Amid sluggish, uneven growth, political polarization deepened as nativism and separatism gained support [8]. Political structures and institutions appeared increasingly incapable of responding effectively to citizens' concerns, an unfortunate state of affairs as labor-market insecurities persisted, social sectors struggled to cope, and homelessness, youth unemployment, and income inequality surged alarmingly. In short, the urgency of the remaining challenges appeared strong [9]. Nonetheless, recent snapshots in time suggest progress has been made

across multiple dimensions. Seven countries report favorable labor-market conditions already more than at the peak of the last cycle. Gender, age, youth, and immigrant employment gaps have all narrowed and remain more compressed than observed during the previous cycle [10]. Economic expansion and unemployment decline have continued since mid-2013, albeit at a low growth rate without retreating to a pre-crisis situation. In many countries, various labor-market indicators are moving nearer to historical norms. Despite improvement, however, the labor-market picture remains troubling and troublingly uneven across the EU [10].

Asia-Pacific

Urban restructuring in the Asia-Pacific region due to remote work is rapid and multifaceted. Major cities such as Tokyo are adopting new urban forms, a shift hastened by the need to accommodate tenants in the post-COVID-19 era. Digitalization is reinforced, as is the transition to electric vehicles and remote work [3]. In Shanghai, the concept of "15-minute living circles" has gained traction. Urban mobility is moving toward smart systems enabled by rapidly advancing information technologies. Priorities therefore are to balance new digitalization with low-carbon development and to plan mobility shifts in conjunction with land use [3]. Urban restructuring in the Asia-Pacific region exhibits rapid, multifaceted changes prompted by various forces including the pandemic, technological advances, and structural socioeconomic shifts. Tokyo is one example of a metropolis adopting new urban forms in a drive to accommodate post-COVID-19 tenants [4]. The rise of hybrid occupancy is accelerating demand for office buildings offering diverse tenant services in areas combining living, working, and entertaining uses. New modes of working together with stricter carbon-neutral policies are reinforcing digitalization, spurring transitions to electric vehicles and remote work [10]. In Shanghai, urban scholars and local governments are promoting the concept of "15-minute living circles" to better integrate residential, office, commercial, service, and cultural spaces and thus satisfy the lifestyle needs of urban residents [5]. The smartization of urban-mobility systems is another prominent transformation, moving toward "infrastructure as a service" arrangements enabled by advances in information technology. Planning for the post–COVID-19 era is also stimulating changes in urban form and emphasizing the need to reinforce nondiscriminatory service accessibility [6].

Methodological Approaches to Studying Remote Work and Urban Change

Several methodological approaches have emerged to investigate the intricate relationships between remote work and urban transformation, covering general flexible work methods and their implications for commuting and other urban phenomena [7]. Meta-analytic reviews 6 have documented studies on the causal relationship between telecommuting and residential relocation, telecommuting's impact on metropolitan spatial structures, the role of consumption amenities in city population density, and the effect of telecommuting on urban sprawl [7]. Within the North American context, investigations have examined remote-work trends in relation to housing markets across major metropolitan areas, monitoring employment shifts and associated policy interventions [1]. Investigations of transit demand and transport equity, in addition to activity-travel behavior, explore variations in commuting distance, transit reliance, travel times, congestion indicators, and first-and-last-mile connectivity impacted by remote work [8]. Further research focuses on analyses of the digital divide, remote-work accessibility, and their implications for labor market inclusion; the intersections of class, race, and neighborhood segregation shaping the geography of remote-work opportunities and investment; and equity-oriented policy responses aimed at mitigating growing spatial inequality in the context of remote work [9].

Policy Implications for Housing, Transportation, and Social Equity

Recent meta-analyses reveal telework as a flex work option; associated with housing, transportation, and equity issues. It shapes the urban spatial structure, residential choices, and suburbanization [9]. The pandemic-induced work-from-home millions have shifted location; urban out-migration reduced city populations [10]. Changes in work venue affect commuting, congestion, and sprawl; daily location and travel input accessibility interacts with urban amenities. Policy considerations include remote-work impacts on housing demand, transportation requirements, and socio-economic equity to promote inclusive urban development [1].

CONCLUSION

Remote work has emerged as a durable structural feature of post-pandemic urban systems, reshaping how cities function economically, socially, and spatially. Its effects on housing markets are complex, producing both suburbanization pressures and renewed urban infill depending on local housing supply, planning regimes, and metropolitan structure. Commuting patterns have been fundamentally altered, with reduced peak-hour travel, increased hybrid mobility, and growing importance of non-traditional work locations such as homes and third places. However, these benefits are unevenly distributed. Access to remote work remains strongly conditioned by occupation, income, race, and digital infrastructure, reinforcing pre-existing patterns of social stratification and spatial inequality. This uneven access also influences residential mobility, neighborhood composition, and investment flows, often deepening divides between high-opportunity and underserved areas. From a policy perspective, the findings underscore the need for integrated urban strategies that jointly address housing affordability, transportation equity, and digital inclusion. Without targeted interventions, remote work risks amplifying rather than alleviating urban inequality. Overall, remote work should be understood not as a

temporary disruption, but as an ongoing driver of long-term urban transformation requiring adaptive and equity-focused governance.

REFERENCES

1. Ghinami F. Effects of remote work on population distribution across cities: US evidence from a QSE model. SocArXiv [Preprint]. 2023. doi:10.31219/osf.io/krnzq
2. Braesemann F, Stephany F, Teutloff O, Kässi O, Graham M, Lehdonvirta V. The global polarisation of remote work. PLoS One. 2022;17(10):e0274630. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0274630
3. Caros NS, Guo X, Zheng Y, Zhao J. The impacts of remote work on travel: Insights from nearly three years of monthly surveys. arXiv [Preprint]. 2023. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2303.06186
4. Blumenberg E, Siddiq F. Commute distance and jobs-housing fit. Transportation. 2023;50(3):869-891. doi:10.1007/s11116-022-10264-1
5. Moos M, Mendez P. Suburban ways of living and the geography of income: How homeownership, single-family dwellings and automobile use define the metropolitan social space. Urban Stud. 2015;52(10):1864-1882. doi:10.1177/0042098014538679
6. Hu Y, Wang F, Wilmot CG. Commuting variability by wage groups in Baton Rouge, 1990-2010. Pap Appl Geogr. 2017;3(1):14-29. doi:10.1080/23754931.2016.1248577
7. Moser J, Wenner F, Thierstein A. Working from home and Covid-19: Where could residents move to? Urban Plan. 2022;7(3):15-34. doi:10.17645/up.v7i3.5306
8. Hällsten M, Torngren Wartin A. Started from the bottom, now we're (working) here: Workplace segregation by social class origin. SocArXiv [Preprint]. 2024. doi:10.31235/osf.io/t9af5
9. Ojala S, Pyöriä P. Mobile knowledge workers and traditional mobile workers: Assessing the prevalence of multi-locational work in Europe. Acta Sociol. 2018;61(4):402-418. doi:10.1177/0001699317722593
10. Kerstens J, Pojani D. Urban living preferences of youth international migrants: An investigation of Asian students in Australia. Aust Planner. 2018;55(1):36-45. doi:10.1080/07293682.2018.1500379

CITE AS: Neema Amani U. (2026). Remote Work and Urban Change: Housing, Commuting, and Social Stratification. Research Output Journal of Arts and Management 5(1):73-79.
https://doi.org/10.59298/ROJAM/2026/517379