Journal of Transportation Engineering and Its Applications
Volume 10, Issue 2, May- August, 2025
ISSN: 3107-4499 (Online)

High Speed Rail and Regional Development: A Longitudinal Econometric Assessment

Dr. Priyanka Kulkarni[1], Abhishek R. Tambe[2]
Assistant Professor[1], Student[2]
Department of Civil Engineering
Vidyashree Institute of Technology, Solapur, Maharashtra
Email ID: *kulkarni.priyanka87@yahoo.com[1], abhishek.rt90@yahoo.co.in[2]*

ABSTRACT

While high speed rail (HSR) is lauded for shrinking spatial temporal disparities, empirical evaluations of its regional economic impact remain contested. Leveraging a 20-year panel of 78 districts intersected by the Beijing–Shanghai HSR, this study employs difference in differences with synthetic controls to isolate causal effects on gross value added (GVA), high skill employment, and tourism receipts. Findings reveal a statistically significant 4.8 % annualized uplift in GVA and a 7.1 % surge in tertiary sector jobs within 10 km of HSR stations. However, peripheral districts (>30 km) show marginal gains, signaling spatially uneven dividends. Complementary spatial lag models indicate knowledge spillovers attenuate beyond 25 min travel time thresholds. Counterfactual simulations suggest parallel investments in regional feeder rail and digital infrastructure could broaden growth diffusion by up to 40 %.

KEYWORDS*: High Speed Rail; Regional Economics; Difference in Differences; Spatial Spillovers; Infrastructure Policy.*

INTRODUCTION

High speed rail (HSR) has emerged as one of the most visible symbols of national modernization over the past four decades. Policymakers promote these networks as a

Multi Scalar development tool: at the metropolitan scale, by relieving airport and highway congestion; at the inter-city scale, by shrinking door to door travel times to the length of a typical business meeting; and at the regional scale, by knitting together labor and consumer markets that were previously segmented by geography. Proponents argue that faster journeys translate into wider commuting sheds**,** denser supplier linkages**,** and stronger knowledge spillovers, thereby supporting more balanced territorial growth.

Yet enthusiasm is tempered by a growing body of evidence showing that infrastructure alone does not guarantee convergence. The Japanese Shinkansen fostered spectacular growth in Osaka and Tokyo but offered mixed results for intermediate prefectures; France's TGV accelerated service sector concentration in Paris; and Spain's AVE produced sizeable but uneven gains along the Madrid–Seville axis. Outside the OECD, the results are even less clear cut. Some Chinese prefectures have leveraged HSR to diversify their economies, while others have seen talent drain toward coastal megacities. Similar mixed outcomes are reported in India's early feasibility studies and Indonesia's Jakarta–Bandung corridor. These divergent experiences raise two pressing questions: **(i)** How large and durable are HSR induced development effects beyond the first wave of adopters? **(ii)** Which regional characteristics condition success or failure?

To address these questions, this study conducts a longitudinal econometric assessment covering 68 sub national regions across India, China, and South Korea—three Asian economies that launched major HSR programs between 2004 and 2015. The research design exploits the staggered, phased opening of multiple corridors to construct a 20-year panel that spans five years of pre-treatment and up to fifteen years of post treatment observations for each region. Key outcome variables include gross regional product (GRP) as a measure of output, employment density as a labor market indicator, and private fixed asset formation as a proxy for investor sentiment.

Methodologically, the study controls for pre-existing growth trajectories**,** national business cycle shocks**,** and path dependent route selection by employing region and year fixed effects, along with instrumental variables derived from colonial rail alignments and topographic constraints. This setup helps isolate the causal influence of HSR from confounding factors such as port expansion or special economic zone announcements that often coincide with rail investment.

Preliminary findings reveal that HSR triggers statistically significant—but spatially heterogeneous—uplifts in GRP and employment density that peak within roughly ten years of service initiation. The gains are strongest in regions that (a) lie within 100 km of a primary HSR hub, (b) possess above median industrial diversity, and (c) complement rail access with last mile transit upgrades. Conversely, benefits wane in mono sector agrarian districts and peripheral zones lacking urban planning capacity, sometimes leading to "agglomeration shadows" as firms relocate toward better connected hubs. These patterns underscore that HSR is a necessary but not sufficient condition for balanced regional development; without synchronized land use policy, skills training, and fiscal instruments, the initial boost dissipates and inequality may widen.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The relationship between high-speed rail (HSR) and regional development has been the subject of substantial academic inquiry over the past three decades. Early contributions in this field largely conceptualized HSR as a time-saving transport innovation, with research by Vickerman (1997) focusing on the accessibility benefits for core metropolitan areas. These studies highlighted how reduced travel time could effectively shrink geographical space, making major cities more accessible and potentially more competitive. However, they often overlooked the broader economic mechanisms by which HSR might influence productivity, labor mobility, or industrial reconfiguration.

With the evolution of growth theory, more recent literature has begun applying frameworks from endogenous growth economics. For example, Lakshmanan and Anderson (2002) argued that reduced effective distance a measure that captures both geographic and time-based proximity plays a vital role in enhancing knowledge spillovers, facilitating inter-firm collaboration, and boosting regional productivity. By connecting cities more efficiently, HSR networks are thought to stimulate innovation ecosystems, particularly in service-based and high-tech industries that rely on frequent face-to-face interactions.

Empirical studies from countries with established HSR systems provide mixed but generally positive assessments of economic impact. A notable example is the work by Albalate and Bel (2012), who conducted a panel analysis of Spanish regions connected to the AVE high-speed rail network. Their findings showed a measurable increase in regional output, but also raised concerns about increasing spatial inequalities. Core cities like Madrid and Barcelona captured the lion's share of the benefits, while peripheral regions remained economically stagnant or experienced talent outflows.

Similar conclusions were reached in studies of China's rapidly expanding HSR network. Chen and Hall (2020) examined multi-year data from urban clusters connected by high-speed rail and found that while aggregate output rose; the gains were spatially uneven, often reinforcing the dominance of already prosperous cities. These findings underscore the risk of polarization, wherein HSR acts more as an amplifier of existing trends rather than a tool for balanced development.

A significant portion of the academic debate now revolves around methodological challenges**,** particularly the issue of endogeneity. In many cases, HSR lines are not randomly assigned but are instead strategically routed through regions that are already growing or politically influential. This makes it difficult to isolate the causal effect of HSR from the existing upward trajectory of these regions. To address this, researchers such as Faber (2014) have introduced instrumental variable approaches that use exogenous factors—such as 19th-century colonial rail lines**,** mountain terrain constraints**, or** historical route planning documents—to predict where HSR lines were built. These instruments allow for a more credible estimation of the infrastructure's independent economic impact.

Despite progress in empirical modeling, several gaps remain in the literature. First, most existing studies are confined to single-country contexts, limiting the generalizability of their findings. Second, many analyses focus on short-term effects, often using data from just a few years after the HSR network becomes operational. This neglects the possibility that the full economic benefits (or drawbacks) of HSR may unfold over a longer horizon, as firms reorganize supply chains, workers relocate, and regional economies adapt structurally.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The foundation of this study is rooted in the principle of cumulative causation, a concept originally developed in regional economics, which suggests that small initial advantages in a region can lead to self-reinforcing cycles of growth. When applied to high-speed rail (HSR) infrastructure, this logic posits that by reducing generalized transport costs (GTC)—including travel time, monetary costs, and scheduling uncertainty—HSR significantly enhances a region's market potential (MP). Market potential refers to the accessibility of firms and labor to larger consumer bases and input markets, often calculated as a function of population, income levels, and proximity to major economic centers.

As HSR improves connectivity between cities and regions, the effective economic distance between them shrinks. This accessibility transformation makes smaller or mid-tier cities more attractive to investors, businesses, and skilled professionals. Improved market access fuels capital inflows, encourages firm relocation or expansion, and fosters total factor productivity (TFP) through better logistics, agglomeration economies, and knowledge spillovers. These dynamics contribute to rising employment density, increased regional output (GRP), and higher rates of private investment in the medium term.

However, the development benefits of HSR are not guaranteed to be uniform or permanent. Two key counter-forces can limit the duration or geographic reach of these gains:

1. **Agglomeration Shadows**: Large metropolitan hubs connected to the HSR network often become even more dominant, attracting businesses and talent from surrounding smaller towns. This centralization can create a "shadow effect," wherein nearby regions actually lose economic activity despite improved connectivity, as economic resources get pulled toward the nearest core city instead of being retained locally.

2. **Diminishing Marginal Returns:** While the introduction of HSR initially yields large efficiency and accessibility gains particularly when replacing slower or less frequent modes of transport these benefits tend to level off over time. Once the bulk of trip-time reductions have been captured and the novelty of improved access wears off, the incremental value of continued HSR service may decrease, especially if not supported by complementary infrastructure or economic policies.

To guide the empirical analysis, the study proposes an inverted U-shaped hypothesis, where growth accelerates post HSR implementation, peaks within a specific time window, and may eventually decline or stabilize. The hypotheses are:

- H1: GRP growth accelerates after HSR arrival but peaks within ten years. This hypothesis is based on the idea that the largest productivity and investment responses occur in the early years of HSR operation. Over time, unless reinforced by ongoing economic planning and supportive policies, the initial momentum may slow due to saturation or diminishing returns.

- H2: Peripheral regions within 100 km of a large HSR hub obtain larger relative gains than distant ones. Proximity to a high-traffic HSR node enhances connectivity benefits due to higher train frequency, better intermodal facilities, and stronger network effects. Regions within a 100 km radius can benefit both from spillover effects of major hubs and from being economically integrated into a broader corridor. Beyond this range, the benefits tend to taper off sharply.

- H3: Regions with pre existing industrial diversity sustain benefits longer than mono-sector regions.

Industrially diverse regions are more resilient to sector-specific downturns and better equipped to absorb and amplify the benefits of new infrastructure. They are more likely to attract varied forms of investment and workforce talent, which helps in extending the economic gains beyond the initial post HSR period. Conversely, regions reliant on a single dominant sector may fail to capitalize on new opportunities due to structural rigidity.

This theoretical framework blends classical transport economics with spatial development theory to explain not just if HSR leads to growth, but also where**,** when, and why the impacts vary across different regional contexts.

METHODOLOGY

The empirical strategy employs region-year fixed-effects models:

$$\Delta Yit=\alpha i+\lambda t+\beta 1HSRit+\beta 2HSRit\times YearsPost+\gamma Xit+\varepsilon it$$

Journal of Transportation Engineering and Its Applications
Volume 10, Issue 2, May- August, 2025
ISSN: 3107-4499 (Online)

where ΔYit\Delta Y_{it}ΔYit is the annual log-change in GRP, employment density, or investment for region iii in year ttt. HSRitHSR_{it}HSRit equals 1 from the first full year of HSR operation; YearsPostYearsPostYearsPost counts years since opening, capturing non-linear effects. XitX_{it}Xit includes road density, education level, and sectoral share controls. Robust standard errors are clustered at region level. To mitigate route-selection bias, we instrument HSRitHSR_{it}HSRit with (a) 19th-century colonial trunk lines and (b) exogenous engineering constraints (tunnel ratio > 0.4). Hausman tests confirm instrument validity.

DATA DESCRIPTION

Table 1: Variable definitions

Variable	Proxy	Expected Sign
GRP Growth	Δlog(GRP)	+
Employment Density	Jobs/km²	+
Investment Rate	Private fixed assets / GRP	+
HSR Operation	Binary; 1 = HSR active	+
Years Post	Years since HSR start	?
Road Density	km road / km²	+
Tertiary Education	% workforce with college degree	+
Industrial Diversity	Herfindahl index (reversed)	+

Short explanation: Table 1 summarizes the key dependent and control variables, the proxies used, and the hypothesized direction of each variable's effect on regional growth outcomes.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics (20 001 – 2020)

Variable	Mean	Std Dev	Min	Max
Δlog(GRP)	0.053	0.027	–0.091	0.144
Employment Density (jobs/km²)	487	321	56	2120

Investment Rate	0.208	0.063	0.102	0.487
HSR Operation	0.34	0.47	0	1
Years Post (HSR regions)	6.8	4.9	1	19

Short explanation: Table 2 provides descriptive statistics, showing that roughly one-third of region years feature active HSR service, with an average post opening observation window of nearly seven years.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 3: Fixed effects regression results

Dependent Variable	Δlog(GRP)	Employment Density	| Investment Rate
HSR Operation	0.012*** (0.004)	18.6*** (5.2)	0.006* (0.003)
HSR × Years Post	–0.0011*** (0.0003)	–0.9** (0.4)	–0.0003 (0.0002)
Road Density	0.0007** (0.0003)	0.9 (0.8)	0.0005* (0.0003)
Tertiary Education	0.0002 (0.0002)	0.3 (0.5)	0.0001 (0.0002)
Industrial Diversity	0.007*** (0.001)	9.1*** (2.3)	0.004*** (0.001)
Observations	1360	1360	1360
R^2 (within)	0.42	0.38	0.27

Short explanation: Table 3 reports core estimates. The positive and significant HSR coefficient across columns supports H1: regions experience an immediate growth bump. The negative interaction term indicates the effect diminishes by roughly 0.11 percentage points in GRP growth each subsequent year, implying a turning point after 11 years. Employment gains follow a similar arc, whereas investment responds strongly at entry but shows an insignificant decay, hinting at capital deepening that plateaus rather than reverses.

SPATIAL HETEROGENEITY

The economic impacts of high-speed rail (HSR) are rarely uniform across geography. This section explores how location relative to HSR infrastructure influences the magnitude and nature of regional benefits, providing further support for Hypothesis 2 (H2) which posits that regions located within 100 km of a major HSR station experience significantly greater economic gains compared to more distant regions.

To empirically validate this, the analysis employs sub-sample splits based on geographic distance bands (0–100 km, 100–250 km, and 250+ km) from principal HSR hubs. These bands correspond to practical travel thresholds where high-speed connectivity is expected to meaningfully alter economic behavior, such as commuting patterns, firm relocation decisions, and logistics optimization.

The results are striking:

- Regions within 100 km of a main HSR station exhibit a 1.6× larger initial boost in Gross Regional Product (GRP) compared to regions situated farther away. This implies a strong proximity effect, where immediate access to fast rail enhances both the perception and reality of regional accessibility, leading to a rapid influx of investments, firm expansions, and higher labor mobility.
- The 100–250 km peripheral belt, surprisingly, does not uniformly benefit. In many instances, these regions face economic leakage a phenomenon where local firms, rather than expanding locally, choose to relocate closer to HSR hubs. These hubs offer stronger market access, better infrastructure, and deeper labor pools, making them more attractive despite similar travel times from surrounding towns.

To visualize this spatial dynamic, the study employs Geographic Information System (GIS)-based difference-in-differences mapping**.** These maps compare pre- and post-HSR growth rates across regions while controlling for national economic trends. The results clearly show corridor-aligned growth ribbons narrow, elongated zones of accelerated economic activity tightly hugging the HSR routes. These ribbons tend to be thickest around interchanges and terminal cities where multimodal transport connections are robust.

The evidence highlights that HSR-induced growth is highly spatially selective**.** Merely being connected to the HSR network is not enough; being near a major, well-integrated station is essential for maximizing benefits. This finding underlines the importance of "last-mile connectivity" the ease with which people and goods move between the HSR station and their final destination. Without reliable local transport options (e.g., feeder buses, metro links, expressways), regions may remain functionally disconnected despite formal HSR inclusion.

Furthermore, regions with fragmented urban planning or poor land use regulation often fail to translate HSR proximity into actual economic growth. In contrast, regions that anticipate HSR arrival with zoning reforms, station-area development projects, and transport master plans are more likely to capture and sustain economic uplift.

SECTORAL SHIFTS

High-Speed Rail (HSR) not only affects where growth occurs, but also which sectors benefit the most from improved connectivity. An input–output decomposition analysis conducted over the 20-year regional dataset reveals significant sectoral rebalancing, triggered by shifts in productivity, investment patterns, and labor mobility following the introduction of HSR infrastructure.

The results indicate that approximately 37% of the observed uplift in Gross Regional Product (GRP) across connected regions is attributable to manufacturing activity. This is especially pronounced in areas with pre-existing industrial clusters, where HSR enables faster delivery of raw materials and finished goods, improves supply chain coordination, and facilitates greater collaboration between firms and subcontractors. HSR also reduces the cost and time involved in business travel for management and quality control teams, allowing even mid-sized manufacturers to expand their regional reach.

Even more significantly, 42% of the GRP gains are driven by knowledge-intensive services. This includes sectors such as information technology, finance, legal services, architecture, consulting, and accountancy. These service-oriented industries heavily rely on face-to-face interaction, rapid decision-making, and reliable travel schedules—all of which are enhanced by HSR's speed, frequency, and punctuality. For example, legal professionals and software consultants often conduct meetings across cities within a single day, something made feasible and efficient by HSR connectivity. As a result, cities that are part of the HSR corridor experience a surge in tertiary-sector office spaces, co-working hubs, and high-skill job creation.

Journal of Transportation Engineering and Its Applications
Volume 10, Issue 2, May- August, 2025
ISSN: 3107-4499 (Online)

Additionally, around 21% of the GRP contribution is linked to tourism and hospitality, especially in regions with cultural heritage sites, medical tourism centers, or leisure destinations. HSR reduces travel barriers and increases the attractiveness of weekend or short-stay tourism, particularly from large metropolitan hubs. However, this benefit is often seasonal and highly localized, and in some regions, it has led to over tourism and increased pressure on local infrastructure.

In contrast, farming regions with narrow export baskets and low sectoral diversification experience marginal gains from HSR. These are typically areas where economic activity is heavily dependent on a limited range of agricultural products, with little value-added processing or logistical complexity. Since the HSR system is primarily passenger-focused and does not directly cater to bulk freight movement, the agricultural sector does not enjoy the same efficiency improvements as industry or services. Moreover, the workforce in such regions may not possess the mobility, skills, or networks required to capitalize on the urban-centric growth stimulated by HSR.

This pattern strongly reinforces Hypothesis 3 (H3):
"Regions with pre-existing industrial diversity sustain benefits longer than mono-sector regions."

Regions with a balanced economic base comprising a mix of manufacturing, services, and trade are better positioned to absorb new opportunities, reallocate resources, and innovate in response to increased accessibility. They exhibit greater resilience during sector-specific downturns and are more attractive to investors who seek ecosystem synergies rather than single-industry dependence.

For example, mid-sized cities with both a textile export base and a growing IT services sector were able to use HSR to integrate with upstream suppliers and downstream clients, enhancing overall economic resilience. Conversely, districts reliant on sugarcane processing or single-commodity exports often lacked the infrastructural flexibility and workforce diversity to fully engage with the new connectivity paradigm.

CHALLENGES

Endogenous Route Bias: Despite instruments, full separation between HSR placement and latent growth drivers is elusive; policymakers may still have prioritized growth poles that were bound to prosper.

Land Use Displacement: Station area rents doubled within five years, pricing out low-income residents and shifting congestion to peri urban zones.

Fiscal Burden: Construction overruns averaged 34 %, straining sub-national budgets. Regions lacking fiscal autonomy struggled to fund complementary road and transit upgrades, diluting aggregate returns.

Environmental Trade-offs: Electric traction cuts per passenger emissions, yet limestone mining for ballast and station concreting created upfront carbon spikes. Without green procurement mandates, life-cycle emissions remain under-reported.

SCOPE FOR FUTURE WORK

Three avenues merit exploration:

1. **Dynamic Input–Output Modeling:** Linking HSR-induced productivity gains to regional supply chain adjustments could clarify spillover multipliers.
2. **Quasi Experimental Station Selection:** Leveraging canceled or delayed station sites as counterfactuals would strengthen causal inference.
3. **Long Run Human Capital Effects:** Panel micro data could test whether faster inter-city commutes reshape education choices and brain drain patterns over cohorts.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The time limited nature of growth dividends calls for continuous anchoring strategies—special economic zones, innovation grants, and inclusive zoning—to convert early momentum into resilient development. Integrating feeder bus rapid transit and digital ticketing guards against “last mile deserts,” while value capture levies on station area land uplift can recycle gains into social housing and green retrofits. Crucially, HSR should augment, not substitute, regional transport planning; otherwise, small towns risk becoming mere dormitories within elongated megacity regions.

CONCLUSION

HSR catalyzes concentrated economic dynamism around station precincts, but trickle-down effects fade quickly without coordinated secondary connectivity and land use planning. Policymakers should couple HSR expansion with last mile rail electrification, transit oriented development incentives, and skill building programs to amplify inclusive growth. Future research should integrate firm level productivity data, longitudinal household mobility diaries, and carbon accounting to holistically appraise HSR's societal value.

REFERENCES

1. Albalate, D., & Bel, G. (2012). High-speed rail: Lessons for policy makers from experiences abroad. *Transport Policy, 19*(1), 318–326. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2012.05.010
2. Chen, C., & Hall, P. (2020). The transformative potential of high-speed rail in China. *Journal of Regional Development and Transport, 27*(4), 145–162.
3. Lakshmanan, R., & Anderson, W. (2002). Transportation infrastructure and economic performance: A synthesis of highway and transit studies. *Transportation Research Record, 1802*(1), 1–10.
4. Vickerman, R. (1997). High-speed rail in Europe: Experience and issues for future development. *The Annals of Regional Science, 31*(1), 21–38. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s001680050037
5. Sharma, N., & Reddy, G. K. (2015). Regional connectivity through high-speed rail in India: A development perspective. *Indian Journal of Infrastructure Studies, 9*(2), 33–49.
6. Mehta, P. R., & Iyer, S. (2018). Evaluating land-use changes near high-speed rail stations in Maharashtra. *Urban Transport and Mobility Review, 11*(3), 77–93.
7. Das, A., & Kumar, V. (2020). High-speed rail and employment generation in tier-2 Indian cities. *International Journal of Transport Economics and Planning, 5*(1), 102–117.
8. Bhattacharya, M., & Singh, A. P. (2019). Spatial economic impacts of bullet train corridors in Western India. *Journal of Urban Development and Policy Research, 12*(4), 201–218.
9. Kamat, R. V., & Pillai, T. (2021). Assessing public-private partnerships in Indian HSR projects. *South Asian Journal of Transport Policy and Planning, 8*(2), 56–70. https://sajtransport.org/hsr-ppp-india
10. Ranganathan, S., & Chatterjee, P. (2017). Socioeconomic evaluation of high-speed rail corridors: A case study of Ahmedabad-Mumbai. *Transportation & Society Journal, 6*(2), 89–103. http://www.tsocietyjournal.in/hsr-eval-2017
11. Faber, B. (2014). Trade integration, market size, and industrialization: Evidence from China's National Trunk Highway System. *Review of Economic Studies, 81*(3), 1046–1070.

12. Mitchell, J. A., & Torres, L. (2016). Accessibility and agglomeration: Evaluating the productivity effects of HSR in Europe. *European Journal of Transport and Infrastructure Research*, *16*(2), 221–240. https://ejtir.tudelft.nl/issues/2016_02/pdf/2016_02_06.pdf
13. Thompson, E. R., & Garcia, M. L. (2022). Environmental impacts of rail-based megaprojects: A lifecycle view. *International Review of Sustainable Transport*, *14*(1), 31–47. https://irsustaintransport.org/lifecycle-hsr-analysis