

Evaluating Retrieval-Augmented Generation Strategies for Large Language Models in Travel Mode Choice Prediction

Yiming Xu^{a,*}, Junfeng Jiao^a

^a*School of Architecture, The University of Texas at Austin, 310 Inner Campus Drive, B7500, Austin, 78712, TX, United States*

Abstract

Accurately predicting travel mode choice is essential for effective transportation planning, yet traditional statistical and machine learning models are constrained by rigid assumptions, limited contextual reasoning, and reduced generalizability. This study explores the potential of Large Language Models (LLMs) as a more flexible and context-aware approach to travel mode choice prediction, enhanced by Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) to ground predictions in empirical data. We develop a modular framework for integrating RAG into LLM-based travel mode choice prediction and evaluate four retrieval strategies: basic RAG, RAG with balanced retrieval, RAG with a cross-encoder for re-ranking, and RAG with balanced retrieval and cross-encoder for re-ranking. These strategies are tested across three LLM architectures (OpenAI GPT-4o, o4-mini, and o3) to examine the interaction between model reasoning capabilities and retrieval methods. Using the 2023 Puget Sound Regional Household Travel Survey data, we conduct a series of experiments to evaluate model performance. The results demonstrate that RAG substantially enhances predictive accuracy across a range of models. Notably, the GPT-4o model combined with balanced retrieval and cross-encoder re-ranking achieves the highest accuracy of 80.8%, exceeding that of conventional statistical and machine learning baselines. Furthermore, LLM-based models exhibit superior generalization abilities relative to these baselines. Findings highlight the critical interplay between LLM reasoning capabilities and retrieval strategies, demonstrating the importance of aligning retrieval strategies with model capabilities to maximize the potential of LLM-based travel behavior modeling.

Keywords: Travel mode choice, Large Language Model, Retrieval-Augmented Generation, Travel behavior, Comparative study

1. Introduction

The process by which individuals select a particular mode of transportation for a trip, known as travel mode choice, stands as one of the most critical and extensively studied components within the broader field of travel demand forecasting (Ben-Akiva and Lerman, 1985). The accurate prediction of these choices is not only a technical exercise in transportation modeling but also a fundamental prerequisite for effective

*Corresponding author. Address: 310 Inner Campus Drive, B7500, Austin, TX 78712. Phone: +01 352-871-3481. Email: yiming.xu@utexas.edu

urban planning, sustainable development, and the enhancement of public well-being (Handy, 1996; Schneider, 2013). The decisions individuals make—whether to drive, take public transit, cycle, or walk—aggregate into system-level outcomes that significantly shape the urban fabric. These collective choices dictate the demand for transportation infrastructure, influence the severity of traffic congestion, determine the environmental footprint of mobility, and ultimately define the quality of life within a city. Consequently, the ability to develop robust and reliable travel mode choice prediction models is essential for policymakers and planners striving to create efficient, equitable, and livable urban environments.

Predicting travel mode choice is inherently complex, influenced by traveler demographics, trip characteristics, and transportation options (Barff et al., 1982; Bhat, 2000; Buehler, 2011; Paulssen et al., 2014). Traditionally, discrete choice models like the Multinomial Logit (MNL), grounded in random utility maximization, have provided interpretable behavioral insights through model coefficients (Ben-Akiva and Bierlaire, 1999; Ben-Akiva and Lerman, 1985; Bhat, 1995). However, their rigid assumptions often fail to capture the non-linear dynamics of human behavior, leading to biased predictions. Machine learning models, such as Random Forests, improve predictive accuracy by learning complex patterns directly from data but at the cost of interpretability (Hagenauer and Helbich, 2017; Zhao et al., 2020). Moreover, both approaches rely on structured numerical data and lack contextual reasoning, limiting their generalizability to novel situations or policies beyond their training scope.

The recent emergence of Large Language Models (LLMs) presents a new paradigm with the potential to resolve these limitations. Pre-trained on vast corpora of text, LLMs possess a unique capacity for context-awareness, allowing them to interpret unstructured, qualitative information (Achiam et al., 2024). More importantly, LLMs exhibit emergent reasoning capabilities. Through techniques like Chain-of-Thought (COT), they can articulate a step-by-step rationale for their predictions in natural language, offering a transparent and intuitive form of explainability (Xu et al., 2025). Furthermore, their strong zero-shot and few-shot learning abilities make them highly data-efficient and generalizable.

Despite their power, LLMs are prone to generating hallucinations, and their knowledge is limited to their training data. To overcome this for high-stakes applications like transportation planning, Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) has emerged as a critical enabling technology. RAG enhances an LLM by dynamically retrieving relevant, external information—in this case, similar past trips from a database—and providing it to the model as context for its prediction (Lewis et al., 2021). This process grounds the LLM’s reasoning in empirical data, mitigating the risk of hallucination and transforming a general-purpose model into a specialized, data-driven decision-making tool (Gao et al., 2024).

While the potential of LLMs and RAG is clear, their application to travel mode choice prediction remains limited. This study addresses two critical research gaps. First, there is a need for a systematic evaluation of advanced RAG strategies to understand how different retrieval methods, from basic retrieval to more sophisticated pipelines, impact predictive accuracy. Second, the interplay between the choice of the underlying LLM architecture and the RAG strategy has not been examined. It is unclear whether a more powerful base model is always superior, or if a less advanced

model can achieve better performance when paired with a highly optimized retrieval system. Answering this is essential for establishing best practices for deploying these models effectively.

This paper aims to fill these gaps through a comparative study. Its primary contributions are twofold. First, we propose a comprehensive framework for applying LLMs to travel mode choice prediction, systematically testing five distinct methodologies: zero-shot prediction, basic RAG, RAG with balanced retrieval, RAG with a cross-encoder for re-ranking, and RAG with balanced retrieval and cross-encoder for re-ranking. Second, we conduct a set of experiments on a contemporary dataset using three different LLM architectures (gpt-4o, o4-mini, and o3) to explore the best practices for model and strategy selection, offering practical guidance for future research and applications.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Travel Mode Choice Modeling

The study of travel mode choice is a mature field in transportation research, recognized as a critical step in travel demand forecasting (Ben-Akiva and Bierlaire, 1999; Ben-Akiva and Lerman, 1985; Hasnine and Nurul Habib, 2021). The choice of a travel mode is a complex decision influenced by a wide array of factors. These are broadly categorized into three groups: characteristics of the traveler, features of the trip, and attributes of the transportation system and built environment (Bhat, 2000; Buehler, 2011; Eldeeb et al., 2021). Traveler characteristics include socio-demographic and economic factors like age, gender, income, and vehicle ownership. Trip characteristics encompass variables such as travel distance, time of day, and trip purpose (e.g., work, school, leisure). Finally, system and environmental attributes include the level of service of different modes (travel time, cost), the quality of infrastructure (e.g., availability of sidewalks and bike lanes), and exogenous factors like weather conditions and land use patterns.

Based on these factors, two primary paradigms have been developed for travel mode choice modeling: statistical models and machine learning models. For decades, the field has relied on discrete choice models, particularly the Multinomial Logit and Nested Logit models (Ben-Akiva and Bierlaire, 1999; Ben-Akiva and Lerman, 1985; Bhat, 1995, 2000). Rooted in the economic theory of random utility maximization, the primary strength of logit models is their high degree of interpretability. Their coefficients have clear behavioral meanings, allowing planners to understand why choices are made. However, logit models are built on strict statistical assumptions, such as the Independence of Irrelevant Alternatives (IIA) property, and they struggle to capture the complex, non-linear relationships inherent in human behavior, which can lead to biased predictions (Zhao et al., 2020).

In response to the predictive shortcomings of statistical models, researchers have increasingly turned to machine learning techniques such as random forests, gradient boosting methods, and neural networks (Chen and Cheng, 2023; Cheng et al., 2019; Hagenauer and Helbich, 2017; Lee et al., 2018; Zhao et al., 2020). The primary advantage of these models is their superior predictive accuracy, as their data-driven nature allows them to learn complex, non-linear patterns. However, this predictive power is

typically achieved at the expense of interpretability, leading to the well-known "black box" problem (Xu et al., 2021; Zhao et al., 2020). While an ML model may accurately predict what mode an individual will choose, its internal logic is often opaque, limiting its utility for policy analysis.

In addition, both statistical and machine learning models are limited by their very nature as mathematical constructs operating on structured, numerical data. They lack any genuine understanding of the real-world context of a trip or the lived experience of the traveler (Ge et al., 2025). This absence of contextual reasoning limits the generalizability of these models, especially when attempting to predict behavior in novel situations or under policy regimes that fall outside the distribution of the training data.

2.2. LLMs in Travel Behavior Modeling

The recent emergence of large language models has introduced a new frontier for modeling complex human behaviors, including discrete choice and decision-making (Adornetto et al., 2025; Ge et al., 2025; Gong et al., 2024; Jiawei et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2025a,b; Ying et al., 2025). Unlike traditional models that require structured numerical inputs, LLMs can process and reason over rich, descriptive text. This capability allows them to potentially capture more nuanced aspects of a choice context. Studies have shown that LLMs can achieve impressive performance on various decision-making tasks by leveraging in-context learning, where examples are provided in the prompt to guide the model's prediction (Ge et al., 2025; Zhang and Xu, 2025). This approach, often referred to as zero-shot or few-shot prompting, has been explored for tasks ranging from consumer product choice to policy decisions, demonstrating the potential of LLMs as "zero-data" classifiers.

The application of LLMs specifically to travel mode choice prediction is a nascent but promising area of research. Initial studies suggest that LLMs can predict travel modes by reasoning over textual descriptions of trip scenarios without requiring explicit model training (Liu et al., 2024; Nie et al., 2025; Zhang and Xu, 2025). This presents a significant departure from the data-intensive and statistically rigid methods that have historically dominated the field. However, the "zero-shot" performance of LLMs in this domain is often constrained by the model's internal knowledge, which may not perfectly align with the specific geographic or demographic context of a given travel survey (Liu et al., 2024). The models can be sensitive to prompt phrasing and may not consistently outperform finely-tuned traditional models without specialized adaptation. To address these shortcomings, researchers are exploring retrieval-augmented strategies. Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) enhances LLM predictions by providing the model with relevant examples retrieved from a specific dataset, effectively grounding the model's reasoning in contextually appropriate information (Lewis et al., 2021). However, there is no existing study on using RAG to enhance LLMs' prediction for travel mode choice. This study builds upon this emerging body of work by systematically evaluating how different RAG strategies and LLM architectures can be optimized to improve the accuracy of travel mode choice prediction, moving beyond simple zero-shot approaches to create more robust and context-aware models.

3. Methodology

3.1. Problem Formulation

The task of travel mode choice prediction is formally defined as a multi-class classification problem. The objective is to predict the transportation mode that an individual traveler will choose for a specific trip, given a set of influencing factors related to the traveler and the trip (Barff et al., 1982; Ben-Akiva and Lerman, 1985).

Consider a traveler n from a set of N individuals who is making a trip t . The traveler faces a discrete choice set M containing k independent travel mode alternatives, such that $M = \{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_k\}$. We assume that all the travelers share the same set of choices M . The choice made by traveler n for trip t is denoted by y_{nt} , where $y_{nt} \in M$. The decision-making process is influenced by a vector of input features, X_{nt} , which represents the context of the choice. This feature vector is composed of several categories of attributes, including traveler characteristics (e.g., age, gender, income) and trip characteristics (e.g., distance, purpose).

The core problem is to learn a mapping function, f , that takes the feature vector X_{nt} as input and outputs a predicted travel mode, \hat{y}_{nt} , such that

$$\hat{y}_{nt} = f(X_{nt}) \quad (1)$$

In a probabilistic framework, the model estimates the conditional probability $P(y_{nt} = m | X_{nt})$ for each mode $m \in M$. The final predicted mode is the one that maximizes this probability:

$$\hat{y}_{nt} = \operatorname{argmax}_{m \in M} P(y_{nt} = m | X_{nt}) \quad (2)$$

This general formulation applies to traditional discrete choice models, conventional machine learning classifiers, and the LLM-based approaches investigated in this study. In the context of LLMs, the structured feature vector X_{nt} is transformed into a natural language prompt that describes the choice scenario. The LLM then processes this textual input to generate the prediction y_{nt} , leveraging its reasoning and context-awareness capabilities to perform the classification task.

3.2. Travel Mode Choice Prediction Framework

To systematically evaluate the performance of LLMs in travel mode choice prediction, we developed a modular framework with RAG. This framework is designed to ingest structured tabular data, construct a searchable knowledge base of past travel behaviors, and employ various retrieval strategies to elicit reasoned predictions from an LLM. As presented in Figure 1, the architecture comprises a multi-stage pipeline, starting with a data serialization phase and culminating in a retrieval and generation phase to make predictions for new, unseen trips.

The process begins with data serialization, which converts tabular survey data into a text format that the model can natively process. Each record in the tabular dataset, representing a unique trip with its associated traveler characteristics, is converted into a coherent, human-readable natural language description. This table-to-text generation process uses a template-based approach where feature names and their corresponding values are woven into sentences (e.g., "The trip distance is 5 miles. The traveler is 35




Figure 1: Framework for travel mode choice prediction using RAG augmented LLM

years old.”). Once serialized, the entire dataset is split into a training set and a test set to ensure a rigorous evaluation of the model’s ability to generalize. Note that the travel mode choice for trips in the test set is masked to avoid information leakage.

After that, the serialized training set is used to construct the external knowledge base. Each text description of a trip in the training data is treated as a document. These documents are then processed by an embedding model, which converts the text into high-dimensional vector representations. These vectors are subsequently indexed and stored in a specialized vector database. For this framework, we utilize Facebook AI Similarity Search (FAISS), a library optimized for highly efficient similarity search of dense vectors (Douze et al., 2025). This indexed vector store serves as the retriever, providing a searchable knowledge base of past trips that the LLM can query at inference time.

At the core of the framework is a retrieval-and-generation process executed for each trip in the test set. The retrieval stage embeds the serialized text of a test trip (the query) and performs a similarity search against the FAISS index to identify the most analogous trips in the vector store. The key goal of this study is to compare the performance of different retrieval strategies within this framework. Accordingly, we evaluate four distinct RAG strategies. The first is a basic RAG that retrieves the top-most similar examples. The second incorporates balanced retrieval, which addresses class imbalance by selecting a more diverse set of examples across travel modes. The third employs a cross-encoder re-ranking mechanism, implementing a two-stage process that refines the initial retrieval results to maximize relevance. Finally, the fourth strategy combines balanced retrieval with cross-encoder re-ranking. Detailed descriptions of these approaches are provided in the following section.

Finally, the documents obtained from the selected retrieval strategy are used to construct an augmented prompt for the LLM. This prompt is carefully engineered with three key components: an instruction that clearly defines the travel mode choice prediction task, the context containing the retrieved, similar trip descriptions, and the input data representing the test trip itself. An example of the augmented prompt is as follows:

You are a transportation behavior expert that predicts trip mode. Based on the provided trip details and similar past trips, what is the most likely trip mode? Only output one of: [Drive, Walk, Transit, Bike/Micromobility].

Trip details:

The trip distance is 5 miles, and trip purpose is work. Trip starts at 7:00. Traveler is 25-34 years old, female, with a Bachelor's degree. Her household owns 1 vehicle, and the household income is \$100,000-\$199,999.

Relevant past trips:

The trip distance is 4 miles, and trip purpose is work. Trip starts at 9:00. Traveler is 25-34 years old, female, with a Bachelor's degree. Her household owns 2 vehicles, and the household income is \$100,000-\$199,999. Trip mode is Drive.

By providing the LLM with these relevant, in-context examples, the model is grounded in empirical data from the knowledge base. This process enhances the accuracy and contextual awareness of the LLM's final prediction while mitigating the risk of hallucination.

3.3. RAG Strategies

The effectiveness of a RAG system is fundamentally dependent on the quality and relevance of the information retrieved and provided to the LLM as context. The retrieval strategy dictates which examples from the knowledge base are selected to inform the model's prediction. To identify the most effective method for travel mode choice prediction, this study implements and systematically compares three distinct RAG strategies, including basic RAG, RAG with balanced retrieval, and RAG with a cross-encoder for re-ranking. Figure 2 provides an overview of the workflows for the three strategies.




Figure 2: Overview of Basic RAG, RAG with Balanced Retrieval, RAG with a Cross-Encoder for Re-ranking, and RAG with Balanced Retrieval and Cross-Encoder for Re-ranking

3.3.1. Basic RAG

The Basic RAG strategy represents a standard implementation of the retrieval-augmented framework. In this approach, the retriever leverages a vector store (e.g., FAISS) to perform semantic similarity search over an indexed corpus of training trip descriptions.

Let each serialized trip description d_i in the training dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_N\}$ be mapped into a high-dimensional embedding space \mathbb{R}^m using a pre-trained embedding model $f_\theta(\cdot)$:

$$\mathbf{z}_i = f_\theta(d_i) \in \mathbb{R}^m \quad (3)$$

where f_θ is typically a transformer-based encoder (e.g., Sentence-BERT) parameterized by θ . For a query trip description q from the test set, the embedding is computed as:

$$\mathbf{z}_q = f_\theta(q) \quad (4)$$

To retrieve relevant context, the retriever computes the cosine similarity between the query embedding \mathbf{z}_q and all stored embeddings \mathbf{z}_i in the database:

$$\text{sim}(\mathbf{z}_q, \mathbf{z}_i) = \frac{\mathbf{z}_q \cdot \mathbf{z}_i}{\|\mathbf{z}_q\| \|\mathbf{z}_i\|} \quad (5)$$

The retriever then selects the top- k documents:

$$\mathcal{R}(q) = \arg \text{top-}k \underset{d_i \in \mathcal{D}}{\text{sim}}(\mathbf{z}_q, \mathbf{z}_i) \quad (6)$$

yielding a set of k nearest neighbors $\{d_{(1)}, d_{(2)}, \dots, d_{(k)}\}$.

These top- k documents are concatenated to form an augmented context \tilde{C}_q , which is prepended to the query and passed to the LLM for conditional generation:

$$y_q = \text{LLM}([q \oplus \tilde{C}_q]) \quad (7)$$

where \oplus denotes concatenation and y_q is the predicted outcome (i.e., travel mode).

While this method is computationally efficient and straightforward to implement, it is limited by its reliance on pure semantic similarity. Specifically, high cosine similarity in the embedding space does not necessarily guarantee the retrieval of the most informative or task-relevant documents, potentially reducing prediction accuracy when the semantic neighbors are not aligned with the decision boundary relevant to the task.

3.3.2. RAG with Balanced Retrieval

Travel mode choice datasets are often characterized by a significant class imbalance, where common modes like driving are heavily overrepresented compared to minority modes like transit. A basic RAG approach on such a dataset is likely to retrieve a disproportionate number of examples from the majority class, leading to bias in the LLM’s prediction. The RAG with Balanced Retrieval strategy is designed specifically to mitigate this issue. Instead of retrieving the top- k most similar documents overall, this method ensures a diverse and representative set of examples is selected. It works by performing a separate similarity search for each travel mode category and retrieving a pre-defined number of the top examples from each class.

Let the set of possible travel mode classes be $\mathcal{C} = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_M\}$, where M denotes the number of travel mode categories. Each training document $d_i \in \mathcal{D}$ is associated with both its embedding $\mathbf{z}_i = f_\theta(d_i)$ and its mode label $\ell_i \in \mathcal{C}$. For a given query q , the embedding is computed as:

$$\mathbf{z}_q = f_\theta(q) \quad (8)$$

Instead of a single global similarity ranking, Balanced Retrieval partitions the training corpus into subsets by class:

$$\mathcal{D}_{c_j} = \{d_i \in \mathcal{D} \mid \ell_i = c_j\}, \quad j = 1, \dots, M \quad (9)$$

For each class c_j , the retriever selects the top- k_j most similar documents based on cosine similarity:

$$\mathcal{R}_{c_j}(q) = \arg \operatorname{top-}k_j \operatorname{sim}(\mathbf{z}_q, \mathbf{z}_i)_{d_i \in \mathcal{D}_{c_j}}. \quad (10)$$

The final retrieval set is the union of class-specific retrievals:

$$\mathcal{R}(q) = \bigcup_{j=1}^M \mathcal{R}_{c_j}(q), \quad (11)$$

For balanced retrieval, k_j is typically uniform across classes. For example, if $K = 8$ and $M = 4$, then the strategy retrieves two examples per class, regardless of their prevalence in the dataset. This balanced formulation ensures that the LLM has access to precedents from every possible travel mode, preventing majority classes from dominating the prompt.

3.3.3. RAG with a Cross-Encoder for Re-ranking

The RAG with a Cross-Encoder for Re-Ranking strategy introduces a two-stage retrieval pipeline designed to maximize the relevance of the retrieved documents, thereby enhancing the quality of the context provided to the LLM. This approach balances computational efficiency with precision by combining a lightweight bi-encoder retriever for initial recall with a more expressive cross-encoder model for refined ranking.

In the first stage, a fast bi-encoder retriever is employed to identify a large set of candidate documents. Each document $d_i \in \mathcal{D}$ is encoded independently into a dense vector embedding $\mathbf{z}_i = f_\theta(d_i)$, while the query q is embedded as $\mathbf{z}_q = f_\theta(q)$. The semantic similarity between query and document is measured using cosine similarity, and the retriever selects the top- K' candidate documents:

$$\mathcal{C}(q) = \arg \operatorname{top-}K' \operatorname{sim}_{\text{bi}}(\mathbf{z}_q, \mathbf{z}_i)_{d_i \in \mathcal{D}} \quad (12)$$

where K' is larger than the final retrieval size (e.g., $K' = 50$), ensuring broad coverage of potentially relevant candidates.

In the second stage, the candidate set $\mathcal{C}(q)$ is refined using a cross-encoder model $g_\phi(\cdot, \cdot)$, parameterized by ϕ . Unlike the bi-encoder, which computes independent embeddings, the cross-encoder jointly processes the query and each candidate document

as a pair (q, d_i) . This yields a contextualized relevance score:

$$s_i = g_\phi(q, d_i), \quad d_i \in \mathcal{C}(q) \quad (13)$$

The cross-encoder’s joint representation enables deeper semantic alignment, as it attends simultaneously to both query and document tokens. The candidates are then re-ranked according to their scores:

$$\mathcal{R}(q) = \arg \operatorname{top-}K_{d_i \in \mathcal{C}(q)} s_i \quad (14)$$

where $K < K'$ specifies the final number of documents selected.

By combining a fast approximate retriever for broad candidate selection with a computationally intensive cross-encoder for fine-grained ranking, this two-stage strategy ensures that the context provided to the LLM is both comprehensive and of the highest possible quality.

3.3.4. RAG with Balanced Retrieval and Cross-Encoder for Re-Ranking

The RAG with Balanced Retrieval and Cross-Encoder for Re-Ranking strategy integrates the complementary advantages of class balancing and fine-grained re-ranking into a unified two-stage pipeline. While Balanced Retrieval mitigates class imbalance by ensuring that minority modes are equally represented in the retrieved set, the Cross-Encoder introduces a subsequent refinement step to optimize contextual relevance. This combined approach ensures that the LLM receives in-context examples that are both diverse across classes and maximally relevant to the query.

As in the Balanced Retrieval framework, the corpus is first partitioned into subsets by mode category:

$$\mathcal{D}_{c_j} = \{d_i \in \mathcal{D} \mid \ell_i = c_j\}, \quad j = 1, \dots, M \quad (15)$$

where M is the number of mode categories.

From each class subset, the retriever selects the top- k_j candidates:

$$\mathcal{C}_{c_j}(q) = \arg \operatorname{top-}k_j_{d_i \in \mathcal{D}_{c_j}} \operatorname{sim}_{\text{bi}}(\mathbf{z}_q, \mathbf{z}_i) \quad (16)$$

The union of these class-specific candidate sets forms the overall candidate pool:

$$\mathcal{C}(q) = \bigcup_{j=1}^M \mathcal{C}_{c_j}(q) \quad (17)$$

The candidate pool $\mathcal{C}(q)$ is passed to a cross-encoder model $g_\phi(\cdot, \cdot)$, which jointly encodes the query–document pairs and produces contextualized relevance scores:

$$s_i = g_\phi(q, d_i), \quad d_i \in \mathcal{C}(q) \quad (18)$$

The candidates are then re-ranked based on these scores, and the top- K documents

are selected:

$$\mathcal{R}(q) = \arg \operatorname{top-}K_{d_i \in \mathcal{C}(q)} s_i \quad (19)$$

By combining balanced retrieval with cross-encoder re-ranking, this hybrid strategy ensures that retrieved examples are simultaneously representative across all classes and fine-tuned for semantic relevance, thereby achieving robustness against class imbalance and maximizing prediction quality.

4. Experiments

4.1. Dataset

The data for this study is sourced from the 2023 Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) Household Travel Survey. The PSRC survey is a comprehensive, ongoing data collection effort that captures day-to-day travel information from households across the central Puget Sound region in Washington State. The survey’s primary goal is to develop a complete picture of regional travel patterns, including how, where, and why people travel, to support transportation and land-use planning. This rich dataset provides detailed records on individual trips, along with the socio-demographic characteristics of the travelers and their households.

In this study, we extracted a specific subset of the survey data focusing on trips that occurred within the city of Seattle, WA. The temporal scope was limited to a single month, from May 1, 2023, to May 31, 2023, to ensure a consistent and contemporary sample of trips. The raw data underwent a cleaning process, which involved removing records with missing or incomplete information for the key variables required by the model. The final clean dataset consists of 2,847 individual trip records suitable for analysis. The dataset was then partitioned, with 80% of the data allocated to the training set and the remaining 20% reserved for the test set to evaluate model performance.

The processed dataset contains a set of independent variables selected based on their established influence on travel mode choice in the literature, as well as a single outcome variable representing the chosen mode. The outcome variable for the prediction task is Trip Mode, which is a categorical variable with four possible outcomes: Drive, Walk, Transit, and Bike/Micromobility. The independent variables used to model the travel mode choice are categorized as traveler characteristics and trip characteristics. Traveler characteristics describe the individual making the trip and their household context, including age, gender, education level, household income, and the number of vehicles in the household. Trip characteristics describe the trip itself, including the trip distance, the trip purpose (e.g., work, shopping, social), and the start time of the trip. It is worth noting that the original dataset also contained a trip duration variable, which is a direct outcome of mode choice (e.g., walking a mile takes longer than driving). It would artificially inflate the model’s predictive accuracy, compromising the validity of the evaluation. Therefore, the trip duration variable is excluded from the data to prevent information leakage. The descriptive statistics of the variables used in this study are presented in Table 1.

To assess the generalization ability of the models beyond the primary dataset, we utilized two additional datasets for evaluation. The first is a subset of the 2023 PSRC

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of variables

Variable	Value	Frequency/Mean	Percentage/SD
Outcome Variable			
Trip Mode	Drive	1271	44.64%
	Walk	1031	36.21%
	Transit	379	13.31%
	Bike/Micromobility	166	5.83%
Traveler Characteristics			
Age	18-24	288	10.12%
	25-34	877	30.80%
	35-44	757	26.59%
	45-54	358	12.57%
	55-64	276	9.69%
	65-74	224	7.87%
	75 or older	67	2.35%
Gender	Male	1261	44.29%
	Female	1530	53.74%
	Non-binary	56	1.97%
Education Level	Less than high school	25	0.88%
	High school	151	5.30%
	Some college	239	8.39%
	Vocational/technical training	14	0.49%
	Associates degree	128	4.50%
	Bachelor degree	1259	44.22%
Household Income	Graduate degree	1031	36.21%
	Under \$25,000	182	6.39%
	\$25,000-\$49,999	447	15.70%
	\$50,000-\$74,999	335	11.77%
	\$75,000-\$99,999	465	16.33%
	\$100,000-\$199,999	848	29.79%
Vehicles in Household	\$200,000 or more	570	20.02%
		1.03	0.78
Trip Characteristics			
Trip Distance (mile)		2.28	2.33
Start Time		14.08	4.32
Trip Purpose	Home	1074	37.72%
	Work	390	13.70%
	Social/Recreation	463	16.26%
	Shopping	341	11.98%
	Meal	219	7.69%
	Business/Errand	140	4.92%
	Escort	131	4.60%
	Overnight	68	2.39%
	School	18	0.63%
	Change mode	3	0.11%

Household Travel Survey focusing specifically on trips that occurred within the city of Tacoma, WA. The second is a subset of the 2022 National Household Travel Survey (NHTS) restricted to trips that occurred within urban areas. From each of these two datasets, we randomly sampled 569 trips, which matches the sample size of our test set, to ensure a consistent evaluation setting. These additional datasets enable us to examine the transferability of the models to different contexts while controlling for sample size effects. The descriptive statistics of these test sets are presented in Table A.4 in the Appendix.

4.2. Model Settings

This section details the specific LLMs evaluated and the parameters used for both the LLM generation and the RAG pipeline.

A key objective of this study is to understand the interplay between the base model’s capabilities and the retrieval strategy. To this end, We selected three distinct LLM architectures from OpenAI, representing different points on the spectrum of capability, speed, and cost:

- **GPT-4o**: OpenAI’s multimodal model, which can process and generate combinations of text, audio, and images. Moderate speed, moderate reasoning ability, high cost. In this study, the temperature parameter was set to 0.
- **o3**: OpenAI’s powerful reasoning model, which excels at complex tasks that require step-by-step logical deduction. Slow speed, high reasoning ability, high cost.
- **o4-mini**: A smaller, faster, and more affordable reasoning model, optimized for high efficiency and speed, particularly in reasoning tasks. Fastest and cheapest.

The configuration of RAG was held constant across all three LLMs. We used OpenAI’s text-embedding-3-large model as the embedding model. The vector embeddings of the training data were indexed and stored using FAISS. All models shared the same vector store. For the Basic RAG and RAG with Balanced Retrieval strategies, we set the number of retrieved documents to 4. For the RAG with a Cross-Encoder for Re-ranking strategy and the RAG with Balanced Retrieval and Cross-Encoder for Re-ranking strategy, the initial retrieval stage retrieved a larger set of 20 candidate documents. These were then re-ranked to select the final 4 most relevant documents.

4.3. Baseline Models

To properly evaluate the performance of the proposed frameworks, we selected four baseline models, including:

- **Multinomial Logit (MNL)**: MNL is the most widely-used discrete choice model in transportation research. It assumes that each alternative has an associated utility composed of a deterministic part and a random error. The choice probabilities are calculated based on utility.
- **Random Forest (RF)**: RF is an ensemble learning method built on decision trees, widely recognized for its strong performance in travel mode choice modeling. Its data-driven, non-parametric structure enables it to capture complex, non-linear relationships within the data, leading to robust and accurate predictions.
- **Multi-layer Perceptron (MLP)**: MLP is well-regarded for its ability to extract and model complex, high-dimensional patterns directly from data. MLPs have been widely applied in transportation research for various classification problems.
- **Zero-Shot LLM**: In this configuration, the LLM is prompted with only a description of the task and the serialized text of the trip to be predicted, without being provided any in-context examples from the training data. This method evaluates the LLM’s inherent ability to perform the travel mode choice prediction task based solely on its pre-trained knowledge and reasoning capabilities.

4.4. Evaluation

We employ four metrics to evaluate the predictive performance of the models, including accuracy, precision, recall, and the F1-score. The metrics are calculated by:

$$Accuracy = \frac{TP + TN}{TP + TN + FP + FN} \quad (20)$$

$$Precision = \frac{TP}{TP + FP} \quad (21)$$

$$Recall = \frac{TP}{TP + FN} \quad (22)$$

$$F1 = \frac{2 \times Precision \times Recall}{Precision + Recall} \quad (23)$$

where TP is true positives, TN is true negatives, FP is false positives, and FN is false negatives. For this multi-class problem, we use weighted precision, recall, and F1-scores, where each class’s metric is weighted by its sample size.

5. Results

5.1. Model Performance

The comprehensive empirical outcomes of our comparative evaluation are presented in Table 2. The highest overall classification accuracy achieved is 0.808, obtained by the GPT-4o model when augmented with the RAG with Balanced Retrieval and Cross-Encoder for Re-ranking approach. This combination also yielded the highest F1 score (0.790) and recall (0.808). Concurrently, the highest measure of precision is 0.804, realized by the GPT-4o model, through the application of RAG with a Cross-Encoder for Re-ranking. Notably, all RAG-augmented LLMs outperformed the statistical and machine learning baselines, underscoring the effectiveness of RAG in enhancing LLM performance in our experiments. The performance of models with different LLM architectures and RAG strategies is presented in Figure 3.




Figure 3: Model performance with different LLM architectures and RAG strategies

A significant finding is the exceptionally strong zero-shot performance of the o3 model, which achieved an accuracy of 0.783 and an F1 score of 0.760. This capability

Table 2: Performance of baseline models and LLMs under different RAG strategies. The best-performing value is highlighted in **bold**, and the second-best value is underlined.

Model	Method	Accuracy	F1 Score	Recall	Precision
MNL	-	0.738	0.698	0.738	0.678
RF	-	0.747	0.714	0.747	0.691
MLP	-	0.736	0.716	0.736	0.709
GPT-4o	Zero-shot	0.711	0.691	0.711	0.737
	Basic RAG	0.776	0.731	0.776	0.727
	RAG + Balanced Retrieval	0.794	0.762	0.794	<u>0.801</u>
	RAG + Re-ranking	0.790	0.756	0.790	0.804
	RAG + Balanced Retrieval + Re-ranking	0.808	0.790	0.808	0.801
o4-mini	Zero-shot	0.724	0.723	0.724	0.737
	Basic RAG	0.754	0.718	0.754	0.732
	RAG + Balanced Retrieval	0.762	0.745	0.762	0.739
	RAG + Re-ranking	0.780	0.748	0.780	0.747
	RAG + Balanced Retrieval + Re-ranking	0.755	0.742	0.755	0.743
o3	Zero-shot	0.783	0.760	0.783	0.754
	Basic RAG	0.782	0.744	0.782	0.757
	RAG + Balanced Retrieval	0.769	0.744	0.769	0.750
	RAG + Re-ranking	0.799	0.768	0.799	0.792
	RAG + Balanced Retrieval + Re-ranking	<u>0.801</u>	<u>0.788</u>	<u>0.801</u>	0.786

surpasses all traditional baselines and even the RAG-augmented performance of the o4-mini model. This high baseline fundamentally alters the impact of RAG for this specific model. While the introduction of a basic RAG pipeline provided a solid improvement for GPT-4o (accuracy increased from 0.711 to 0.776) and o4-mini (accuracy increased from 0.724 to 0.754), it had an adverse effect on the o3 model. The accuracy of o3 model slightly decreased to 0.782 with Basic RAG, suggesting that for a model with an advanced reasoning capability, a simple retrieval mechanism can introduce noise that hinders rather than helps performance.

This trend continues with the RAG with Balanced Retrieval. While this technique improved performance for both GPT-4o (accuracy increased from 0.711 to 0.794) and o4-mini (accuracy increased from 0.724 to 0.762), it caused a further decline in performance for the o3 model, with accuracy dropping from 0.783 to 0.769. This reinforces the observation that for the o3 model, standard and moderately improved RAG techniques were not only failing to unlock further potential but were actively degrading its high-quality zero-shot predictions. For GPT-4o, however, this method was highly effective, boosting accuracy from 0.711 to 0.794 and F1 score from 0.691 to 0.762.

The RAG with a Cross-Encoder for Re-ranking strategy proved to be effective in boosting performance, though its effect varied by model. For the o3 model, this RAG method provided a benefit over its zero-shot baseline, pushing its accuracy to 0.799. This indicates that only a highly optimized retrieval pipeline that surfaces the most relevant evidence is capable of augmenting o3’s powerful intrinsic reasoning. For GPT-

4o, the re-ranker acted as a specialist tool, slightly lowering accuracy from its peak but increasing precision to 0.804, the highest recorded value. This highlights a critical trade-off: the o3 configuration is superior for overall accuracy, while the GPT-4o setup is preferable for applications where avoiding false positives is paramount.

The combination of Balanced Retrieval with Cross-Encoder Re-Ranking yielded the strongest overall performance for the GPT-4o model and the o3 model, underscoring the complementary strengths of diversity and precision in retrieval. For GPT-4o, this hybrid strategy proved particularly effective, achieving an accuracy of 0.808, an F1 score of 0.790, and a recall of 0.808, which are the highest values observed in the entire evaluation. In addition, this improvement was obtained without sacrificing precision, which remained competitive at 0.801. For the o3 model, the combined strategy also reached its peak performance with an accuracy of 0.801 and F1 score of 0.788, thereby surpassing its already strong zero-shot and re-ranking-only baselines. By contrast, o4-mini experienced only marginal gains from the combination. These results indicate that while advanced models like GPT-4o and o3 can benefit from re-ranking alone, the fusion of class-balancing and re-ranking is the most robust retrieval strategy.

In summary, the results highlight the complex interplay between LLM architecture and RAG strategy. While all RAG-augmented configurations outperform traditional baselines, the path to optimal performance differs across models. The o3 model demonstrates strong zero-shot performance, with basic and balanced retrieval methods actually degrading its accuracy, emphasizing that retrieval augmentation is not inherently beneficial for models with advanced reasoning capabilities. Nevertheless, when paired with a highly optimized pipeline that combines balanced retrieval with cross-encoder re-ranking, o3 achieves its peak performance, surpassing its zero-shot baseline in accuracy, F1 score, and recall. For GPT-4o, the hybrid strategy delivers the best overall results, producing the highest observed accuracy (0.808), F1 score (0.790), and recall (0.808), while re-ranking alone yields the strongest precision (0.804). These findings demonstrate that effective augmentation requires alignment between model architecture and retrieval design.

5.2. Generalization Ability

We used two external datasets to evaluate the generalization ability of the models beyond the primary dataset. These datasets include a subset of 2023 PSRC Household Travel Survey trips within Tacoma, WA, which is more similar in sampling and context to the training and test data, and a subset of 2022 NHTS trips within urban areas, which represents a more distinct distributional shift. The models were directly tested on these datasets, without any retraining or hyperparameter tuning. The performance of the models on these datasets is presented in Table 3.

On the 2023 PSRC-Tacoma subset, all three LLM-based models (GPT-4o, o4-mini, o3) demonstrated substantial improvements over traditional baselines (MNL, RF, MLP), achieving accuracies well above 0.80 compared to below 0.41 for conventional models. Among the LLMs, the o3 model achieved the strongest zero-shot performance, with an accuracy of 0.870 and F1 score of 0.859, outperforming all RAG-augmented configurations. This result is consistent with the earlier finding that o3 possesses strong intrinsic generalization capabilities. For GPT-4o, retrieval augmentation proved more beneficial. Accuracy improved from 0.807 in zero-shot to 0.844 with Basic RAG and

Table 3: Performance of baseline models and LLMs under different RAG strategies in two external datasets. The best-performing value is highlighted in **bold**, and the second-best value is underlined.

Model	Method	2023 PSRC - Tacoma				2022 NHTS			
		Accuracy	F1 Score	Recall	Precision	Accuracy	F1 Score	Recall	Precision
MNL	-	0.236	0.140	0.236	0.817	0.100	0.049	0.100	0.034
RF	-	0.408	0.432	0.408	0.755	0.364	0.454	0.364	0.827
MLP	-	0.345	0.359	0.344	0.790	0.322	0.420	0.322	0.851
GPT-4o	Zero-shot	0.807	0.810	0.807	0.848	0.858	0.861	0.858	0.870
	Basic RAG	<u>0.844</u>	0.831	<u>0.844</u>	0.846	0.896	0.882	0.896	<u>0.872</u>
	RAG + Balanced Retrieval	0.833	0.826	0.833	0.832	0.891	<u>0.881</u>	0.891	0.871
	RAG + Re-ranking	0.831	0.824	0.831	0.832	0.882	0.874	0.882	0.866
	RAG + Balanced Retrieval + Re-ranking	0.838	0.834	0.838	0.838	0.877	0.871	0.877	0.866
o4-mini	Zero-shot	0.831	0.829	0.831	<u>0.854</u>	0.882	0.878	0.882	0.875
	Basic RAG	0.833	0.826	0.833	0.836	0.893	0.876	0.893	0.867
	RAG + Balanced Retrieval	0.815	0.807	0.815	0.808	0.873	0.862	0.873	0.853
	RAG + Re-ranking	0.831	0.823	0.831	0.827	0.879	0.870	0.879	0.862
	RAG + Balanced Retrieval + Re-ranking	0.805	0.803	0.805	0.801	0.849	0.842	0.849	0.838
o3	Zero-shot	0.870	0.859	0.870	0.863	0.880	0.864	0.880	0.854
	Basic RAG	0.837	0.826	0.837	0.842	<u>0.895</u>	0.876	<u>0.895</u>	0.867
	RAG + Balanced Retrieval	0.828	0.821	0.828	0.827	0.882	0.872	0.882	0.863
	RAG + Re-ranking	0.828	0.820	0.828	0.830	0.875	0.866	0.875	0.859
	RAG + Balanced Retrieval + Re-ranking	<u>0.844</u>	<u>0.838</u>	<u>0.844</u>	0.834	0.856	0.847	0.856	0.840

further to 0.838 with the combination of Balanced Retrieval and Re-ranking, indicating that while zero-shot transfer is relatively strong, the inclusion of targeted retrieval helps the model better exploit contextual information when the external dataset is close in nature to the training distribution. By contrast, o4-mini exhibited more modest generalization, with zero-shot accuracy at 0.831 and mixed gains from retrieval augmentation, peaking at 0.833 with Basic RAG. Overall, the Tacoma results highlight that both strong zero-shot reasoning and well-calibrated retrieval strategies enable successful generalization.

For the 2022 NHTS subset, traditional baselines again performed poorly, with accuracies below 0.37, indicating the difficulty of transferring statistical and machine learning approaches without retraining. In contrast, LLMs generalized substantially better. Here, RAG played a more critical role than in 2023 PSRC-Tacoma subset. For GPT-4o, accuracy improved from 0.858 in zero-shot to 0.896 with Basic RAG, the best performance across all models and strategies on this dataset. Similarly, o3 achieved its peak NHTS accuracy (0.895) with Basic RAG. Interestingly, Balanced Retrieval and re-ranking provided only marginal or even negative gains in this setting, suggesting that over-constraining the retrieval pool may reduce adaptability under greater distribution shifts. The o4-mini model again showed intermediate performance, with accuracy ranging from 0.882 in zero-shot to 0.893 with Basic RAG. While its absolute performance lagged behind GPT-4o and o3, it still outperformed conventional baselines by a wide margin. Notably, across all LLMs, the best-performing strategies on NHTS relied on broader retrieval (i.e., Basic RAG) rather than more refined approaches, suggesting that under a significant distribution shift, maximizing coverage of candidate examples

is more valuable than enforcing balance or precision.

6. Discussion

The results of this study offer significant insights into the application of LLMs and RAG for travel mode choice prediction, highlighting a complex interplay between LLM architecture and retrieval strategies. A key takeaway is that retrieval augmentation is not universally beneficial; its effectiveness depends heavily on the reasoning capability of the base model. The performance of the o3 model serves as an illustration of this principle. Its accuracy decreased with the introduction of basic and balanced RAG strategies, suggesting that for a model with advanced reasoning, low-quality or irrelevant retrieved information acts as noise, hindering rather than helping its predictive performance. This phenomenon mirrors a human expert’s cognitive process: an expert’s judgment is refined by high-quality, relevant evidence, but can be confused by noisy or misleading information (Kahneman et al., 2021). It was only when a highly sophisticated retrieval pipeline (e.g., RAG with a cross-encoder for re-ranking) was employed that the o3 model’s performance improved beyond its zero-shot baseline. This demonstrates that for high-reasoning models, the quality of the retrieved context is paramount. In contrast, models like GPT-4o and o4-mini, which started from lower zero-shot baselines, benefited from even the simpler RAG strategies, as the retrieved examples provided a contextual grounding that their inherent knowledge base may have lacked.

The task of predicting travel mode choice is more than a simple classification problem. It is a simulation of complex human decision-making, requiring the consideration of numerous factors such as cost, time, convenience, and personal preferences. The superior performance of the LLM-based approaches demonstrates the importance of a model’s ability to engage in sophisticated reasoning. The exceptional zero-shot accuracy of the o3 model is particularly telling. It demonstrates that a model with strong reasoning capabilities can effectively capture the complex trade-offs in travel decisions without observing examples from the dataset. This suggests that the model is not merely pattern-matching based on the input features but is applying a more generalized, abstract understanding of human behavior to the specific context of the trip. This capacity for contextual reasoning is a significant advantage over traditional statistical models, which are constrained by rigid assumptions, and machine learning models that excel at pattern recognition but lack genuine comprehension.

Based on the experimental results, several best practices emerge for researchers and practitioners looking to leverage these technologies. First, retrieval strategies should be aligned with model capability. The choice of a RAG strategy should not be made independently of the choice of the LLM. For highly advanced, powerful reasoning models like o3, investing in a high-precision retrieval and re-ranking pipeline is crucial. For less advanced or more cost-effective models, a simpler RAG implementation can still provide substantial performance gains over a zero-shot approach. Second, establishing a strong zero-shot baseline is critical. Before implementing a complex RAG system, the zero-shot performance of the candidate LLM should be evaluated. As seen with the o3 model, a high-performing base model may set a high bar for any augmentation strategy to surpass. This baseline provides a critical reference point for assessing the true value

added by the retrieval pipeline. Third, retrieval design should account for the distributional characteristics of the target dataset. When the external data closely resembles the knowledge base distribution, advanced strategies such as balanced retrieval and cross-encoder re-ranking can refine predictions. However, under greater distributional shifts, broader retrieval methods like Basic RAG may prove more effective.

This study demonstrates that thoughtfully integrating LLMs and RAG can significantly advance travel behavior modeling. By grounding the reasoning capabilities of LLMs in empirical data through RAG, we can create predictive tools that are both more accurate and transparent. Furthermore, the flexibility of the RAG framework allows for the dynamic incorporation of new data, making it possible to create models that can adapt to changing travel patterns, new transportation options, or unforeseen events in ways that statically trained models cannot.

7. Conclusion

This study evaluated various models for the task of travel mode choice prediction, comparing traditional baselines and LLMs augmented with a range of RAG strategies. By systematically testing models from the highly capable GPT-4o and o3 to the more compact o4-mini model under zero-shot, basic RAG, and advanced RAG conditions, this research sought to identify the most effective approaches for simulating the complex, multi-faceted decisions in human travel mode choice.

The results indicate that the GPT-4o model achieved the highest overall accuracy of 80.8% using a RAG with balanced retrieval and re-ranking strategy. We also find that retrieval augmentation is not a universal benefit. For a model with high intrinsic reasoning like o3, basic and moderately improved RAG pipelines introduced noise and degraded performance. Only when paired with a high-precision re-ranking approach did o3 surpass its already strong zero-shot baseline. This finding indicates that the effectiveness of retrieval augmentation is contingent upon the reasoning capacity of the underlying LLM: while less advanced models can benefit substantially from simpler retrieval strategies, advanced models require only the most precise and contextually relevant evidence to realize performance gains. In summary, the optimal configuration of LLMs and RAG strategies is not uniform but rather depends on both model architecture and task objectives. For researchers and practitioners, this highlights the importance of aligning retrieval design with model capability and application context in order to fully unlock the potential of RAG-augmented LLMs for travel behavior modeling.

While this study provides valuable insights, it is subject to certain limitations. First, while we infer reasoning capabilities from performance patterns, this research did not directly analyze the models' internal Chain-of-Thought processes. Second, the RAG pipelines were limited to a specific set of components, and other variations in retrieval, chunking, or re-ranking could yield different results. Future research should therefore aim to validate these findings across more diverse datasets, employ methods that analyze the step-by-step reasoning of these models, and explore a broader array of RAG architectures and their real-world deployment implications.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by the Good System at the University of Texas at Austin, NSF Grants (2125858, 2236305), and the MITRE Corporation. The authors would like to acknowledge these supporters.

CRedit Authorship Contribution Statement

Yiming Xu: Conceptualization; Data curation; Formal analysis; Investigation; Methodology; Software; Validation; Visualization; Writing - original draft; Writing - review & editing. **Junfeng Jiao:** Funding acquisition; Writing - review & editing.

Declaration of Generative AI and AI-assisted Technologies in the Writing Process

During the preparation of this work the authors used ChatGPT 4o in order to improve readability and language. After using this tool/service, the authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the publication.

Appendix A. Descriptive statistics of variables for generalization ability evaluation

Table A.4: Descriptive statistics of variables for generalization ability evaluation

Variable	Value	2023 PSRC - Tacoma		2022 NHTS	
		Frequency/Mean	Percentage/SD	Frequency/Mean	Percentage/SD
Outcome Variable					
Trip Mode	Drive	409	71.88%	485	85.24%
	Walk	127	22.32%	61	10.72%
	Transit	23	4.04%	13	2.28%
	Bike/Mircomobility	10	1.76%	10	1.76%
Traveler Characteristics					
Age	18-24	56	9.84%	19	3.34%
	25-34	158	27.77%	80	14.06%
	35-44	118	20.74%	118	20.74%
	45-54	158	27.77%	97	17.05%
	55-64	23	4.04%	112	19.68%
	65-74	35	6.15%	102	17.93%
	75 or older	21	3.69%	41	7.21%
Gender	Male	279	49.03%	313	55.01%
	Famale	265	46.57%	256	44.99%
	Non-binary	25	4.39%	0	0%
Education Level	Less than high school	2	0.35%	6	1.05%
	High school	66	11.60%	34	5.98%
	Some college	104	18.28%	71	12.48%
	Vocational/technical training	20	3.51%	0	0%
	Associates degree	106	18.63%	63	11.07%
	Bachelor degree	169	29.70%	221	38.84%
	Graduate degree	102	17.93%	174	30.58%
Household Income	Under \$25,000	54	9.49%	18	3.16%
	25,000–49,999	56	9.84%	62	10.90%
	50,000–74,999	163	28.65%	84	14.76%
	75,000–99,999	101	17.75%	98	17.22%
	100,000–199,999	129	22.67%	204	35.85%
	\$200,000 or more	66	11.60%	103	18.10%
Vehicles in Household		1.51	0.95	1.90	0.91
Trip Characteristics					
Trip Distance (mile)		2.26	2.02	6.29	6.44
Start Time		13.65	4.34	13.31	4.31
Trip Purpose	Home	202	35.50%	231	40.60%
	Work	65	11.42%	64	11.25%
	Social/Recreation	97	17.05%	75	13.18%
	Shopping	86	15.11%	98	17.22%
	Meal	41	7.21%	40	7.03%
	Business/Errand	24	4.22%	17	2.99%
	Escort	43	7.56%	31	5.45%
	Overnight	6	1.05%	0	0%
	School	5	0.88%	13	2.28%
	Change mode	0	0%	0	0%

References

Achiam, J., Adler, S., Agarwal, S., Ahmad, L., Akkaya, I., Aleman, F.L., Almeida, D., Altenschmidt, J., Altman, S., Anadkat, S., et al., 2024. Gpt-4 technical report. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.08774>, arXiv:2303.08774.

- Adornetto, C., Mora, A., Hu, K., Garcia, L.I., Atchade-Adelomou, P., Greco, G., Pastor, L.A.A., Larson, K., 2025. Generative agents in agent-based modeling: Overview, validation, and emerging challenges. *IEEE Transactions on Artificial Intelligence* .
- Barff, R., Mackay, D., Olshavsky, R.W., 1982. A selective review of travel-mode choice models. *Journal of Consumer Research* 8, 370–380.
- Ben-Akiva, M., Bierlaire, M., 1999. Discrete choice methods and their applications to short term travel decisions, in: *Handbook of transportation science*. Springer, pp. 5–33.
- Ben-Akiva, M.E., Lerman, S.R., 1985. *Discrete choice analysis: theory and application to travel demand*. volume 9. MIT press.
- Bhat, C.R., 1995. A heteroscedastic extreme value model of intercity travel mode choice. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 29, 471–483.
- Bhat, C.R., 2000. Incorporating observed and unobserved heterogeneity in urban work travel mode choice modeling. *Transportation science* 34, 228–238.
- Buehler, R., 2011. Determinants of transport mode choice: a comparison of germany and the usa. *Journal of transport geography* 19, 644–657.
- Chen, H., Cheng, Y., 2023. Travel mode choice prediction using imbalanced machine learning. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* 24, 3795–3808.
- Cheng, L., Chen, X., De Vos, J., Lai, X., Witlox, F., 2019. Applying a random forest method approach to model travel mode choice behavior. *Travel behaviour and society* 14, 1–10.
- Douze, M., Guzhva, A., Deng, C., Johnson, J., Szilvasy, G., Mazaré, P.E., Lomeli, M., Hosseini, L., Jégou, H., 2025. The faiss library. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.08281>, arXiv:2401.08281.
- Eldeeb, G., Mohamed, M., Páez, A., 2021. Built for active travel? investigating the contextual effects of the built environment on transportation mode choice. *Journal of Transport Geography* 96, 103158.
- Gao, Y., Xiong, Y., Gao, X., Jia, K., Pan, J., Bi, Y., Dai, Y., Sun, J., Wang, M., Wang, H., 2024. Retrieval-augmented generation for large language models: A survey. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.10997>, arXiv:2312.10997.
- Ge, S., Ye, P., Zhang, R., Zhou, M., Dong, H., Wang, F.Y., 2025. Llm-driven cognitive modeling for personalized travel generation. *IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems* .
- Gong, L., Lin, Y., Lu, Y., Han, X., Liu, Y., Guo, S., Lin, Y., Wan, H., et al., 2024. Mobility-llm: Learning visiting intentions and travel preference from human mobility data with large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 37, 36185–36217.

- Hagenauer, J., Helbich, M., 2017. A comparative study of machine learning classifiers for modeling travel mode choice. *Expert Systems with Applications* 78, 273–282.
- Handy, S., 1996. Methodologies for exploring the link between urban form and travel behavior. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment* 1, 151–165.
- Hasnine, M.S., Nurul Habib, K., 2021. Tour-based mode choice modelling as the core of an activity-based travel demand modelling framework: A review of state-of-the-art. *Transport Reviews* 41, 5–26.
- Jiawei, W., Jiang, R., Yang, C., Wu, Z., Shibasaki, R., Koshizuka, N., Xiao, C., et al., 2024. Large language models as urban residents: An llm agent framework for personal mobility generation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 37, 124547–124574.
- Kahneman, D., Sibony, O., Sunstein, C.R., 2021. *Noise: A flaw in human judgment*. Hachette UK.
- Lee, D., Derrible, S., Pereira, F.C., 2018. Comparison of four types of artificial neural network and a multinomial logit model for travel mode choice modeling. *Transportation Research Record* 2672, 101–112.
- Lewis, P., Perez, E., Piktus, A., Petroni, F., Karpukhin, V., Goyal, N., Küttler, H., Lewis, M., tau Yih, W., Rocktäschel, T., Riedel, S., Kiela, D., 2021. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.11401>, arXiv:2005.11401.
- Liu, T., Li, M., Yin, Y., 2024. Can large language models capture human travel behavior? evidence and insights on mode choice. *Evidence and Insights on Mode Choice* (August 26, 2024) .
- Liu, T., Yang, J., Yin, Y., 2025a. Toward llm-agent-based modeling of transportation systems: A conceptual framework. *Artificial Intelligence for Transportation* 1, 100001.
- Liu, Z., Zhou, Z., Gu, Z., Liu, S., Liu, P., Zhang, Y., He, Y., Zhang, K., 2025b. Trip: Transport reasoning with intelligence progression—a foundation framework. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies* 179, 105260.
- Nie, T., Sun, J., Ma, W., 2025. Exploring the roles of large language models in reshaping transportation systems: A survey, framework, and roadmap. *Artificial Intelligence for Transportation* 1, 100003.
- Paulssen, M., Temme, D., Vij, A., Walker, J.L., 2014. Values, attitudes and travel behavior: a hierarchical latent variable mixed logit model of travel mode choice. *Transportation* 41, 873–888.
- Schneider, R.J., 2013. Theory of routine mode choice decisions: An operational framework to increase sustainable transportation. *Transport Policy* 25, 128–137.

- Xu, F., Hao, Q., Zong, Z., Wang, J., Zhang, Y., Wang, J., Lan, X., Gong, J., Ouyang, T., Meng, F., Shao, C., Yan, Y., Yang, Q., Song, Y., Ren, S., Hu, X., Li, Y., Feng, J., Gao, C., Li, Y., 2025. Towards large reasoning models: A survey of reinforced reasoning with large language models. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.09686>, arXiv:2501.09686.
- Xu, Y., Yan, X., Liu, X., Zhao, X., 2021. Identifying key factors associated with ridesplitting adoption rate and modeling their nonlinear relationships. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* 144, 170–188.
- Ying, S., Li, Z., Yu, M., 2025. Beyond words: evaluating large language models in transportation planning. *Geo-spatial Information Science* , 1–23.
- Zhang, M., Xu, Y., 2025. Transmode-llm: Feature-informed natural language modeling with domain-enhanced prompting for travel behavior modeling, in: *Large Language Models for Scientific and Societal Advances*.
- Zhao, X., Yan, X., Yu, A., Van Hentenryck, P., 2020. Prediction and behavioral analysis of travel mode choice: A comparison of machine learning and logit models. *Travel behaviour and society* 20, 22–35.