

# Graph Databases for Behavior Science

Juan C. Correa<sup>1,2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>\*Departamento de Estudios Empresariales, Universidad Iberoamericana,  
Mexico City, Mexico, 1219.

<sup>2</sup>\*Research and Development Unit, Critical Centrality Institute.

Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): [j.correa.n@gmail.com](mailto:j.correa.n@gmail.com);

## Abstract

Behavioral scientists have multiple options for managing research data. While relational databases offer robust tools for storage and analysis, they impose structural constraints that limit the representation of complex behavioral phenomena. This article argues that graph databases provide a rigorous and conceptually richer alternative, enabling the modeling of human behavior as an interconnected system rather than a set of isolated variables. Beyond a technological shift, adopting graph-based approaches invites a paradigm change in behavior science—one that embraces complexity, dynamic relationships, and multi-level contingencies. Practical implications are illustrated through examples from clinical, consumer, and industrial/organizational psychology.

**Keywords:** Graph database, Network modeling, complex behavior


## 1 Introduction

In a recent paper, [Soto \(2025\)](#) introduced relational databases for behavior science and used real-world examples to illustrate how relational databases have been used by behavioral scientists. Although relational databases remain the dominant paradigm in research and industry, alternative approaches are gaining traction. The so-called ‘Not Only SQL’ (NoSQL) category includes database systems that employ non-tabular data models, such as key-value pairs, documents, wide columns, matrices, and graphs. Whereas relational databases store structured data in tables (i.e., columns as variables, rows as cases, and cells containing specific values), NoSQL systems accommodate flexible formats that better support evolving and highly connected data.

In this article, I examine graphs as a paradigm that deviates from the traditional lenses of relational databases, where nodes and edges (instead of tables and joins) represent the basic elements of any behavior that can be represented as a network or a complex system. Networks have a long history in mathematics as “*graph theory*” (Estrada, 2011). In sociology and social sciences, graph theory is known as “social network analysis” (Wasserman & Faust, 1994). In this context, the term “social network” should not be confused with online platforms such as Facebook or Instagram, as they are technological implementations that do not necessarily represent all aspects of social networks as a discipline. Psychologists have leveraged this framework to analyze the structure of psychopathology (Borsboom & Cramer, 2013), conduct bibliometric analysis of cyberbehavior (Serafin, Garcia-Vargas, García-Chivita, Caicedo, & Correra, 2019), estimate the correct number of dimensions in psychological and educational instruments (Golino & Epskamp, 2017), or understand the measurement of organizational climate (Menezes, Menezes, Moraes, & Pires, 2021).

## 2 Network as a collection nodes and edges

Estrada (2011) defines a network as a collection of points (called nodes) joined together in pairs by lines (called arcs or edges) like those depicted in Figure 1. Despite this simplistic definition, networks provide a powerful framework to model any type of system from planets in a galaxy to neurons in the nervous system (Vazza & Feletti, 2020).



**Fig. 1** A visual representation of four types of networks: A) non-directed unweighted network, B) non-directed weighted network, C) directed unweighted network, and D) directed weighted network.


In behavioral sciences, networks have been used to understand the mechanisms of team assembly and how these mechanisms determine collaboration structure and team performance (Guimerà, Uzzi, Spiro, & Amaral, 2005). Graphs offer fundamental concepts for understanding how entities (nodes) and their relationships (edges) form interconnected structures. From a data management viewpoint, the analysis of these networks requires tools that go beyond the rigid tabular constraints of relational databases. As the concepts of graphs are thoroughly covered in introductory texts (Newman, 2010), these will not be revisited here. Instead, this article aims to

illustrate how graph-based databases can enrich the methodological toolbox of behavioral scientists, enabling analyses that embrace complexity, dynamic relationships, and multi-level contingencies ([Robinson, Webber, & Eifrem, 2015](#)).

### 3 Graph databases: A gentle introduction

[Robinson et al. \(2015\)](#) define a graph database as a system that implements Create, Read, Update, and Delete (CRUD) operations on a graph data model, where entities are represented as nodes and relationships as edges. Unlike relational databases, which organize data in tables, graph databases treat relationships as first-class elements rather than secondary links between tables. This design enables efficient traversal and pattern matching across highly connected data, making it ideal for modeling complex networks such as behavioral contingencies or social interactions.

Figure 2 shows a graph with eight nodes and eight edges. Nodes represent real-world entities such as persons (i.e., Anna, Pam, Carlos, and John) companies (i.e., Chevron and Rice University), and routes (i.e., I-10 and I-45). Edges represent the relationship between pairs of nodes. Thus, John and Pam work in Chevron but they commute distinct distances through different routes. Carlos and Anna work in Rice University, they both commute by the same route but they have to drive different distances. Interestingly, the information of nodes and edges can be enriched with attributes. These attributes also represent real-world characteristics like the distance each person has to commute, their sex, or the sector of the company they work for. A graph database like the one depicted in Figure 2 leverages the so-called “labeled property graph” which has the following elements: 1) nodes and relationships, 2) nodes contain properties (key-value pairs), 3) nodes can be labeled with one or more labels, 4) relationships are named and directed, and always have a start and end node, 5) relationships can also contain properties. Although these elements offer significant benefits for behavioral scientists, they have been largely overlooked. This gap presents an opportunity to enrich the methodological toolbox for behavior analysts working in both basic and applied settings, particularly those interested in integrating methods from other disciplines into behavioral sciences.



**Fig. 2** A visual representation of a graph database that combines persons, companies, and routes

According to [Robinson et al. \(2015\)](#), one advantage of graph databases is their superior performance when handling connected data compared to relational databases that rely on tabular structures. In relational databases, join-intensive queries slow down as datasets grow, whereas graph databases maintain relatively stable performance—even with millions of nodes and edges. While big data challenges may not concern experimental behavior analysts working with small laboratory datasets, applied behavior analysts can benefit significantly from graph databases. For example, consider analyzing urban traffic at an individual level by tracking the movements of hundreds of thousands of drivers every two hours ([Gonzalez, Hidalgo, & Barabasi, 2008](#)). In such cases, graph databases excel because queries operate on localized portions of the graph rather than scanning the entire dataset. If edges store information such as commuting distances, queries can be designed to retrieve specific conditions (e.g., individuals who commute less than 10 miles). Consequently, execution time depends only on the size of the subgraph traversed, not the overall graph size.

Another advantage of graph databases has to do with their flexibility. Behavioral scientists aim to connect data in ways that reflect their knowledge and expertise. This is a key reason why graph databases serve as the underlying infrastructure for constructing “knowledge graphs” ([Barrasa & Webber, 2023](#)). With these knowledge graphs, behavioral scientists allow the structure and schema to evolve alongside their understanding of the behavioral phenomenon rather than being rigidly defined upfront, when knowledge is most limited. This is particularly important when a behavioral phenomenon lacks theoretical background or lacks replication ([Burgos, 2025](#)). Graph databases fulfill this need by providing a flexible model that adapts to changing requirements and evidence. Because graphs are inherently additive, new nodes, relationships, labels, and subgraphs can be introduced. The modifications introduced to the original graph do not imply a threat to existing queries or application functionality. This flexibility minimizes the need for exhaustive upfront modeling and lowers the frequency of costly migrations (particularly for companies that hire behavior data

scientists who use to be in charge of analyzing customers observed behavior), thereby reducing maintenance overhead.

A third benefit of graph databases is the agility that they offer. Modern graph databases enable smooth development and easy system maintenance. Their schema-free design, combined with testable APIs and query languages, allows controlled evolution of applications. While the absence of rigid schemas means traditional governance mechanisms are missing, this is not a drawback. On the contrary, it encourages more transparent and actionable data governance. Typically, governance is enforced programmatically through tests that validate data models, queries, and business rules. This approach aligns well with agile and test-driven development practices, making graph database-based applications adaptable to changing business needs.

It is worth mentioning that relational databases acknowledge relationships, but only during modeling, where they serve as join mechanisms between tables. In graph databases, we often need to clarify the meaning of relationships and even qualify their strength. These are aspects that relational database management systems do not address explicitly (Robinson et al., 2015). From this viewpoint, graph databases demand ontological considerations such as those recently described for psychology and behavioral sciences (Burgos, 2025). As datasets grow more complex and less uniform, relational data management systems like Microsoft Access, PostgreSQL, or SQLite become burdened with large join tables, sparsely populated rows, and extensive null-checking logic. Greater interconnectedness in relational databases leads to more joins, which degrade performance and complicate adaptation to evolving requirements. Soto (2025) has highlighted some of these limitations as “challenges to adoption.” From the lenses of graph databases, however, these challenges are not even necessary. I will elaborate upon this particular aspect below.

## 4 Behavioral Application of graph databases

To illustrate the application of graph databases for behavioral scientists, I revisit data from customers who used an online food delivery platform in the city of Bogotá. The database is available in a public data repository (Segura & Correa, 2019) and its associated research article (Correa et al., 2019). Behavioral scientists who are familiar with structured datasets will find that this database is in a comma separated value (.csv) file, just like most tables used in relational database management systems like Microsoft Access or SQLite. Given the wide variety of graph database management systems in the market (e.g., Neo4j, Microsoft Azure Cosmos, Aerospike, Amazon Web Services Neptune, NebulaGraph, Memgraph, TigerGraph, Giraph), the rest of this work relies on Neo4j (Barrasa & Webber, 2023). Neo4j ranks as the leading freemium software. It offers two free options: “Neo4j Community Edition” and “Neo4j AuraDB Free,” as well as two licensed options called “Neo4j enterprise” and “Neo4j AuraDB Professional/Enterprise.”

## References

- Barrasa, J., & Webber, J. (2023). *Building knowledge graphs: A practitioner’s guide*. Sebastopol, CA: O’Reilly.

Borsboom, D., & Cramer, A. (2013, 03). Network analysis: An integrative approach to the structure of psychopathology. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 9(Volume 9, 2013), 91–121, <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-050212-185608>

Burgos, J. (2025). Getting ontologically serious about the replication crisis in psychology. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, 45(2), 79–100, <https://doi.org/10.1037/teo0000281>

Correa, J.C., Garzón, W., Brooker, P., Sakarkar, G., Carranza, S.A., Yunado, L., Rincón, A. (2019). Evaluation of collaborative consumption of food delivery services through web mining techniques. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 46, 45–50, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2018.05.002>

Estrada, E. (2011). *The structure of complex networks: Theory and applications*. Oxford University Press.

Golino, H.F., & Epskamp, S. (2017). Exploratory graph analysis: A new approach for estimating the number of dimensions in psychological research. *PLOS ONE*, 12(6), e0174035, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0174035>

Gonzalez, M.C., Hidalgo, C.A., Barabasi, A.-L. (2008). Understanding individual human mobility patterns. *Nature*, 453(7196), 779–782, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature06958>

Guimerà, R., Uzzi, B., Spiro, J., Amaral, L. (2005, 04). Team assembly mechanisms determine collaboration network structure and team performance. *Science*, 308(5722), 697–702, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1106340>

Menezes, I., Menezes, A.C., Moraes, E., Pires, P.P. (2021). Measuring organizational climate via psychological networks analysis. *International Journal of Organization Theory & Behavior*, 24(3), 229–250, <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOTB-08-2020-0142>

Newman, M.E.J. (2010). *Networks: An introduction*. Oxford University Press.

Robinson, I., Webber, J., Eifrem, E. (2015). *Graph databases: New opportunities for connected data*. Sebastopol, California: O'Reilly.

Segura, M.A., & Correa, J.C. (2019). Data of collaborative consumption in online food delivery services. *Data in Brief*, 25, 104007, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2019.104007>

Serafin, M.J., Garcia-Vargas, G.R., García-Chivita, M., Caicedo, M.I., Correra, J.C. (2019). Cyberbehavior: A bibliometric analysis. *Annual Review of CyberTherapy and Telemedicine*, 17, 17–24,

Soto, P.L. (2025, 12). Relational databases for behavior science. *Perspectives on Behavior Science*, , <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40614-025-00486-w>

Vazza, F., & Feletti, A. (2020). The quantitative comparison between the neuronal network and the cosmic web. *Frontiers in Physics*, 8, 525731, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fphy.2020.525731>

Wasserman, S., & Faust, K. (1994). *Social network analysis: Methods and applications*. Cambridge University Press.