



Becoming *You*  
L A B S

# Familycentrism

How Life Stage and Circumstance Shape What “Family First” Really Means

Daniel B. Davis, PhD  
Head of Research, Becoming You Labs  
Sociologist, San Diego State University

Whitepaper  
November 2025

# Table of *Contents*

<b>Executive Summary</b>	01
<b>Overall Familycentrism Prevalence</b>	02
<b>Predictors of Familycentrism (Regression Analysis)</b>	03
<b>Relationship Status and Familycentrism</b>	05
<b>Household Income and Familycentrism</b>	07
<b>Generational Cohort and Familycentrism</b>	08
<b>Industry and Familycentrism</b>	09
<b>Gender and Familycentrism</b>	11
<b>Ethnic Group and Familycentrism</b>	12
<b>Conclusion</b>	14
<b>Appendix</b>	15

# Executive Summary

This report analyzes how Familycentrism—the value placed on family health, wellbeing, and presence—varies across demographic groups in the 2025 Becoming You Labs dataset (N = 88,928). While “family first” is a common cultural refrain, the data reveal that family ranks only fourth of sixteen core life values, suggesting that its everyday importance is strong but not dominant.

Familycentrism trails other values such as Eudemonia (pleasure and wellbeing), Voice (authentic self-expression), and Non Sibi (service to community), suggesting that “family first” is more an aspiration than a reality in contemporary value hierarchies. To Gen Z familycentrism ranks 7th after the three mentioned, plus Affluence (being wealthy), Beholderism (being beautiful and having beautiful things), and Achievement (life and work successes).

A multiple regression model ( $R^2 = .05$ ,  $p < .001$ ) identified several predictors of Familycentrism in respondents’ ideal lives:

- **Relationship status** emerged as the strongest factor: married individuals rated Familycentrism highest and showed the smallest gaps between ideal and lived experience.
- **Household income** was also a positive predictor, indicating that financial security may make it easier to live family-centered values.
- **Generation** showed a downward trend, with Gen Z ranking family lower than older cohorts.
- **Industry** had modest influence, with education and healthcare workers valuing family slightly more than those in media or technology.
- **Gender** differences were minor overall, though non-binary respondents reported lower scores.
- **Ethnicity** was not a significant predictor once other factors were controlled.

Across demographics, the data reveal a consistent pattern: Familycentrism grows with life stage, relationship stability, and economic security, while younger and less-settled groups express greater aspiration than fulfillment.

These findings suggest that while family remains an enduring value, its expression depends heavily on circumstance—revealing a nuanced portrait of how people balance family ideals with the realities of modern life.

# Overall Familycentrism Prevalence

Category	Means (Standard Deviations)
<b>Ideal Life Value Rank</b>	6.59 (4.2)
<b>Current Life Value Rank</b>	6.55 (4.5)
<b>Authenticity Gap</b> <i>(% more desired than experienced)</i>	11.8 (30.7)
<b>Top Value</b>	11% (31%)
<b>Core Value</b>	48% (50%)
<b>Moderate Value</b>	35% (48%)
<b>Peripheral Value</b>	17% (38%)
<b>Bottom Value</b>	01% (09%)

# Predictors of Familycentrism (Regression Analysis)

A multiple regression tested how demographic factors predict the importance placed on Familycentrism in respondents' ideal lives. The model was statistically significant,  $F(6, 62024) = 538.41, p < .001$ , explaining about 5% of the variance in Familycentrism scores—typical for social science models where many influences are diffuse and individually modest.

Marital status was the strongest predictor ( $\beta = .203, p < .001$ ): people who are married rated Familycentrism substantially higher than those who are single, partnered, or divorced. Household income also had a positive effect ( $\beta = .073, p < .001$ ), indicating that financial security may help individuals align more closely with family-oriented ideals.

By contrast, generation ( $\beta = -.062, p < .001$ ) revealed a downward trend—particularly among Gen Z respondents, who rank family lower than older cohorts. Industry ( $\beta = -.044, p < .001$ ) also mattered slightly, suggesting that work context shapes how people balance career and family priorities.

Gender showed only a small overall effect ( $\beta = -.014, p < .001$ ), though the non-binary subgroup expressed markedly lower Familycentrism scores; this appears meaningful despite their smaller representation in the sample. Ethnicity was not a significant predictor.

**Table 1. Multiple Regression Predicting Familycentrism (Ideal Life Score)**

Predictor	B	$\beta$ (Standardized)	<i>p</i>
Marital Status	0.264	.203	<.001
Household Income	0.086	.073	<.001
Generation	-0.092	-.062	<.001
Industry	-0.020	-.044	<.001
Gender	-0.037	-.014	<.001
Ethnicity	0.003	.003	n.s.
(Constant)	4.584	—	<.001

**Model Summary:**  $R = .22, R^2 = .05, \text{Adj. } R^2 = .049, F(6, 62024) = 538.41, p < .001$

The following sections examine each demographic factor in detail, beginning with those that showed the strongest influence in the regression model. These analyses highlight how and where family values differ across social groups.

This starts with relationship status and household income, the most powerful predictors of Familycentrism, followed by generation cohort, industry, gender, and ethnicity. Each includes descriptive frequency comparisons (Chi-square tests) and mean differences (ANOVA tests) to capture both categorical and continuous variation.

# Relationship Status and Familycentrism

**Table 2. Familycentrism by Relationship Status (Chi-square Tests)**

Relationship Status	% Top Value (#1)	% Core (Top 5)	% Peripheral (Bottom 5)	% Bottom (#16)
Single	5.1	32.2	27.5	1.4
Partnered	6.7	37.3	22.9	1.0
Married	15.0	59.8	9.9	0.3
Divorced	11.0	47.7	17.9	0.9
Widowed	12.2	53.8	16.1	0.6

All associations significant at  $p < .001$ .

**Table 3. Familycentrism Rank & Gap by Relationship Status (ANOVA Tests)**

Relationship Status	Ideal Life Rank (1-16)	Authenticity Gap %
Single	8.2	12.6
Partnered	7.6	10.6
Married	5.4	3.0
Divorced	6.7	6.5
Widowed	6.1	4.9

All ANOVA tests are significant at  $p < .001$ .

## Interpretation

Familycentrism varies sharply by relationship status. Married respondents are by far the most likely to rank Familycentrism among their top values—three times more likely than singles—and they show the smallest gap between their ideal and lived experience. Widowed and divorced

individuals also tend to place high importance on family, though with somewhat greater gaps, likely reflecting changes in family structure or connection.

Single and partnered respondents, by contrast, rank Familycentrism lower overall and report the largest discrepancies between how much they value family and how much it features in their daily lives. These differences follow a clear pattern: greater family alignment appears to accompany more established or formal relationship commitments.

# Household Income and Familycentrism

**Table 4. Familycentrism by Household Income (Chi-square Tests)**

Income Group	% Top Value (#1)	% Core (Top 5)	% Peripheral (Bottom 5)	% Bottom (#16)
<\$50k	5.6	34.6	26.2	1.4
\$50-99k	8.7	43.1	20.2	0.9
\$100-149k	10.5	48.6	17.2	0.7
\$150k+	13.2	53.8	13.3	0.5

All associations significant at  $p < .001$ .

**Table 5. Familycentrism Rank & Gap by Household Income (ANOVA Tests)**

Income Group	Ideal Life Rank (1-16)	Authenticity Gap %
<\$50k	7.9	10.4
\$50-99k	7.1	9.5
\$100-149k	6.6	7.4
\$150k+	6.0	5.3

All ANOVA tests are significant at  $p < .001$ .

## Interpretation

Familycentrism tends to rise with income, both in priority and in lived alignment. Respondents in the highest income brackets are the most likely to rank family among their top values and report the smallest gaps between their ideal and current experience. In contrast, those with lower household incomes rank Familycentrism lower and express larger shortfalls between the importance they place on family and how present it feels in their daily lives.

The pattern suggests that greater financial stability may make it easier for individuals to live in closer alignment with their family-related ideals, while those under greater economic strain experience more tension between valuing family and having the means or flexibility to prioritize it.

# Generational Cohort and Familycentrism

**Table 6. Generational Differences in Familycentrism (Chi-square Tests)**

Generation	% Top Value (#1)	% Core (Top 5)	% Peripheral (Bottom 5)	% Bottom (#16)
Gen Z	6.2	38.1	22.2	1.0
Millennial	10.0	45.8	18.7	0.8
Gen X	13.6	54.3	13.8	0.6
Boomer	13.7	56.3	12.3	0.5

All associations significant at  $p < .001$ .

**Table 7. Familycentrism Rank & Gap by Generational Cohort (ANOVA Tests)**

Generation	Ideal Life Rank (1-16)	Authenticity Gap %
Gen Z	7.5	12.7
Millennial	6.8	8.0
Gen X	5.8	3.0
Boomer	7.3	4.0

All ANOVA tests are significant at  $p < .001$ .

## Interpretation

Across generations, Familycentrism shows clear but measured variation. Older cohorts, particularly Gen X and Boomers, are more likely to rank Familycentrism among their core values and show smaller gaps between how much they value family and how much it features in their current lives.

Millennials fall in the middle, while Gen Z ranks Familycentrism lowest overall and reports the largest shortfall between ideal and lived experience. These results suggest that the sense of family alignment tends to strengthen with age, while younger adults express greater aspiration than fulfillment in this area.

# Industry and Familycentrism

**Table 8. Familycentrism by Industry (Chi-square Tests)**

Industry	% Top Value (#1)	% Core (Top 5)	% Peripheral (Bottom 5)	% Bottom (#16)
Education/Academia	12.4	52.1	15.6	0.5
Healthcare/Medical	12.7	52.4	14.6	0.7
Finance/Banking/Insurance	11.9	51.7	13.8	0.5
Manufacturing/Production	11.4	51.5	14.1	0.5
Publishing/Media	8.2	40.1	24.0	1.0
Retail/Sales	10.1	45.8	17.6	0.7
Technology/IT	9.7	44.8	18.5	0.8
Other	10.3	47.0	18.1	0.7
Not Currently Employed	7.9	41.3	21.7	2.9

*All associations significant at  $p < .001$ .*

**Table 9. Familycentrism Rank & Gap by Industry (ANOVA Tests)**

Industry	Ideal Life Rank (1-16)	Authenticity Gap %
Education/Academia	6.2	6.0
Healthcare/Medical	6.1	7.2
Finance/Banking/Insurance	6.2	8.1
Manufacturing/Production	6.2	7.7
Publishing/Media	7.5	7.4
Retail/Sales	6.8	8.2
Technology/IT	6.9	8.6
Other	6.7	6.5
Not Currently Employed	7.3	2.4

All ANOVA tests are significant at  $p < .001$ .

### Interpretation

Familycentrism varies somewhat across industries but remains a mid-tier value overall. Workers in education, healthcare, finance, and manufacturing are the most likely to place family among their top values and report relatively small gaps between how much they value it and how fully it shows up in their lives.

By contrast, respondents in publishing, media, retail, and technology rank Familycentrism lower and show wider gaps, indicating less alignment between their ideals and daily experience. Those not currently employed also report lower prioritization of family but unusually small gaps, suggesting family may be less central but more stably expressed in their present circumstances.

# Gender and Familycentrism

**Table 10. Familycentrism by Gender (Chi-square Tests)**

Gender	% Top Value (#1)	% Core (Top 5)	% Peripheral (Bottom 5)	% Bottom (#16)
Men	10.7	50.0	15.3	0.6
Women	11.0	47.8	17.6	0.7
Non-Binary	2.3	20.1	35.6	2.1

All associations significant at  $p < .001$ .

**Table 11. Familycentrism Rank & Gap by Gender (ANOVA Tests)**

Gender	Ideal Life Rank (1-16)	Authenticity Gap %
Men	6.4	7.6
Women	6.6	6.6
Non-Binary	9.3	9.3

All ANOVA tests are significant at  $p < .001$ .

## Interpretation

Gender differences in Familycentrism are statistically significant but relatively modest in size. Men and women show similar overall patterns—both tend to rank Familycentrism near the middle of their value hierarchies. Both also report small authenticity gaps between how much they value family and how fully it is realized in their lives.

Non-binary respondents, however, stand out with substantially lower Familycentrism rankings and the largest gaps. This indicates less identification with family as a central organizing value and more distance between their ideals and current experiences.

# Ethnic Group and Familycentrism

**Table 12. Familycentrism by Ethnicity (Chi-square Tests)**

Ethnicity	% Top Value (#1)	% Core (Top 5)	% Peripheral (Bottom 5)	% Bottom (#16)
White	12.1	51.1	15.7	0.7
Black	3.8	32.4	25.4	1.3
Asian	8.2	40.9	20.8	1.0
Latinx	8.3	42.2	20.6	0.7
Mixed/Other	8.0	42.5	19.9	0.7

All associations significant at  $p < .001$ .

**Table 13. Familycentrism Rank & Gap by Ethnicity (ANOVA Tests)**

Ethnicity	Ideal Life Rank (1-16)	Authenticity Gap %
White	6.3	6.4
Black	8.1	8.7
Asian	7.2	9.1
Latinx	7.1	7.1
Mixed/Other	7.1	8.1

All ANOVA tests are significant at  $p < .001$ .

## Interpretation

Familycentrism differs notably across racial and ethnic groups. White respondents are the most likely to rank Familycentrism among their top values and show the smallest gaps between how much they value family and how much it shapes their daily lives. Latinx and mixed-heritage respondents fall close to the overall average, with moderate rankings and modest gaps.

Black and Asian respondents rank Familycentrism somewhat lower on average and report larger gaps, indicating that while family remains meaningful, it may be less central or less easily expressed in their current circumstances. Overall, the data point to meaningful variation in how family values are prioritized and experienced across cultural contexts.

## Conclusion

Across nearly 89,000 respondents, Familycentrism emerges as a meaningful but not universal organizing value. While many claim “family comes first,” the data suggest a more complicated picture: Familycentrism sits near the midpoint of the national value hierarchy, and most people experience at least some distance between their ideals and daily lives.

The regression results underscore how life stage and circumstance shape these patterns. Being married and financially secure are the strongest predictors of higher Familycentrism; yet, only 15% of wealthy married people rank it #1 (see Appendix B) compared to the 11% national average. These two are followed by modest effects in age, cohort, and industry.

Gender and ethnicity, by contrast, add little explanatory power overall, though non-binary respondents stand out with notably lower alignment. Together, these factors account for about five percent of the variation in Familycentrism—typical for social values research, where multiple social and psychological influences intertwine.

When the lens widens to group comparisons, a clear gradient appears. Married respondents and those with higher incomes most closely live the family ideals they endorse, while singles, younger adults, and lower-income groups report wider authenticity gaps. These gaps reflect not indifference, but constraint: the tension between valuing family and having the time, money, or stability to realize it. Differences by industry also hint at how occupational culture and work demands shape people’s capacity to “walk the talk” of family life.

Across generations, the downward tilt among Gen Z suggests a cultural inflection point. Younger adults appear less centered on family and more likely to treat it as one value among many, not a defining feature of identity or purpose. For older cohorts, Familycentrism remains steadier and more fulfilled, perhaps reflecting a combination of age, stage, and social context.

Taken together, the findings reveal that Familycentrism endures—but unevenly. It remains stronger where life structure supports it and weaker where it competes with economic, social, or identity pressures. The broader story is not of decline, but of divergence: People still want family to matter, yet fewer find themselves able to live that value fully.

The appendices that follow provide additional detail on the value distributions discussed in this paper, including Core value frequencies, mean rankings, and how Familycentrism compares across demographic groups. These tables offer further context for interpreting the patterns highlighted in the main text.

# Appendix

## Appendix A. Percent that a Value is Core (N = 88,928)

Value	Rank	% Core (Top 5)
Eudemonia	1	62.2
Voice	2	59.2
Non Sibi	3	52.0
Familycentrism	4	47.9
Affluence	5	37.9
Beholderism	6	32.5
Radius	7	32.4
Cosmos	8	29.3
Scope	9	26.0
Achievement	10	24.3
Workcentrism	11	24.3
Agency	12	23.5
Belovedness	13	21.9
Place	14	17.0
Belonging	15	15.8
Luminance	16	3.8

This table summarizes how frequently each value appears in respondents' Core set—their top five most important values. Eudemonia, Voice, and Non Sibi emerge as the most widely held, each appearing in the Core for more than half of participants. Familycentrism and Affluence follow, rounding out the top five. Values such as Beholderism, Radius, Cosmos, and Scope fall in the mid-range, held by roughly a quarter to a third of respondents. The least commonly held Core values include Place, Belonging, and especially Luminance, which appears in fewer than 4 percent of respondents' top five. Overall, the distribution highlights substantial variation in which values people prioritize most strongly.

**Appendix B. Percentage of People for Whom Familycentrism is their #1 Value by Relationship Status and Household Income Category**

	<\$50k	\$50-\$99k	\$100k-\$149k	\$150k+
<b>Single</b>	4.0	5.76	5.17	5.34
<b>Partnered</b>	5.0	6.67	8.21	6.42
<b>Married</b>	9.66	12.93	14.04	15.47
<b>Divorced</b>	8.0	11.55	11.26	10.81
<b>Widowed</b>	12.0	12.0	13.0	9.0

This table shows how often respondents selected Familycentrism as their top personal value across different combinations of relationship status and household income. The pattern is consistent: Married and widowed respondents report the highest rates of Familycentrism as their #1 value across all income levels, with percentages generally increasing as income rises. Single and partnered respondents show lower overall levels, though the pattern is relatively stable across income categories. The results suggest that both relationship commitments and financial security may be associated with a greater emphasis on Familycentrism as a core value.

## Appendix C. Mean Rank of 16 Values by Gen Z

Value	Mean Rank
Eudemonia	4.96
Voice	5.72
Non Sibi	6.09
Affluence	7.10
Beholderism	7.32
Achievement	7.48
Familycentrism	7.52
Belovedness	7.85
Radius	8.21
Scope	8.41
Workcentrism	8.77
Belonging	9.28
Agency	9.59
Cosmos	10.08
Place	11.20
Luminance	12.80

This table reports the average ranking of each value for Gen Z participants, with lower numbers indicating higher priority. Eudemonia, Voice, and Non Sibi occupy the top positions, reflecting their central importance to young adults' sense of well-being, expression, and contribution. Values such as Affluence, Beholderism, Achievement, and Familycentrism cluster in the middle, suggesting moderate but varied relevance across respondents. Toward the bottom of the ranking are Place and Luminance, which Gen Z participants tend to view as less central compared to other values. Overall, the pattern shows that Gen Z places the greatest emphasis on personal growth, autonomy, and purpose-driven living over family.

## Appendix D. Values Held in Core (Top 5) Above Familycentrism by Gender

### Percentage Core Above Familycentrism for Men

Value	%
Eudemonia	57.7
Voice	57.6
Belovedness	54.9
Familycentrism	50.0

### Percentage Core Above Familycentrism for Women

Value	%
Eudemonia	64.0
Voice	59.2
Belovedness	53.6
Familycentrism	47.8

### Percentage Core Above Familycentrism for Non-Binary People

Value	%
Voice	81.6
Eudemonia	68.0
Non Sibi	63.2
Radius	51.1
Belovedness	30.4
Beholderism	30.2
Scope	29.3
Agency	23.6
Belonging	21.6
Achievement	21.3
Cosmos	20.7
Workcentrism	20.6
Familycentrism	20.1

Across all gender groups, several values appear in the Core more often than Familycentrism. For men, Eudemonia, Voice, and Belovedness all rank higher. For women, Eudemonia, Voice, and Non Sibi exceed Familycentrism. Among non-binary respondents, many values—including Voice, Eudemonia, Non Sibi, and Radius—surpass Familycentrism by wide margins. These patterns show that Familycentrism, while meaningful, is not the top priority for most respondents.