

Intergenerational dynamics of family practices among young adults and their parents living together during the pandemic

Paula Pustulka, Justyna Kajta and Jowita Radzińska

1 Introduction

Studies dedicated to families and intimacy point to a certain paradox, in which modern families are on the one hand characterised by the precariousness of ‘drifting’ on the ocean of rapid social change and the pervasive crisis of relational stability (Adams 2010: 504), and, on the other hand, they are marked by the immutability of individuals’ aspirations to sustain and foster good family bonds (Jamieson 1998). The COVID-19 pandemic – as a significant and multiscalar social crisis – in many regards highlighted these conflicting visions of family life and necessitated changes in the practices of ‘doing’ (Morgan 1996) and ‘undoing’ family (Höppner et al. 2022) (see also Grunau in this volume). This happened as intergenerational relations became more externally governed by state policies whilst family members were suddenly confined into togetherness at home for longer periods of time.

As argued by Höppner and colleagues (2022), age and generationality (re)organised doing family through extended care requirements, given that care and educational institutions, as well as many workplaces, closed their doors. The pandemic also contributed to families’ ‘undoing’ via social distancing on the one hand, and relational strain caused by overcrowding, on the other (Prime et al. 2020). In other words, coresiding with one’s loved ones during the pandemic could simultaneously be described as a major source of increased stress caused by impossibility of doing and displaying family on one’s own terms (Radzińska/Pustulka 2022) and was pointed out as the last bastion of support and solidarity (Pustulka/Buler 2022).

The practices of doing family often had to be revisited during the pandemic in the context of the above dichotomy, being suspended in-between the positive emotional and social impact of having a family in the same household (Kajta et al. 2022) and the challenges that stemmed from living together in the trying times (Prime et al. 2020). With increasing research on various constellations of family members who shared a home during the pandemic, the differentiation of the given moment in the

family life-cycle (cf. McGoldrick et al. 2016) and the importance of age for ‘undoing’ family during the crisis came to the fore (Höppner et al. 2022). More specifically, the dynamics of family life under COVID-19 were hugely contingent on the ages of those representing different family generations sharing a space, alluding to the heterogeneity of family practices relative to codependency, capital and strength of bonds (cf. Stanley/Markman 2020; Cantillon et al. 2021; Pustulka/Buler 2022).

In this chapter, we focus on a particular context of ‘doing family’ (Morgan 1996) through practices of coresidence, as observed in the dyads of young adults (18–35-year-old) and their parents who lived together during the key period of lockdowns introduced in response to the pandemic in Poland in the 2020–2021 period. Analysing a specific subset of 40 interviews, we discuss three main scenarios of how family dynamics unfold in terms of experiencing intergenerational coresidence. The main research question is: What are the main patterns of intergenerational family dynamics, evident from family practices, observed among young adults and their parents living together during the COVID-19 lockdowns? Therefore, the chapter is contributing *au-courant* knowledge about (un)doing intergenerational family in times of crisis (cf. Höppner et al. 2022).

2 Doing family through co-residence during the pandemic

Familyhood in the modern world refers less and less to the imposed, functional meanings of blood ties, instead centralising relational closeness and practical support (cf. McCarthy/Edwards 2011). The turn to practice theory in social sciences, in family studies particularly evident in the works of Morgan (1996, 2011), means that family has become something that requires ongoing activity and engagement. In other words, family is about the practice of doing rather than just stasis of being (cf. Radzińska/Pustulka 2022), thus indicating that ‘doing’ can also be threatened by ‘undoing’, especially during crises (Höppner et al. 2022). Practices allow individuals to give their family life some structure without necessarily drawing meaning from the functional embedding of kin structures in an institutional or systemic context (Morgan 1996: 11). Looking at practices offers a way of capturing both permanence and variability or fluidity in the processes of doing and undoing family, as these transpire in the construction of ‘the self’ as relative to the proximity relationships created with others. The study of family practices thus emphasises the rituality, negotiability, and processuality of actions within relationships and family life, as well as the multilevel evaluations of these practices (McCarthy/Edwards 2011: 88).

Modern family life retained its ambivalence during the COVID-19 pandemic. On the one hand, researchers found that relationships in the families became strained as the practices of doing family became more contained and concentrated to the family space (Stanley/Markman 2020). In line with Morgan’s classic study (1996),

practices with non-coresidential kin members became delocalized and diffused. Isolation and distancing contributed to undoing of families (dissolution of bonds), while sharing space caused family conflicts to be reported more commonly (Prime et al. 2020; Höppner et al. 2022). On the other hand, studies also pointed to how a semblance of normalcy could be attained through routine everyday family practices (e.g., sharing meals; cf. Cantillon et al. 2021) and celebration of special occasions and holidays (Radzińska/Pustulka 2022). Maintaining contact and caring for relationships became particularly important during the COVID-19 pandemic (Höppner et al. 2022), but as material and emotional resources were depleted, a tightening of circles of support to closer relationships could be observed (Radzińska 2022; Schwiertz/Schwenken 2020).

Through the lens of doing family, coresidence practices belong to the sphere of navigating relationships in regard to both the quality of bonds and the housing conditions (cf. Holdsworth/Morgan 2005). Beyond the pandemic context, the housing situation is conceptualised on the basis of relational (the composition of the household and ‘temperature’ of relations within it) and spatial aspects (housing space and opportunities for each household member to have undisturbed and properly equipped space) (Lips 2021; Kajta et al. 2022; Walper/Reim 2020). It has been argued that, similar to other family relationships, the bonds between young adult children and their parents have evolved towards having a less hierarchical nature (cf. Woodman/Wyn 2014). Although differences in social status mean that it is primarily the middle-class youth who benefits from prolonged support (Sørensen/Nielsen 2021), it is generally accepted that all parents build a type of ‘scaffolding’ to assist young people with their transitions (Scabini et al. 2006), both out of the house and more broadly – in terms of reaching independence (Holdsworth/Morgan 2005).

In short, it is today not uncommon to continue living together, with the parents providing young grownups with economic, social and emotional assistance (Beer/Faulkner 2011; Woodman/Leccardi 2015). For the sake of context, it should be mentioned that compared to the European average age of leaving home (26,4), Polish young adults stay at family homes longer, until 28,1 (Eurostat 2020). Taking into account longer time perspective (2011–2019), the rates of coresidence were never below 88,3% for the younger cohort (18–24), and 43,4% for the older cohort (25–34) (Eurostat 2022). Importantly, rates for both age cohorts have increased recently. Compared to the data from 2019 (88,4%, 43,9%, respectively), in 2021 it stands at 94,4% and 48,8%. We assume that the pandemic could contribute to this noticeable change.

In line with the above data, international research shows the pandemics delay-effects for reaching independence, housing context included (Luppi et al. 2021). Even in the regimes where housing independence was considered important prior to the COVID-19 outbreak, reversed transitions (cf. Woodman/Leccardi 2015) – known as ‘boomeranging’ – were reported (Vehkalahti et al. 2021). Pre-existing intergenerational dynamics, embedded in both the structural aspect of family capital and its

relational 'temperature', stood out as crucial factors for offsetting the challenges of living together during lockdown (Walper/Reim 2020; Lips 2021).

Considering this state-of-the-art, this chapter contributes an analysis of the recent qualitative data on the experiences of young adults and their parents living together during the pandemic, focusing on 'doing family' and housing situation.

3 Study & methods

The chapter is based on the analysis of the data coming from the first wave of an intergenerational (multi-perspective) Qualitative Longitudinal Research (QLR) conducted in accordance with Neale's (2020) methodological proposal in the framework of a multi-component research project entitled *Becoming an adult in times of ultra-uncertainty: intergenerational theory of 'shaky' transitions* (ULTRAGEN; National Science Center Poland grant no. 2020/37/B/HS6/01685). The broader study, which has begun during the pandemic (2021), examines the impact of social crises on the transitions-to-adulthood. Given the unpredictability of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, digital research methods were implemented, and in-depth individual interview techniques were adapted to an online research environment. The project was approved by the relevant Research Ethics Committee.

During the first wave of this QLR (May–November 2021) 70 interviews with members of 35 families were collected. Young adults (aged 18 to 35; $n=35$) and one parent of each ($n=35$) were interviewed separately. Participant recruitment followed a purposive qualitative sampling and accounted for several criteria: residing in larger cities, heterogeneity in terms of gender, education and age (in case of young adults), or regarding gender and socio-economic background (in case of their parents).

Taking into account that this chapter is dedicated to the experiences of coresidence, 20 pairs (40 interviews) living together during the pandemic were subsampled and analysed here. In the remaining dyads, young adults lived independently, e.g., with partners or the non-interviewed parent. Among the 20 selected cases, 13 families lived together on a regular basis, with no prior experiences of living apart. Further seven families framed their pandemic coresidence as temporary, specifically occurring as a result of the young adults' boomeranging (i.e., moving back to their parents' homes). In three dyads who shared space during lockdown, the young adult has already moved out again by the summer of 2021. In the remaining four pairs, the situation was in flux. The interviewees' characteristics are presented in Figure 2 and 3 at the end of the chapter.


Data analysis was based on the interpretive paradigm and inductive approach facilitated by software-assisted data analyses. For this chapter, thematic approaches were used, as we focused on the interviewees' narratives regarding housing situations as well as relations with parents/children emanated in doing family/family

practices. The initial case-by-case analysis was followed by multi-perspective review of dyads, cross-case comparisons and elaborating of the emergent, saturated patterns. By juxtaposing the intra-family narratives, intergenerational similarities and differences in the experiences of coresidence could be tracked. As a result, three scenarios of intergenerational coresidence were described.

4 Exploring intergenerational corona co-residence

The first aspect taken into account in the analysis are the relations and practices of doing family narrated by young adults and their parents. These encompass the presence and frequency of mutual, everyday practices, family support practices, as well as potential conflicts that affect togetherness and cause family undoing, all understood as shaping the overall sense and evaluation of doing family (cf. Morgan 1996; McCarthy/Edwards 2011). The second aspect appearing as important is the spatial one, operationalized mostly through the housing situation and satisfaction with one's residence (Lips 2021; Walper/Reim 2020). Based on these aspects, we discern three main scenarios of intergenerational coresidence during the pandemic. Our conceptual model is presented in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Aspects and scenarios of 'doing family' through intergenerational coresidence during crises



4.1 Scenario 1: Tight but nice

The first scenario highlights the stories of families whose spatial capabilities are limited, yet their relations can be described as close, marked by shared practices of doing family. Although the pandemic-related lockdown resulted in some short-term challenges, these were not narrated as a primary problem, but rather as circumstances to consider within the more complex situation. In Scenario 1, structural challenges do not translate into family relations: household members support each

other and some of them highlight rather upsides of the rediscovered family practices during the lockdown.

To illustrate, two cases of father-daughter pairs will be presented: Magda (20) and her father Witold (46), and Nina (18) and her father Bartosz (46). In both cases, the household consisted of parents and their two children. Both families shared a challenge of limited space (small apartments) that gained significance in the pandemic context. It was especially reported as difficult for the young adults. As Magda experienced online learning in one room with her sister, Nina had to rearrange a living room to have online dancing lessons:

We have two rooms (in the flat), [I share one] with my sister. Sometimes it's hard, because when we're two, well, when there were these online lessons, it was hard. I had lessons, she had lessons, here something, there that: a total confusion. (Magda)

I had to chase everyone out of the living room because I just had to be alone. I moved all the furniture around so I had space [for dancing classes]. I simply connected through Zoom, with the camera. I stood at a chair and did exercises for 1.5 hours. In the winter, at 8 pm, so in the dark with artificial light, in the living room. It was not cool and that's what I remember as the worst of it. (Nina)

The limited space in the dwelling was also narrated by the women's fathers. However, both of them referred to having insufficient economic capital that could otherwise allow them to make an investment into alternative properties. Importantly, next to financial aspects, the family life-cycle (cf. McGoldrick et al. 2016) transpired as a relevant argument in housing decisions because the fathers envisioned the adult daughters being gone quite soon, rendering the space sufficient in their minds. Thus, the potential housing transition of young adults was mentioned as one of the reasons for staying in the current place. Simultaneously, as Witold highlighted, the situation on the housing market has been challenging for nearly everyone in Poland. Based on his own experiences of prolonged coresidence with his parents (until he accumulated enough capital to get a mortgage on a flat), his practices reflect the intersection of family and market logics: as he is not able to provide his daughter with housing capital, he exerts no pressure on her to move out:

We have a mortgage on the apartment, but it's not a big apartment, so with two children, we're also getting tired (of it), so to speak. We are tired in the respect that the daughters have grown up. When they were small, there was no problem. (...) Now they have company of their own. It's tight. It's just tight.

The fathers' perspective was shared by the daughters as they would like to move out but had not been formulating precise plans. Importantly, these structural challenges do not translate to relational ones. Although the pandemic was described as a little tiring because of the limited space and some tensions, both pairs admitted that they experienced mostly good family relations during the pandemic:

[During the pandemic] we certainly saw more of each other, (...) which is kind of positive because we learned something new about ourselves, and somehow started to act differently. There were also some nicer moments. We spent more time together, we could do more, tell more stories, get to know each other more closely. That's some positives there. But it was also an occasion to argue. That's the truth (...) but I think [we experienced] more positives than negatives. (Witold)

In this excerpt, we can see a clear evocation of doing family through shared time, stories and interaction (cf. Morgan 2011) in the modern way. This importance of strengthening bonds on the basis of disclosure of intimate information and trust (cf. Jamieson 1998) was also present in the daughters' accounts. Their stories confirm that young adults, even in the absence of economic/housing capital, see their families as a source of relational backing (cf. Holdsworth/Morgan 2005), with parents identified as someone one can count on:

[Because of remote learning/work] there was a lot of time when we were together, locked in the house, so we just had to learn and switch to spending more time with each other. It seems to me that however it affected us, it only got better. We started talking to each other more, and certainly nothing got worse (...) I enjoy spending time with my parents. (...) I can always talk to them when I have a problem, they will always help me. (Nina)

As regards the pandemic times, the narrators expressed both continuation or intensification of previously existing practices of doing family: talking to each other, celebrating dinners, watching movies, spending time gardening. Doing family is here aligned with supporting the external activities of family members in education and work. It can be argued that the families from Scenario 1 were able to not only draw on the relational resources but confirm and strengthen them during the crisis.

4.2 Scenario 2: Nothing to complain about

Through the second scenario we describe families whose situation is comfortable in terms of both spatial conditions and relations. As living together was already comfortable pre-pandemic, the COVID-19 did not bring revolutionary changes to 'doing family'. On the contrary, those equipped with material-relational resources could

more easily open up to the non-obvious benefits of the pandemic, for example by spending more time with each other or taking care to deepen their relationships.

Stories from two pairs, encompassing a mother-daughter and a mother-son dyads, both living in relatively spacious properties, are presented as illustrations. Dorota (43) shares a rented flat with her husband and two daughters, including the interviewed Pola (19). Beata (47) and her son Dominik (22) also live in a four-person household (with Dominik's father and younger sister). Importantly, Dominik returned to his family home temporarily due to the pandemic and remote education. Since both pairs perceived their housing conditions as comfortable, the experience of the pandemic triggered a more conscious appreciation of the ease of everyday existence:

We rented a big flat [before the pandemic] because we needed such a four-room space. (...) We are very happy because the flat is big and nice. (...) We have a park behind the fence (...) Even though it's not our flat, we feel comfortable here and I'm happy at the moment (Dorota).

As regards the housing and relational situations, the assessment of the impact of the pandemic on the quality of everyday life as minor or even positive for relationships can be seen in Beata's narrative:

I really didn't feel it, this pandemic. I didn't notice that this pandemic has somehow affected children or us because we are locked down.

Spending time together on a daily basis was a continuation of the pre-pandemic habits, with the benefit of having more time than before. Familiality, which today increasingly refers to relational closeness and practical support (cf. McCarthy/Edwards 2011) was tested during the period of the pandemic when home confinement intensified family relationships. The pairs who continued to enjoy spending time with each other afterwards felt that they had a really good relationship:

When we spend time together, we talk, watch tv (...) Yesterday we went to the allotment all together; this time is really not too much, because I can work even seven days a week (...) When there are moments like that, sometimes, we'll sit down and play a game, we'll even have a laugh. More than once they've waited for me to get back from work, I was on late shift, at 10 pm. I'm back from work and we played (games) too. As much as we can, we make time for each other, as much as time allows (Beata).

An essential criterion for coresidential convenience was the available space, not necessarily expressed in square metres but related to having one's own/exclusive room (cf. Lips 2021). During the pandemic-related remote activities, this directly trans-

lated into more comfortable working and learning conditions. Pola, for example, highlighted that the comfort of their confinement was a result of the number of family members staying at home. She was aware that it would have been difficult to create similarly consoling conditions for a fourth person:

We're at home a lot and we had to learn to put up with each other. When we were at home (...) my mom worked remotely, and my sister and I were here. Only my dad would go to work (...) There would be no room for him anymore; I don't know where he would sit. I don't know if it was a big influence, but we probably had to be more in tune to endure it (Pola).

In Scenario 2, the daily practices of being together and emotional closeness provided capital to better cope with the hardships of the lockdowns. With good relationships and sufficient resources, even returning home because of the pandemic – ‘boomeranging’ (Vehkalahti et al. 2021) – was seen more through the lens of benefits than losses and limitations:

I [did not] feel any more control or anything like that (...) Certainly, the exam session at home was easier for me, I don't know why, maybe also from experience and habits from previous exams it was easier for me, but also from the fact that I was home, I didn't have to go anywhere, get ready, I was in front of the computer (Dominik).

Even controversial issues such as a parent's caregiving seemed easier to accept and even in some cases appreciated:

I wouldn't be able to live alone. I think it would be beyond me. (...) I like to be aware for now that there are my parents watching over everything I do. So I'm fine with that. I wouldn't want to be entirely on my own for the time being (Pola).

The slight reduction in comfort expressed by the interviewees was related to the life outside of the family, namely the necessity of reducing contacts in the wider social networks and challenges of learning/working remotely. There was no ‘undoing family’ as these aspects had little to do with the dwelling quality or relationships with the coresiding loved ones.

4.3 Scenario 3: Comfortable yet parallel lives

The third scenario of coresidential coexistence concerns dyads living comfortably but leading rather parallel lives. For the most part, the stories here demonstrate the impact of limited practices of doing family on the parent-child bonds that are rooted

in the everyday and routine sphere, regardless of the objectively very good housing situation. The two case examples concern one mother-son and one mother-daughter pair, wherein some sort of 'family undoing' – understood as weakening of bonds (Höppner et al. 2022) – has happened prior to the COVID-19 crisis.

Despite sharing a dwelling, some young adults and their parents exhibit narrow relational practices (cf. Morgan 1996). This can be observed in the stories of a two-person household formed by Danuta (44) and her son Mateusz (21). They were very consistent in their evaluation of their bond as 'fine' but also weakening. While their stories are aligned, the mother expressed some resentment towards Mateusz becoming disinterested in family practices, for instance treating celebrations and everyday family time as an unwelcome duty:

(Being together) happens less often. We sit down, talk about some things, eat something. It's no longer that I go to the movies with him, or go to the beach with him. He doesn't want to go with me anymore. He has his friends, he has his girlfriend and he spends time with them. He joins us at the Christmas table because he has to. (...) Otherwise he won't propose it, won't see the need to go to his grandparents on the weekend, for example. I have to drag him. (Danuta)

Simply put, I'm entering adulthood and I forget about meetings with family, rather focus on my profession, studies and friends (Mateusz)

For this family, the pandemic became an accelerator of 'undoing' and detachment, increasing the overall absence of the young adult in family life. Mateusz could use the 'risk of a virus' as a valid excuse not to see his family too often. The pandemic-related rift was deepened by the fact that while Danuta appreciated remote work giving her more time for her family, her son continued his previously started relationally independent life.

Underscoring how the particular moment of the family life-cycle (McGoldrick et al. 2016; Höppner et al. 2022) played a significant role during the pandemic, we see here that even if the family is well-equipped and not ridden by conflicts, both generations discover that the time has come for family practices to become less intensive, as the young adult thinks about prospective paths and independent relations, rather than bonds in the family (cf. Holdsworth/Morgan 2005). Thus, as the relational practices are becoming separate from doing family, more consideration is given to moving out, despite the fact that the housing situation in the family of origin is comfortable and spatially non-problematic:

His girlfriend lives with her parents, although she has a possibility (separate flat) to live on her own. She wants to live with her parents, because she's fine with her parents, and he says the same thing, that he doesn't want to move out, because he's fine living with me. I think that if they agree that

they need to live together, the two of them, then that decision will be made then. (Danuta)

Another example comes from the case of Anita (18) and her mother Julita (46). The daughter underlined that the pandemic did not have any spatial repercussions for her, as she is an only child who has an entire floor in a suburban house at her disposal. At the same time, both Anita and her mother highlighted that the family dynamics have shifted and are marked by fewer and fewer practices of doing family:

When I was a kid, we had a movie night every Friday, (a family) film screening, some walks (...) Now it's basically nothing. (My) parents still have Friday screenings, but I told them that I don't want to spend time with them in this way, because we don't talk during these screenings, or even discuss the films afterwards, we don't say what we liked (...) so it's all the more pointless. (...) There are no such shared moments of togetherness (anymore).

Even though puberty is theoretically behind them, Julita seems to recognize that her daughter is more distant. Zooming in on spatial practices, we can see the mother-daughter tensions being illustrated by Julita's wish to manage her daughter's life and space, and Anita's struggle for control over the home-defining practices:

She is changing a lot. Yesterday we had a big argument about me (...) restricting her, not listening to her needs, (about the fact) that she doesn't ask me to make her bed, and I make her bed. So I explain to her why I am making her bed, because she gets up, takes the quilt off (...) and we have a cat who goes outside and brings in all sorts of things with her, along with ticks. I just ask her "Honey, cover the sheet (...) because it's dangerous and unsanitary". And that's the only thing I ask. But of course, (...) this bed is a symbol of our arguments (...) a symbol of the misunderstanding; (it's) where this boundary is.

Although the family could continue living together, the temperature of the relationship has dropped and both mother and daughter saw fewer motivations for living together. While Julita is worried that her daughter's departure will be hard for her, she also recognizes that it might be time for her daughter to move out for relational reasons.

When relationships are strained but extensive capital is available, the young adults and their parents can together seek solutions of making coresidence bearable, including separation of living spaces and enforcing rules on who is in control of which room and why. Hence, the trials of corona coresidence in the face of relational strain could be realised mostly in households with very comfortable housing, i.e., those owning or renting dwellings that met or exceeded family needs.

5 Discussion & Conclusion

Three scenarios of the interlacing family practices and housing situations were discovered in our analysis and discussed in this chapter. Each of the scenarios has been illustrated with the cases of young adult-parent pairs, allowing for multiperspectivity and cross-validation of findings in the context of doing family rather than at the individual level.

Two of the scenarios cover close intergenerational family relations illustrated by numerous practices of togetherness (cf. Morgan 1996). They are distinguished, however, by different spatial circumstances. The first scenario was observed in families coresiding in limited, 'tight' spaces, whereas the second pertained to comfortable dwellings where more spatial freedoms were available by default. In the scenario where space was limited but family practices were warm and frequent, both young adults and their parents could downplay the obvious disadvantages of limited space, especially difficult during the lockdown. The upsides of the situation (more time spent together, emotional support) were highlighted here. Thus, in the case of pre-existing good relations and everyday practices, pandemic and 'forced' togetherness could translate into intensification and appreciation of 'doing family' as a response to difficult times. For the second scenario where interviewees had 'nothing to complain about', both spatial and relational aspects seemed to be in order, regardless of the COVID-19 lockdowns and risks. The comfort of cohabitation was drawn from having intimate space for working/learning and was buttressed by continuation of the previously existing family practices. The pandemic was not narrated as having a huge impact on family dynamics.

The third scenario describes the situations in which the household members have a relatively large housing space and, simultaneously, rather weak relations. The latter are evident from quite limited practices of togetherness, consistent with family that has been undone (Höppner et al. 2022). Although the families were satisfied with the spatial aspects of their housing situation, simultaneous absence of the family practices of togetherness triggered both generations to contest sharing of the home-space. As a result, these families have seen the increased prominence of family discussions on young adults seeking independence. For them, the crisis might become a catalyst for changing family housing situations but was less commonly a reason for new family practices emerging.

Taking into account all scenarios, it can be argued that having enough space for going through the pandemic lockdown did not have a uniform effect on the families of the coresiding young adults and their parents. It seems that the embeddedness of the pre-pandemic family everyday practises matters here. When spatial aspects are not narrated as challenging, the difference lies in the 'temperature' of relations and the quality of the time spent together. While the pandemic has caused intensification, maintenance or modification of the previously existing family practices, it did

not create completely new ones in the families with limited practices of everyday togetherness. In this qualitative sample, we did not find any cases in which weakness of relations would overlap with limited/tight housing conditions. Overall, it should be noticed that research involving interviewing family dyads can result in the recruitment of the pairs of young adults and their parents who have good (enough) relations to take part in the project together. This might point to the known self-selection bias in family research.

Seen through the prism of the existing literature, our findings confirm that the pandemic – like previous crises – had significant effects on doing family and family practices (cf. Pustulka/Buler 2021; Radzińska/Pustulka 2022). One of the areas specifically of note were housing situations in which multigenerational families found themselves (cf. Walper/Reim 2020; Timonen et al. 2021; Lips 2021), as they could make or break the family during the coronavirus crisis, mostly when spatial confinement translated to strained relationships. We argue that the pandemic introduced new dynamics into intergenerational settings of family spaces, engendering new/modified ways of thinking about family as being done or undone (Höppner 2022) in connection to age, generationality and family life-cycle (McGoldrick et al. 2016). However, the shape of pandemic family dynamics depended on both spatial conditions and the previously (non)existing everyday family practices and relations.

Initial struggles were directly linked to the family's housing situation and caused by a sudden need to share limited space when 'stay-at-home' directives came into effect. Both young adults and their parents spoke of various consequences linked to suddenly being forced to spend the entirety of their time in close spatial proximity. Next to spatial rearrangements, more emotional work was also needed in the realm of managing space, resolving tensions and negotiating relationships that stemmed from different relational expectations. Simultaneously, some young adults also highlighted certain benefits of spending more time with their immediate family, especially parents, in regard to family practices focused on quality time and emotional closeness (cf. Morgan 1996). Their narratives are complemented by the perspective of their parents, who usually had to manage not only their own emotional, spatial, and material needs, but also those of the household and family members overall.

Like any qualitative inquiry, the study has certain limitations in terms of non-generalisability. However, unlike aggregated quantitative data, in-depth interviews can foster disentanglement of the specificity encroached in personal experiences of families. Taking into account the longitudinal character of the project presented in the paper, the next wave of interviews (planned for early 2023) will let us add a temporally comparative time perspective to the presented results. We will be able to see how these pandemic-related family practices and experiences evolve in the individuals' narratives over time.

Figure 2: Sample Part 1

Young adult				Parent			Coresidence situation		
	Pseudo-nym	Gender Age	Educational / Labor Market Status	Pseudo-nym	Gender Age	Labor Market Status	Housing type	Number of household members	Type of coresidence
1.	Marek	M 25	PhD student	Izabela	F 50	academic teacher	own apartment	4	temporary: 2 months during lockdown
2.	Szymon	M 23	student/ part-time job in food industry	Kaja	F 44	public sector official	own apartment	2	permanent
3.	Anita	F 18	high-school student	Julita	F 46	researcher/freelancer	own house	3	permanent
4.	Julia	F 20	student/ part-time job in food industry	Piotr	M 47	academic teacher	rented apartment	3	permanent: every other month because of joint custody
5.	Pola	F 19	recent high-school graduate/ job at a call centre	Dorota	F 43	academic teacher	rented apartment	4	permanent
6.	Klara	F 19	recent high-school graduate	Olga	F 42	homemaker	own house	5	ongoing boomeranging
7.	Dominik	M 22	student/part-time retail job	Beata	F 47	chemist	own apartment	4	temporary: few months during pandemic
8.	Bartek	M 24	student/looking for a job	Klaudia	F 52	psychologist	own house	2	ongoing boomeranging
9.	Wojtek	M 19	recent high-school graduate/ working part-time in hospitality	Malkolm	M 45	entrepreneur	own house	7	permanent

Figure 3: Sample Part 2

Young adult				Parent			Coresidence situation		
	Pseudo-nym	Gender Age	Educational / Labor Market Status	Pseudo-nym	Gender Age	Labor Market Status	Housing type	Number of household members	Type of coresidence
10.	Damian	M 23	student/ looking for a job	Krzysztof	M 49	storehouse manager	own apartment	4	permanent
11.	Mateusz	M 21	student/ part-time job in food industry	Danuta	F 44	banking specialist	own apartment	2	permanent
12.	Stefan	M 19	recent high-school graduate	Agata	F 44	beautician	own apartment	3	permanent
13.	Kamila	F 21	student/summer job	Ilona	F 52	call centre employee	own apartment	4	permanent
14.	Tymoteusz	M 24	service clerk	Maryla	F 57	kindergarten teacher	own house	7	ongoing boomeranging
15.	Nina	F 18	high-school student	Bartosz	M 46	municipal official	own apartment	4	permanent
16.	Eliza	F 21	student/ job in retail	Andrzej	M 45	manager/taxi driver	own apartment	4	permanent
17.	Magda	F 20	intern at the public institution	Witold	M 46	dispatcher at post office	own apartment	4	permanent
18.	Weronika	F 31	entrepreneur	Antoni	M 56	manager	own house	5	permanent: two separate households in one house
19.	Mirek	M 27	new entry-level job in logistics	Jurek	M 60	pensioner/ dog breeder	own house	3	temporary: few months during pandemic
20.	Igor	M 31	office worker	Edmund	M 55	modeller	own apartment	3	permanent

Literature

- Adams, Bert N. (2010): "Themes and Threads of Family Theories: A Brief History," in: *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 41(4), pp. 499–505.
- Beer, Andrew/Faulkner, Debbie (2011): "Housing over the life course: housing histories, careers, pathways and transitions," in: *Housing transitions through the life course*, pp. 15–38.
- Cantillon, Sara/Moore, Elena/Teasdale, Nina (2021): "COVID-19 and the Pivotal role of Grandparents: Childcare and income Support in the UK and South Africa," in: *Feminist Economics* 27.1-2, pp. 188–202.
- Eurostat (2021), Age of young people leaving their parental household, https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Age_of_young_people_leaving_their_parental_household&oldid=494351, dated 01/05/2022.
- Eurostat (2022), Share of young adults aged 18–34 living with their parents by age and sex – EU-SILC survey[ilc_lvps08], http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=ilc_lvps08, dated 28/07/2022.
- Holdsworth, Clare/Morgan, David (2005): *Transitions in context: Leaving home, independence and adulthood: leaving home, independence and adulthood, Maidenhead: Open University Press.*
- Höppner, Grit/Wanka, Anna/ Endter, Cordula (2022): "Linking Ages–un/doing age and family in the Covid-19 Pandemic," in: *Journal of Family Research* 34.1, pp. 563–581.
- Jamieson, Lynn (1998): *Intimacy: Personal Relationships in Modern Societies*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Katja, Justyna /Pustulka, Paula/Radzińska, Jowita (2022): Young people and housing transitions during COVID-19: Navigating co-residence with parents and housing autonomy, *Housing Studies*, 38(1), 44–64. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673037.2022.2135171>.
- Lips, Anna (2021): "The Situation of Young People at Home During COVID-19 Pandemic," in: *Childhood Vulnerability Journal* 3.1, pp. 61–78.
- Luppi, Francesca/Alessandro, Rosina/Emiliano, Sironi (2021): "On the changes of the intention to leave the parental home during the COVID-19 pandemic: A comparison among five European countries," in: *Genus* 77.1, pp. 1–23.
- McCarthy, Jane Ribbens/Edwards, Rosalind (2011): *Key Concepts in Family Studies*, London: Sage.
- Morgan, David H. (2011): *Rethinking Family Practices*, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Morgan, David H. (1996): *Family Connections: An introduction to family studies*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

- McGoldrick, Monica/Garcia-Preto, Nydia A./Carter, Betty A. (2016): *Expanding Family Life Cycle. Individual, Family, and Social Perspectives*. 5th Edition, Boston: Pearson.
- Neale, Bren (2020): *Qualitative Longitudinal Research*, Great Britain: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Pustulka, Paula/Buler, Marta (2022): "First-time motherhood and intergenerational solidarities during COVID-19," in: *Journal of Family Research* 34.1, pp. 16–40.
- Prime, Heather/Wade, Mark/Browne, Dillon T. (2020): "Risk and resilience in family well-being during the COVID-19 pandemic," in: *American Psychologist* 75.5, pp. 631–643.
- Radzińska, Jowita/Pustulka, Paula (2022): "Pandemiczne święta: typologia postaw Polek i Polaków wobec zmian w praktykach rodzinnych w kryzysie w świetle danych jakościowych," in: *Roczniki Nauk Społecznych* 14.50, pp. 63–81.
- Radzińska, Jowita (2022): "Zmiana postrzegania i doświadczania solidarności w pandemii COVID-19," in: *Studia Socjologiczne* 3.246, pp. 111–136.
- Scabini, Eugenia/Marta, Elena/Lanz, Margherita (2006): *The transition to adulthood and family relations: An intergenerational approach*, Hove/New York: Psychology Press.
- Schwartz, Helge/Schwenken, Helen (2020): "Introduction: inclusive solidarity and citizenship along migratory routes in Europe and the Americas," in: *Citizenship Studies* 24.4, pp. 405–423.
- Sørensen, Niels Ulrik/Nielsen, Mette Lykke (2021): "In a way, you'd like to move with them: young people, moving away from home, and the roles of parents," in: *Journal of Youth Studies* 24.4, pp. 547–561.
- Stanley, Scott M./Markman Howard J. (2020): "Helping couples in the shadow of COVID-19," in: *Family process* 59.3, pp. 937–955.
- Timonen, Virpi/Greene, Jo/Émon, Ayesha (2021): "We're Meant to Be Crossing Over ... but the Bridge Is Broken: 2020 University Graduates' Experiences of the Pandemic in Ireland," in: *YOUNG* 29.4, pp. 349–365.
- Vehkalahti, Kaisa/Armila, Päivi/Sivenius, Ari (2021): "Emerging Adulthood in the Time of Pandemic: The COVID-19 Crisis in the Lives of Rural Young Adults in Finland," in: *YOUNG* 29.4, pp. 399–416.
- Walper, Sabine/Reim, Julia (2020): "Young People in the COVID-19 Pandemic: Findings from Germany," in: *International Society for Study of Behavioral Development Bulletin* 78, pp. 18–20.
- Woodman, Dan/Leccardi, Carmen (2015): "Generations, transitions, and culture as practice: A temporal approach to youth studies," in: Dan Woodman/Andy Bennett (eds.), *Youth cultures, transitions, and generations*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 56–68.
- Woodman, Dan/Wyn, Johanna (2014): *Youth and generation: Rethinking change and inequality in the lives of young people*, London/New York: Sage.