BOUNDARY AMBIGUITY

Authored by

mohammad looti

October 14, 2025

Boundary Ambiguity

Primary Disciplinary Field(s): Family Studies, Clinical Psychology, Systems Theory

Boundary Ambiguity is a profound psychological and systemic concept describing a state of uncertainty within a family unit regarding who is considered an "in" or "out" member. This ambiguity arises when there is a significant discrepancy between the psychological or emotional perception of a family member's status and their actual physical presence. It represents a fundamental confusion about the boundaries of the family system itself, leaving members unable to definitively answer crucial questions about their structure, roles, and status, especially following highly stressful life transitions such as divorce, chronic illness, or disaster. The confusion inherent in **Boundary Ambiguity** is not merely a disagreement, but a systemic challenge to the definition of reality, which often paralyzes the family's ability to adapt or move forward.

The core issue lies in the contrast between internal experience and external observation. A family member viewing the system from within may be deeply uncertain about how to proceed with practical and emotional tasks--such as addressing property division, assigning caregiving duties, or planning for the future--because the status of a key member is unresolved. Conversely, an outside observer, such as a legal professional or a community member, may perceive the boundary status of the individual quite clearly (e.g., legally divorced, medically incapacitated). This internal-external conflict means that the cognitive coping mechanisms necessary for effective family functioning are severely undermined, leading to high levels of stress, role strain, and often, frozen grief.

1. Core Definition

At its most basic level, **Boundary Ambiguity** (n.) refers to the dissonance or lack of clarity concerning the membership of the family unit. It is characterized by the psychological inability of family members to determine accurately who belongs to the system and who does not, or the degree to which a person belongs. This condition creates an untenable paradox: the person is both here and gone, or neither here nor gone. This psychological state of flux is particularly taxing because it obstructs the fundamental need for clarity regarding roles (who does what), status (who is recognized as a legitimate member), and overall membership (who counts as 'family').

The conceptual framework holds that clarity of boundaries is essential for the effective functioning of any system. When boundaries become blurred, roles become ambiguous. For instance, in situations of **divorce and remarriage**, a child may experience high Boundary Ambiguity regarding the status of a stepparent or an absent biological parent, creating uncertainty about loyalty and expected behaviors. Similarly, if a grandparent moves in due to declining health, the boundaries between the immediate nuclear family and the extended family become ambiguous, requiring renegotiation of privacy, space, and caregiving responsibilities. When this negotiation fails, the ambiguity persists, leading to systemic stress and often, a retreat into fixed or rigid patterns of

interaction designed to avoid addressing the central uncertainty.

The distinction between internal perception and external reality is paramount. A legal decree of divorce, for example, clearly defines the structural boundary change for the outside world. However, if the divorced parents continue to share emotional or economic resources extensively, the psychological boundary for the children and potentially the parents themselves remains ambiguous. This discrepancy--the objective fact versus the subjective experience--is the defining feature of the concept, driving the need for clinical intervention focused on achieving psychological clarity, even when structural clarity is unattainable.

2. Historical Context and Origins

The concept of **Boundary Ambiguity** was primarily developed and formalized by family therapist and researcher Pauline Boss in the 1970s and 1980s. Boss initially encountered this phenomenon while studying families of soldiers missing in action (MIA) during the Vietnam War. These families were trapped in an agonizing state of limbo; the soldier was physically absent, yet psychologically and legally, they remained present. There was no body, no death certificate, and thus, no permission to grieve, reorganize, or move forward definitively. This inability to establish closure crystallized the concept.

Boss subsequently broadened the application of the term beyond military contexts to encompass any stressful event that separates physical presence from psychological presence, or vice versa. Her work is deeply rooted in **Family Systems Theory**, which views the family not as a collection of individuals but as an interconnected system where a change in one part affects all other parts. Ambiguity, in this context, is viewed as a systemic stressor that prevents the system from achieving equilibrium or establishing necessary adaptive changes. The development of the concept shifted the therapeutic focus from treating individual pathology to addressing the cognitive and perceptual confusion within the relational unit itself.

The development of tools like the Boundary Ambiguity Scale (BAS) further validated the concept, allowing researchers and clinicians to quantify the level of perceived ambiguity within different family systems, linking high scores to various negative outcomes such as depression, anxiety, and relationship conflict. The rigorous conceptualization provided a necessary lens for understanding unique forms of loss that do not conform to traditional models of grief, which typically require a clear, finalized ending. By identifying the problem as one of ambiguous boundaries and status rather than simple grief, Boss provided a pathway for intervention that focuses on meaning-making and acceptance of uncertainty.

3. The Two Dimensions of Ambiguity

Boss identified two crucial types of ambiguous loss that result in **Boundary Ambiguity**, based on

the physical and psychological presence of the missing or uncertain member. These dimensions are critical for both diagnosis and targeted intervention, as the nature of the uncertainty dictates the type of coping mechanism required by the family.

The first type is characterized by **physical absence with psychological presence**. This occurs when a family member is physically gone, but the family holds onto the hope or belief that they may return, or they are legally still considered a member. Examples include soldiers missing in action, kidnapped children, individuals lost in natural disasters, or the non-custodial parent who is highly idealized or demonized but remains a central emotional figure in the children's lives despite physical distance. In this scenario, the family cannot complete the necessary tasks of mourning because the loss has not been definitively confirmed. The system remains "on hold," waiting for resolution, which drains resources and prevents new roles from being established.

The second, often more challenging type involves **physical presence with psychological absence**. In this situation, the family member is physically present in the home, yet cognitively, emotionally, or relationally absent. Classic examples include individuals suffering from severe dementia, severe mental illness (such as schizophrenia), chronic addiction, or debilitating brain injury (such as a coma). The person looks the same and occupies physical space, but the relationship has profoundly changed; the personality, memory, or emotional connection that defined the relationship is gone. Family members struggle to reconcile the person they see with the person they remember, resulting in chronic grief and confusion over how to relate to the physically present stranger. This type of ambiguity can lead to severe emotional exhaustion, as caregivers attempt to interact with a ghost of the past while simultaneously managing the physical needs of the present.

4. Manifestations within the Family System

The consequences of unresolved **Boundary Ambiguity** ripple through the family system, manifesting in predictable patterns of dysfunction and stress. One of the most immediate manifestations is **role confusion**. When the status of a member is unclear, the responsibilities and duties that person previously held are left floating. For instance, if a husband is psychologically absent due to severe alcoholism, the wife may be forced to take on both parental and economic roles, resulting in role overload. If the family refuses to acknowledge the psychological absence, they may resist assigning these roles to others, preferring to maintain the pretense of normalcy, which exacerbates systemic stress.

Another key manifestation is the inability to make crucial **life decisions**. Families paralyzed by ambiguity often struggle to move forward with economic planning, residence changes, or even routine daily scheduling because they are perpetually waiting for the ambiguous situation to resolve itself. This "stuckness" often appears as family rigidity or resistance to change.

Furthermore, the emotional manifestation involves **frozen grief** or chronic sorrow. Because the loss is incomplete or undefined, the family cannot transition through the normal stages of mourning. They remain suspended in a state of anticipatory grief or prolonged sadness, which can lead to individual psychological distress such as anxiety, depression, or emotional numbness.

In the context of **divorce and remarriage**, ambiguity manifests in the form of blurred loyalty lines. Children may feel guilty defining the new stepparent as a parental figure if the biological parent is still psychologically present (or idealized), leading to behavioral problems or emotional withdrawal. The failure of the system to clearly address and label the new configuration--to define who has authority and who belongs--maintains the high stress level. The persistence of these ambiguous boundaries often means the family system operates under a continuous, low-level crisis state, requiring high energy simply to maintain the illusion of stability.

5. Boundary Ambiguity vs. Permeable Boundaries

While related, it is crucial to differentiate **Boundary Ambiguity** from the concept of a permeable family or system. General boundary permeability refers to the degree of emotional and informational flow allowed between the family and the outside world, or between subsystems within the family (e.g., parent-child boundaries). Highly permeable boundaries are often described as enmeshed or diffuse, where privacy is low and emotional differentiation is difficult. Rigid boundaries, conversely, are highly impermeable, leading to disengagement.

Boundary Ambiguity, however, is not fundamentally about the flow of information or emotional closeness; it is about the structural uncertainty of membership. A family can have rigid internal boundaries (low emotional flow) and still suffer from Boundary Ambiguity if the status of an external member is unclear. Conversely, a family with highly permeable boundaries (enmeshed) may also suffer from ambiguity, especially regarding the roles and relationships of those members who are physically present but psychologically unavailable. The two concepts often interact: Boundary Ambiguity is a stressor that often *causes* the family to react with dysfunction, which may manifest as overly permeable or overly rigid coping boundaries.

In essence, permeability describes *how* the system interacts and regulates closeness, while ambiguity describes *who* the system believes it is composed of. Ambiguity is the fundamental cognitive problem of "is this person in or out?" whereas permeability is the relational problem of "how close or separate should we be?" Effective clinical work requires recognizing that while both represent boundary difficulties, ambiguity must be addressed by helping the family define the "in/out" status, even if the answer is "we don't know," thereby tolerating the uncertainty.

6. Clinical Implications and Assessment

For clinical practitioners, recognizing **Boundary Ambiguity** is the first step toward effective

intervention, particularly in family therapy. Standard therapeutic approaches that focus on achieving closure or resolution often fail in these cases because resolution (e.g., confirmation of death or return) may be impossible. Therefore, the clinical goal shifts from seeking absolute clarity to fostering cognitive mastery and resilience in the face of uncertainty.

The primary tool for assessing the severity and pervasiveness of the problem is the **Boundary Ambiguity Scale (BAS)**, developed by Boss and her colleagues. This quantitative measure helps identify the level of perceived uncertainty across various family contexts (such as physical loss or cognitive impairment). High BAS scores indicate a family that is likely stressed, struggling with adaptation, and prone to poor decision-making. The assessment helps the clinician validate the family's stress--confirming that their confusion is a predictable, normal reaction to an abnormal, ambiguous situation.

Therapeutic strategies focus heavily on **reconstruction of meaning** and the acceptance of the paradox. Techniques often involve acknowledging the reality of both presence and absence simultaneously. For the family of an MIA soldier, this means recognizing the pain of the loss while simultaneously celebrating the memory and legacy of the person. For the family dealing with dementia, it means grieving the person they lost while learning to love and care for the person who remains. The goal is to help the family establish new, clear boundaries around the ambiguity itself, allowing them to reorganize roles and move forward without guilt or the need for definitive closure that may never arrive.

7. Impact on Family Functioning and Resilience

The long-term impact of high **Boundary Ambiguity** on family functioning is significant, primarily because it depletes the family's adaptive resources and undermines effective communication. Families struggling with high ambiguity often exhibit lower morale, chronic conflict stemming from underlying anxiety, and difficulty maintaining functional subsystems (e.g., parental coalition breaking down). The stress associated with not knowing can also manifest physically, leading to increased health problems among family members.

Conversely, research into families that manage ambiguous loss effectively highlights pathways to **resilience**. Resilient families are those that are able to: 1) Find meaning in the loss or ambiguity, framing the uncertainty as a challenge rather than a catastrophe; 2) Master the situation by identifying the elements they can control (e.g., funeral planning for the psychologically absent person, or reorganizing finances); and 3) Reconstruct identity by defining themselves in relation to the loss, rather than being defined by it. This often involves developing a flexible worldview that allows for simultaneous reality checks--the person is gone, *and* they are still loved.

Ultimately, the concept emphasizes that while ambiguity is a stressor, the family's ability to tolerate and normalize that uncertainty is the key predictor of long-term health. The family that achieves

psychological clarity--even if that clarity is the acceptance of unresolved ambiguity--is far more resilient than the family that remains frozen in denial, perpetually fighting to force a resolution that objective reality cannot provide.

8. Debates and Criticisms

While **Boundary Ambiguity** is a highly influential and validated concept, particularly in clinical family therapy, it is not without debate. One primary criticism focuses on potential cultural bias. Critics argue that the concept, largely developed in Western contexts, may inadvertently pathologize family structures in other cultures where ambiguity regarding membership or the physical location of kin is more normative or accepted, such as in certain communal or non-nuclear extended family systems. What is perceived as ambiguity in one cultural context may simply be structural flexibility in another.

Furthermore, some psychological commentators suggest that the concept risks over-complicating or pathologizing aspects of normal human grief and adaptation. They argue that some degree of uncertainty is inherent in all loss, and classifying a wide range of experiences (from divorce to dementia) under one umbrella term might obscure the distinct therapeutic needs of each specific scenario. The reliance on measurement tools like the BAS has also drawn critique regarding its reliability in capturing the nuanced, subjective experience of family dynamics, particularly when ambiguity is tied to highly traumatic events.

Despite these debates, the enduring strength of the Boundary Ambiguity concept lies in its ability to provide language for the previously unspeakable pain of incomplete loss. It has profoundly shifted clinical practice by offering interventions focused on cognitive reframing rather than unattainable closure, providing a foundational framework for understanding modern family stress that extends far beyond the traditional nuclear model.

Further Reading

Pauline Boss
Systems Theory
Family Systems Theory
Dementia
Concept