



Bureau of Justice Statistics

Special Report

September 2010, NCJ 227379

National Crime Victimization Survey

Victimization During Household Burglary


Shannan Catalano, Ph.D.,
BJS Statistician

An estimated 3.7 million household burglaries occurred each year on average from 2003 to 2007. In about 28% of these burglaries, a household member was present during the burglary. In 7% of all household burglaries, a household member experienced some form of violent victimization (figure 1).

These estimates of burglary are based on a revised definition of burglary from the standard classification in the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS). Historically, burglary is classified as a property crime except when someone is home during the burglary and a household member is attacked or threatened. When someone is home during a burglary and experiences violence, NCVS classification rules categorize the victimization as a personal (rape/sexual assault, robbery, and aggravated and simple assault) rather than a property crime (household burglary, theft, and motor vehicle theft). In this report, the definition of household burglary includes burglaries in which a household member was a victim of a violent crime (see *Methodology*).

Figure 1.

Number and percent distribution of household burglaries, 2003–2007



Highlights

- An estimated 3.7 million burglaries occurred each year on average from 2003 to 2007.
- A household member was present in roughly 1 million burglaries and became victims of violent crimes in 266,560 burglaries.
- Simple assault (15%) was the most common form of violence when a resident was home and violence occurred. Robbery (7%) and rape (3%) were less likely to occur when a household member was present and violence occurred.
- Offenders were known to their victims in 65% of violent burglaries; offenders were strangers in 28%.
- Overall, 61% of offenders were unarmed when violence occurred during a burglary while a resident was present. About 12% of all households violently burglarized while someone was home faced an offender armed with a firearm.
- Households residing in single family units and higher density structures of 10 or more units were least likely to be burglarized (8 per 1,000 households) while a household member was present.
- Serious injury accounted for 9% and minor injury accounted for 36% of injuries sustained by household members who were home and experienced violence during a completed burglary.

“Home invasion” has been used widely to describe an array of victimizations

“Home invasion” has been used broadly to describe any crime committed by an individual unlawfully entering a residence while someone is home. More narrowly, home invasion has been used to describe a situation where an offender forcibly enters an occupied residence with the specific intent of robbing or violently harming those inside.

The limited numbers of states incorporating the term “home invasion” into their state statutes include the intent on the part of the offender in their definition. In part, these statutes have defined intent as—

- A person enters or remains unlawfully in a dwelling with the intent of committing a violent crime;
- A person knowingly enters the dwelling place of another with the knowledge or expectation that someone (one or more persons) is present;
- The unauthorized entering of any inhabited dwelling or other structure belonging to another with the intent to use force or violence upon the person of another.

Public perception and media reports of home invasion do not necessarily include intent

Public perception and media reports of home invasion do not necessarily include intent on the part of the offender. Situations reported by the media as home invasion include—

- An offender forcibly enters a home to rob the household of specific items, including cash, drugs, or other items— *specific households or residents may become a target either to “settle a score” or because residents are perceived as vulnerable, such as persons with disabilities and the elderly.*
- An offender enters a residence falsely believing no one is home and a confrontation occurs between the resident and the offender.

- A household member returns home while a burglary is in progress and a confrontation occurs between the household member and the offender.

National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) estimates of nonfatal crimes and the consequences to victims do not include offender motivation

The NCVS provides estimates of nonfatal violent and property crime and the consequences to victims. If a victim suffers violence during a burglary, NCVS classification rules categorize the victimization as a personal rather than a property crime. Some of these burglaries measured by the survey may fall under the broad definition of home invasion.

Between 2003 and 2007—

- A household member was home in 28% of the 3.7 million average annual burglaries that occurred between 2003 and 2007 (table 1).
- In nonviolent burglaries, household members knew the offender in 30% of the burglaries taking place while someone was home; the offender was a stranger in 24%. The identity of the offender was unknown in 46% of burglaries.
- On average, household members became victims of violent crimes in about 266,560 burglaries annually. Offenders known to their victims accounted for 65% of these burglaries; strangers accounted for 28%.

Because the NCVS does not determine offender motivation for entering an occupied household, the survey cannot address the more stringent application of the term “home invasion” that includes offender intent. Additionally, the NCVS does not distinguish between a household member who is present when the offender gains entry and one who arrived home unexpectedly while the burglary was in progress.

Table 1.

Household burglaries, by type, 2003–2007

Type of burglary	Average annual number of burglaries	Percent of burglaries	
		Household member present	Household member experienced violence
Household burglary	3,713,000	27.6 %	7.2 %
Completed	3,083,750	26.7 %	8.0 %
Forcible entry	1,134,230	15.5	4.9
Unlawful entry	1,949,520	33.3	9.7
Attempted forcible entry	629,250	32.0 %	3.4 %

Note: Percent present is calculated as the number of households in which someone was home during a burglary (N=1,025,520) divided by the number of household burglaries (N=3,713,000). Percent experiencing violence is calculated as the number of households experiencing violence (N=266,560) divided by the number of household burglaries (N=3,713,000).

Findings include household characteristics of burglaries of both occupied and unoccupied residences

The findings on household burglary in this report are presented in three parts. *Household characteristics* of burglaries of both occupied (household member present) and unoccupied (household member not present) residences are examined in Tables 1 through 4. *Burglary characteristics of occupied households*, such as method of entry and type of damage, are examined in Tables 5 through 14. *Characteristics of violence* during household burglaries that took place while someone was home are examined in Tables 15 through 20.

Violence during household burglaries remained stable from 2000 to 2007


Between 2000 and 2007 the rate of household burglary of unoccupied households declined from 25.8 to 21.2 victimizations per 1,000 households (figure 2). In contrast, the rate of household burglary when someone was home remained stable between 2000 (8.5 per 1,000 households) and 2007 (8.3 per 1,000 households). The percentage of these burglaries that included violence remained stable between 2000 (6.3%) and 2005 (5.7%). Between 2005 and 2007, however, there is some indication of an increase in the percentage of violent burglaries from 5.7% to 7.7%.

Households composed of single females with children had the highest rates of burglary while someone was present

Households composed of married couples without children experienced the lowest rates of both types of burglary—when no one was home (14 per 1,000 households) and while a household member was present (4 per 1,000 households) (table 2). Households composed of single males were more likely than those composed of single females to experience a burglary while no one was home. However, households composed of single males and single females were equally likely to experience a burglary while the residence was occupied.

Single heads of households—male (59 per 1,000 households) and female (54 per 1,000 households)—living with children experienced the highest rates of burglary while no household member was present. Households composed of single females with children had the highest rate of burglary while someone was home (22 per 1,000 households). There was no consistent pattern in the risk of being present during a

Figure 2.
Household burglary, 2000-2007



*See *Criminal Victimization, 2006—Technical Notes*, BJS Web, 12 December 2007.

Table 2.
Average annual household burglary, by household composition and head of household characteristics, 2003-2007

Characteristics	Average annual number of households	Rate per 1,000 households	
		Household member not present	Household member present
Household composition			
Households without children	58,104,000	17.3	5.8
Married couples	26,018,350	13.5	3.7
Single male	14,219,630	24.6	6.9
Single female	17,866,020	17.1	8.0
Households with children	29,405,670	28.2	10.5
Two-parent	22,395,420	19.9	7.2
Single male	1,041,190	58.7	13.7
Single female	5,969,060	54.1	22.3
Other ^a	29,365,170	29.0	12.9
Race of head of household^b			
White	116,874,850	23.0	8.8
Black	96,089,150	21.6	8.5
American Indian/Alaska Native	14,556,460	32.5	10.3
American Indian/Alaska Native	671,650	57.0	19.6
Asian Pacific Islander	4,546,100	12.6	5.2
More than one race	4,546,100	45.4	18.1
Hispanic/Latino origin head of household			
Hispanic or Latino	1,011,500	23.0	8.8
Hispanic or Latino	12,335,710	26.4	11.9
Non-Hispanic or Latino	103,913,070	22.6	8.4
Age of head of household			
12-19	116,874,850	23.0	8.8
12-19	1,085,100	58.8	26.9
20-34	26,609,020	30.2	11.2
35-49	36,445,680	32.4	12.9
50-64	29,341,680	19.9	7.0
65 or older	23,393,370	12.2	4.8

^aIncludes a combination of children, adult relatives, and other adults not related to household members living together. The NCVS is unable to disentangle these more complex household structures involving common law marriages, domestic partnerships, and alternative familial living arrangements.

^bHead of household is a classification defining one and only one person residing in each housing unit as the head. It implies that the person is either the homeowner (or in the process of buying the unit) or the person responsible for renting the unit. The head of household must be age 18 or older with two exceptions: all household members are under age 18 or the head of household is under age 18 and married to someone age 18 or older.

burglary between households composed of single males with children and other household compositions.

Residences with an American Indian or Alaska Native head of household experienced higher rates of burglary

Households having an American Indian or Alaska Native head of household (57 per 1,000 households) experienced higher rates of burglary when no one was home than any other race.

A slightly different pattern in the likelihood of experiencing a burglary was observed for households victimized while occupied. Residences having an American Indian, Alaska Native, or a person of more than one race as the head of household were equally likely to be home during a burglary.

Households with a white head of household were somewhat less likely than those with a black head of household to experience a burglary while a household member was present. Asian and Pacific Islander head of households were the least likely to be present during a burglary.

Households with a head of household ages 12 to 19 had the highest rates of burglary; ages 65 or older had the lowest rates

Burglary rates declined for households with heads of households in older age groups. Households with a head of household age 65 or older had the lowest rates of burglary—12 per 1,000 households while no one was home and 5 per 1,000 households while the residence was occupied. Households with a head of household age 12 to 19 had the highest rates of burglary—59 per 1,000 households when no one was present and 27 per 1,000 households while the residence was occupied.

Higher income households experienced lower rates of burglary

Rates of household burglary were generally lower for higher income households than lower income households (table 3).

Across all categories, the risk of burglary was higher for households living in rental properties. Households living in rental properties experienced higher rates of burglary when no one was home and while the residence was occupied than those who owned or were in the process of buying their homes.

Table 3.

Average annual household burglary, by household income and ownership, 2003–2007

Characteristics	Average annual number of households	Rate per 1,000 households	
		Household member not present	Household member present
Household income			
Less than \$7,500	4,992,420	47.2	18.5
\$7,500 to \$14,999	8,294,260	34.3	15.9
\$15,000 to \$24,999	11,407,660	29.4	11.7
\$25,000 to \$34,999	11,074,270	23.8	10.0
\$35,000 to \$49,999	14,045,700	23.9	9.0
\$50,000 to \$74,999	15,364,730	18.6	7.0
\$75,000 or more	21,336,190	16.8	5.7
Home ownership			
Own	80,230,680	18.9	6.7
Rent	35,012,820	33.5	13.9

Table 4.

Average annual household burglary, by type of housing and number of units in the structure, 2003–2007

Housing structure	Average annual number of households	Rate per 1,000 households	
		Household member not present	Household member present
Type of housing			
House or apartment	110,403,770	22.1	8.5
Hotel, motel, or rooming house	127,160	36.5 ^	3.1^
Mobile home	5,656,090	32.4	11.1
Student quarters	453,450	4.3	1.3 ^
Other units ^a	234,380	3.6	2.9
Number of units^b			
1	79,766,660	22.1	7.9
2	5,638,510	31.3	13.0
3	1,602,980	26.0	15.8
4	3,462,380	28.7	13.5
5-9	5,950,620	25.1	10.4
10 or more	14,415,580	19.7	8.3
Group quarters unit	408,570	41.4	29.3

^aBased on 10 or fewer sample cases.

^aIncludes residences that are temporarily unoccupied, quarters that are not a house such as a condo or duplex, temporary living quarters, and general quarters.

^bA housing unit is a group of rooms or a single room occupied as separate living quarters or intended for occupancy as separate living quarters. To be considered separate living quarters, the occupant must live and eat separately from all other persons on the property and have direct access to their living quarters from the outside or through a common hall or lobby.

Single-unit housing and housing with 10 or more units were least likely to be burglarized while someone was home

Household members living in mobile homes (32 per 1,000 households) were more likely than those living in any other type of housing to experience a burglary while no one was home, with one exception—hotels, motels, and rooming houses. Households living in mobile homes were equally likely as those staying in a hotel, motel, or rooming house to experience a burglary while no one was present (table 4).

Households residing in houses or apartment complexes (9 per 1,000 households) were somewhat less likely than those living in mobile homes (11 per 1,000 households) to be burglarized while someone was home.

There was no consistent pattern in the risk of experiencing a burglary when no one was home by the number of units in a housing structure. However, a pattern was observed when a household member was home. Households residing in single-family units and households residing in higher density structures consisting of 10 or more units (8 per 1,000 households) generally had lower rates of household burglary while a household member was present.

Damaging or removing a door was the most common type of entry in forcible and attempted forcible entry burglaries

Removing or damaging a window screen during a forcible entry was equally likely to occur whether the residence was occupied (11%) or unoccupied (9%) (table 5). In comparison, tampering with a door handle was less likely to occur while a household member was present (20%) than when no one was home (26%).

Attempted forcible entry burglaries differed somewhat from forcible burglaries. Damaging or removing window screens were an equally likely method of an attempted entry by an offender to occupied (22%) or unoccupied (18%) residences (table 6). However, burglars were more likely to attempt to enter a household by tampering with door handles or locks when household members were not in the residence (30%) than while the residence was occupied (19%).

Table 5.

Method of entry and type of damage in completed household burglary involving forcible entry, 2003–2007

Method of entry and type of damage	Household member not present		Household member present	
	Average annual number	Percent	Average annual number	Percent
Window	462,430	48.8 %	80,670	47.0 %
Pane damaged or removed	284,340	30.0	47,360	27.6
Screen damaged or removed	83,250	8.8	19,380	11.3
Lock damaged or unlocked	71,720	7.6	9,780	5.7
Other damage*	23,120	2.4	4,150	2.4 ^
Door	696,290	73.4 %	120,800	70.4 %
Damaged or removed	412,860	43.5	76,050	44.3
Screen damaged or removed	15,800	1.7	6,970	4.1
Handle/lock removed or tampered	242,660	25.6	33,700	19.6
Other damage*	24,970	2.6	4,080	2.4 ^
Other entry*	13,060	1.4 %	4,420	2.6 %^

Note: Forcible entry is a completed burglary in which force, such as breaking a window or slashing a door screen, is used to gain entry to a residence. Percentages will not add to 100 because households may report more than one type of damage.

^Based on 10 or fewer sample cases.

*Other unspecified entry or damage.

Table 6.

Method of entry and type of damage in attempted household burglary involving forcible entry, 2003–2007

Method of entry and type of damage	Household member not present		Household member present	
	Average annual number	Percent	Average annual number	Percent
Window	187,800	44.1 %	105,550	56.1 %
Pane damaged, broken, removed, or cracked	85,920	20.2	46,650	24.8
Screen damaged or removed	75,440	17.7	40,460	21.5
Lock damaged or tampered	17,090	4.0	7,940	4.2
Other damage*	9,350	2.2	10,500	5.6
Door	316,890	74.5 %	108,080	57.5 %
Damaged or removed	159,810	37.6	56,270	29.9
Screen damaged or removed	16,450	3.9	9,570	5.1
Handle/lock removed or tampered	125,550	29.5	35,340	18.8
Other damage*	15,080	3.5	6,900	3.7
Other entry*	5,100	1.2 %^	3,340	1.8 %^

Note: Attempted forcible entry is a burglary in which force was used in an unsuccessful attempt to gain entry to a residence. Percentages will not add to 100 because households may report more than one type of damage.

^Based on 10 or fewer sample cases.

*Other unspecified entry or damage.

Table 7.

Method of entry in household burglary involving unlawful entry, by presence of household member, 2003–2007

Method of entry	Household member not present		Household member present	
	Average annual number	Percent	Average annual number	Percent
Total	1,217,030	100.0 %	623,520	100.0 %
Someone let the offender in	19,960	1.6 %	109,810	17.6 %
Offender pushed way inside	2,750	0.2 ^	73,790	11.8
Open door or window	209,430	17.2	168,560	27.0
Unlocked door or window	481,230	39.5	174,760	28.0
Had key	95,740	7.9	22,490	3.6
Picked lock or window	49,600	4.1	14,020	2.2
Unknown means through locked door or window	64,340	5.3	10,720	1.7
By other means	260,870	21.4	38,890	6.2
Don't know	33,110	2.7	10,480	1.7

Note: Unlawful entry is a completed burglary committed by someone having no legal right to be on the premises even though no force was used to gain entry. An offender may gain access to a residence when household members are not present by being let in by an individual not living in the household, such as a visiting guest, housekeeper, or repair person. Totals may not add to 100% due to rounding.

^Based on 10 or fewer sample cases.

Offenders used an open door or window to gain unlawful entry in 17% of unoccupied residences

In 40% of unlawful entries to unoccupied residences, offenders gained access through an unlocked door or window (table 7). A smaller percentage (5%) of unlawful entries while no one was home was through a locked door or window by unknown means; 8% of offenders used a key to the residence to gain access.

For households occupied at the time of the burglary, offenders were equally likely to gain unlawful entry through an open (27%) or unlocked (28%) door or window. Respondents in 18% of burglaries of occupied residences stated that someone inside the home let the offender in; 12% stated that someone inside opened the door and the offender pushed their way in. Nearly 4% stated that the offender had a key to the residence and used the key to gain access.

Household members were at work during a quarter of burglaries that took place while no one was home

In households in which no one was home about a quarter stated that household members were at work when the burglary occurred (table 8). A similar percentage (23%) of households were away from their residences and engaged in leisure activities when the burglary took place.

Victims in 38% of households burglarized while someone was home were asleep at the time of the burglary while 44% of households stated that household members were engaged in other activities in the home when the offender gained entry to the residence.

Household burglaries that occurred when no one was home were more likely to occur between the daytime hours of 6 am and 6 pm (43%) than between the hours of 6 pm to 6 am (26%) (table 9). Conversely, a household member was more likely to be present during a nighttime burglary (61%) than during one that occurred between the daytime hours of 6 am and 6 pm (33%).

Table 8.

Victim activity during household burglaries, by presence of household member, 2003–2007

Type of activity	Household member not present		Household member present	
	Average annual number	Percent	Average annual number	Percent
Total	2,612,060	100.0 %	1,024,230	100.0 %
Working or on duty	656,180	25.1 %	38,470	3.8 %
On the way to or from work	38,460	1.5	14,160	1.4
On the way to or from school	36,840	1.4	1,630	0.2
On the way to or from other place	53,990	2.1	9,000	0.9
Shopping/errands	176,280	6.7	16,980	1.7
Attending school	39,860	1.5	1,560	0.2
Leisure activity away from home	607,640	23.3	48,120	4.7
Sleeping	144,370	5.5	389,880	38.1
Activities at home	80,190	3.1	450,910	44.0
Other activity*	167,380	6.4	26,590	2.6
Don't know	610,870	23.4	26,920	2.6

Note: Respondents may report at home activities when someone other than a household member is in the residence at the time of the burglary. Totals may not add to 100% due to rounding.

*The other activity category is specified when it is not clear what the respondent was doing or where the respondent was at the time of the victimization. Examples include the respondent was in the hospital or taking care of a sick friend.

Table 9.

Time of occurrence of household burglaries, by presence of household member, 2003–2007

Time of day	Household member not present		Household member present	
	Average annual number	Percent	Average annual number	Percent
Total	2,683,270	100.0 %	1,021,430	100.0 %
Daytime (6 am - 6 pm)	1,159,450	43.2 %	336,340	32.9 %
Nighttime (6 pm - 6 am)	697,940	26.0	626,150	61.3
Don't know time of day	825,880	30.8	58,940	5.8

With the exception cash, items were more likely to be stolen when residents were not home at the time of a burglary

Purses, wallets, credit cards (29%), electronics (33%), and personal items (31%) made up a larger percentage of items stolen during a burglary that occurred when no one was home compared to burglaries that took place when a household member was present (table 10). Firearms were stolen in 4% of burglaries of unoccupied households. Cash was equally likely to be stolen regardless of whether a household was occupied or unoccupied during the household burglary. Fifty-five percent of households burglarized while a resident was home, stated that no items were taken during the burglary compared to 25% of households burglarized while no one was home.

Households burglarized while no one was home were more likely to suffer greater economic losses

Households burglarized while no one was home were more likely to suffer greater economic losses than those burglarized while occupied (table 11). Thirty percent of households burglarized while no one was home had stolen items valued at more than \$1,000; 17% of burglaries with household members present experienced thefts of \$1,000 or greater. Households burglarized while a household member was present were more likely to suffer losses of less than \$250, compared to other categories.

About three-quarters of all household burglaries by forcible entry while no one was home were reported to the police

The percentages of burglaries reported to the police, forcible, unlawful, and attempted forcible entry burglaries were equally likely to be reported regardless of whether a household member was home at the time of the burglary (table 12). However, differences were observed among forcible entry, unlawful entry, and attempted forcible entry in the percentages of burglaries by household members being present and household members not being present.

For households burglarized while no one was home, forcible entry burglaries (73%) were more likely to be reported to the police than unlawful (41%) or

attempted forcible (41%) entry burglaries. More than three-quarters (78%) of households with members present during a forcible burglary reported the crime, 52% reported unlawful burglary, and 62% reported attempted forcible entry. These differences were not statistically significant.

Table 10.
Type of items taken, 2003–2007

Type of item	Household member not present		Household member present	
	Average annual number	Percent	Average annual number	Percent
No items taken	676,360	25.2 %	566,300	55.2 %
Cash	147,410	5.5	58,590	5.7
Purse, wallet, credit cards	774,610	28.8	106,700	10.4
Electronics	876,650	32.6	131,460	12.8
Jewelry, watches, keys	355,430	13.2	54,080	5.3
Personal items ^a	823,890	30.7	164,190	16.0
Household items ^b	597,890	22.2	86,340	8.4
Firearms	94,960	3.5	7,630	0.7
Food/liquor	92,460	3.4	14,330	1.4
Other items taken	178,260	6.6	31,770	3.1

Note: Totals may exceed 100% because households may report more than one item stolen.

^aIncludes stamps, coin collections, recreational equipment, clothing, luggage, bicycles or bicycle parts, and animals or livestock.

^bIncludes silver, china, tools, machinery, and farm or garden produce.

Table 11.
Economic loss in household burglaries where property was stolen, 2003–2007

Property value	Household member not present		Household member present	
	Average annual number	Percent	Average annual number	Percent
Total	2,011,130	100.0 %	459,230	100.0 %
No property loss	20,700	1.0 %	6,690	1.5 %
Less than \$10	26,520	1.3	8,720	1.9
\$10 to \$49	145,130	7.2	53,720	11.7
\$50 to \$249	496,530	24.7	140,610	30.6
\$250 to \$999	535,110	26.6	114,370	24.9
\$1,000 or more	601,860	29.9	79,570	17.3
Monetary value not Known	185,280	9.2	55,540	12.1

Note: Includes cash and non-cash property. Households may report both cash and non-cash losses. Totals may not add to 100% due to rounding.

Table 12.
Household burglary reported to police, by type of entry, 2003–2007

Type of burglary	Percent of household burglaries while—	
	Member not present	Member present
All burglary	52.4 %	58.6 %
Completed burglary	54.5 %	57.8 %
Forcible entry	73.1	78.2
Unlawful entry	40.8	52.2
Attempted forcible entry	40.8 %	62.2 %

Table 13.

Reasons for not reporting household burglary to police, by presence of household member, 2003–2007

Reason	Percent of reasons for not reporting when—	
	Member not present	Member present
Not important enough to report		
Minor crime	29.5	28.6
Not clear a crime occurred	4.4	5.9
Inconvenient	5.3	4.5
Private or personal matter	7.5	17.6
Police could not help		
Could not identify offender/lack of proof	17.9	14.6
No insurance, loss less than deductible	4.3	3.1
Could not recover or identify property	8.5	4.1
Police would not help		
Police ineffectiveness	6.8	4.6
Police biased	1.5	2.6
Police would not bother	14.6	13.1
Crime was discovered too late	10.1	6.4
Reasons related to the offender		
Child offender	1.8	2.7
Protect offender	2.3	4.5
Afraid of reprisal	0.9	6.1
Offender was a police officer	0.1 [^]	--
Other reasons		
Don't know why I did not report it	1.5	1.4
Other reason given	0.1 [^]	0.3 [^]
Other reason not listed	11.5	12.1
Total not reported	1,181,990	396,170

Note: Percent may exceed 100% because households may report more than one reason for not reporting to the police.

--No cases were present for this category.

[^]Based on 10 or fewer sample cases. Totals may not add to 100% due to rounding.

Table 14.

Household burglary of occupied residences, by victim-offender relationship, 2003–2007

Relationship	All burglary	Type of burglary	
		Completed ^a	Attempted forcible entry
Total	1,025,520	824,320	201,200
Offender known to the victim	29.5 %	33.5 %	13.1 %
Intimates (current or former)	10.6	11.9	5.0
Relatives/known acquaintances	18.9	21.6	8.0
Strangers	24.2	24.1	24.5
Unknown offender^b	46.3	42.4	62.4

Note: Totals may exceed 100% because estimates include multiple offenders. Percentages are calculated as the number of households victimized by each victim offender category divided by the number of households burglaries in which someone was present.

^aIncludes forcible entry and unlawful entry without force.

^bSurvey respondents may not have been able to provide information on the offender because the respondents were not the household members present during the burglary, or the respondents may not have been able to see the offender clearly because of dim lighting (darkness), concealed identity, or other reasons.

For households burglarized while residents were not present, the most common reasons for not reporting the victimization to the police were that the burglary was considered a minor crime (30%), the resident could not identify the offender or the resident lacked proof (18%), the police would not bother investigating the crime (15%), or that the crime was discovered too late (10%) (table 13).

Offenders were known to their victims in a third of households burglarized when a household member was present

Offenders were known to their victims in about a third of the 1 million average annual burglaries from 2003 to 2007 that took place with a household member present (table 14). About a quarter of households with a member present during a completed rather than an attempted burglary stated that the offender was a stranger; 42% stated that the offender was unknown.

Households were less likely to know the offender in attempted forcible entry burglaries. The offender was known to household members in about 13% of households that experienced an attempted forcible entry; the relationship to the offender was unknown in 62% of these entries.

Violence during the course of a burglary may be examined by two different means

The general risk of violence may be examined as a percentage of all household burglaries of residences that were occupied (household member present) and unoccupied (household member not present) during the burglary. The specific risk of violence may be examined as a percentage of the number of burglaries with a household member present during the course of the burglary (see *Methodology*).

An assault occurred in 5% off all household burglaries

In 7% of all household burglaries, someone was home at the time and experienced a violent victimization (figure 1, table 15). This translates to about 266,560 household burglaries out of about 3.7 million taking place each year on average.

Simple assault (15%) was the most common form of violence during a completed burglary when a resident was home

A household member was present in roughly 1 million burglaries from 2003 to 2007. Of these households, 26% (or 266,560) experienced some form of a violent victimization during the burglary (figure 1, table 16).

The type of violence against household members present at the time of a burglary varied by burglary category. Simple assault was the most common form of violence experienced by household members present during completed (15%) and attempted (6%) burglaries. Robbery was more likely to occur when a burglary was completed rather than attempted. A robbery occurred in 7% of completed burglaries, compared to 1% of attempted forcible entries. An aggravated assault against a household member was equally likely to occur during a completed or an attempted burglary. A rape or sexual assault occurred in about 3% of households experiencing a completed burglary.

Residents present during a burglary were equally likely to be victimized by an intimate partner (current or former) as they were by a stranger

One or more household members knew the offenders in some manner in 65% of the 266,560 burglaries that took place while someone was present and experienced violence (table 17). Overall, household members knew approximately a third of these offenders as intimates (current or former) (31%), or relatives,

Table 15.

Type of violence that occurred during household burglaries, by type of burglary, 2003–2007

Type of violence	All burglary	Type and percent of burglaries	
		Completed*	Attempted forcible entry
Total	7.2 %	8.0 %	3.4 %
Rape/sexual assault	0.6 %	0.7 %	-- %
Robbery	1.6 %	1.9 %	0.3 %
Assault	5.0 %	5.3 %	3.1 %
Aggravated assault	1.3	1.3	1.1
Simple assault	3.7	4.0	2.0
Average annual number of burglaries	3,713,000	3,083,750	629,250

Note: Estimates may not add to total due to rounding. Percentages are calculated as the number of households in which someone experienced a violent crime during a household burglary divided by the number of household burglaries.

--No cases were present for this category.

*Includes forcible entry and unlawful entry without force.

Table 16.

Type of violence that occurred during household burglaries when someone was home, by type of burglary, 2003–2007

Type of violence	All burglary	Type of burglary	
		Completed*	Attempted forcible entry
Total	26.0 %	29.7 %	10.6 %
Rape/sexual assault	2.2 %	2.7 %	-- %
Robbery	5.8 %	7.0 %	0.9 %
Assault	18.0 %	20.0 %	9.7 %
Aggravated assault	4.6	4.9	3.4
Simple assault	13.3	15.1	6.3
Total average annual number of burglaries of occupied residences	1,025,520	824,320	201,200

Note: Percentages are calculated as the number of households that experienced a violent crime divided by the number of burglaries in which households were occupied.

--No cases were present for this category.

*Includes forcible entry and unlawful entry without force.

Table 17.

Victim-offender relationship in violent household burglary, 2003–2007

Relationship	All burglary	Type of burglary	
		Completed ^a	Attempted forcible entry
Victim knew offender	65.1 %	66.2 %	51.7 %
Intimates (current or former)	31.1	31.5	26.3
Relatives/known acquaintances	34.0	34.7	25.5
Strangers	27.5	26.5	39.7
Unknown offender^b	7.4	7.3	8.5
Total average number of burglaries where someone experienced violence	266,560	245,180	21,380

Note: Percentages are calculated as the number of households victimized by each victim offender relationship category divided by the number of violent household burglaries.

^aIncludes forcible entry and unlawful entry without force.

^bSurvey respondents may not have been able to provide information on the offender because the respondents were not the household members present during the burglary.

well-known individuals, or household acquaintances (34%). A stranger perpetrated the violence in 28% of households burglarized while someone was home and violence occurred.

Findings for completed burglaries were similar to those for all burglaries. Household members

knew offenders in some manner in two-thirds of completed burglaries involving violence. Despite the apparent differences between victim-offender relationships, when violence occurred during a completed household burglary, individuals present were equally likely to be victimized by an intimate partner (current or former) (32%) as they were by a stranger (27%).

Victims in violent burglaries were equally likely to report knowing the offender in some manner in an attempted forcible burglary as they were to report the offender as a stranger.

Thirty percent of individuals experiencing violence during a completed burglary faced an armed offender

Overall, 61% of offenders were unarmed when burglarizing a home while residents were present and violence occurred (table 18). Household members faced an offender with a firearm in about 12% of all households burglarized while someone was home and violence occurred.

Household members present during a completed burglary were less likely to face an armed offender (30%) than an unarmed offender (63%). Those present and violently victimized during an attempted forcible entry were equally likely to face an armed or an unarmed offender (38%). Offenders were armed with a firearm in 23% of burglaries in households (73,000 on average) burglarized by a stranger where violence occurred (table 19).

Federal Bureau of Investigation, Supplementary Homicide Reports, 2003-2007

According to the FBI's Supplementary Homicide Reports, 430 burglary-related homicides occurred between 2003 and 2007 on average annually. This number translates to less than 1% of all homicides during that period.

Between 2003 and 2007, approximately 2.1 million household burglaries were reported to the FBI each year on average. Household burglaries ending in homicide made up 0.004% of all burglaries during that period.

Table 18.

Presence of weapon in violent household burglary, by type of burglary, 2003-2007

Type of weapon	All burglary	Type of burglary	
		Completed*	Attempted forcible entry
No weapon present	60.5 %	62.6 %	37.6 %
Weapon present	30.1 %	29.5 %	37.7 %
Firearm	12.4	12.5	10.8 ^
Sharp weapon	10.6	10.1	16.3 ^
Other weapon type	7.2	6.8 ^	10.6 ^
Do not know if offender had weapon	9.3 %	8.0 %	24.7 %^
Total average number of burglaries where someone experienced violence	266,560	245,180	21,380

^Based on 10 or fewer sample cases.

*Includes forcible entry and unlawful entry without force.

Table 19.

Presence of weapons in violent household burglary committed by a stranger, by type of burglary, 2003-2007

Type of weapon	All burglary	Type of burglary	
		Completed*	Attempted forcible entry
No weapon present	40.2 %	40.2 %	40.2 %
Weapon present	45.5 %	46.6 %	37.4 %^
Firearm	23.3	25.5	6.2 ^
Sharp weapon	15.8	13.8	31.2 ^
Other weapon type	6.5 *	7.3 *	--
Do not know if offender had weapon	14.2 %	13.2 %*	22.3 %^
Total	73,360	64,860	8,500

^Based on 10 or fewer sample cases.

--No cases were present for this category.

*Includes forcible entry and unlawful entry without force.

Table 20.

Injury in violent household burglary, by type of burglary, 2003-2007

Type of injury	All burglary	Type of burglary	
		Completed*	Attempted forcible entry
Not injured	55.7 %	52.5 %	92.3 %
Injured	44.3 %	47.5 %	7.7 %
Serious injury	8.5	9.2	--
Minor injury	33.4	35.6	7.7 ^
Rape/sexual assault without other injuries	2.4 ^	2.6 ^	--
Total	266,160	244,780	21,380

--No cases were present for this category.

^Based on 10 or fewer sample cases.

*Includes forcible entry and unlawful entry without force.

Household members were injured in almost half of all completed burglaries involving violence

Household members were more likely to be injured during a completed burglary (48%) than an attempted forcible entry burglary (8%) when a household member was present and violence occurred (table 20). Serious injury accounted for 9% and minor injury accounted for 36% of injuries sustained by household members who were home and experienced a violent crime during a completed burglary. Most household members who were present during a violent burglary (92%) were not injured.

Methodology

Data sources

The National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) gathers data on crimes against persons ages 12 or older and their households, reported and not reported to the police, from a nationally representative sample of U.S. households. The survey provides information about victims (age, gender, race, Hispanic origin, marital status, income, and education level), offenders (genders, race, approximate age, and victim-offender relationship), and the nature of the crime (time and place of occurrence, use of weapons, nature of injury, and economic consequences). Between 2003 and 2007, 40,320 households were interviewed annually on average with a 91% household response rate.

Except for data on homicides, all estimates presented in this report were generated from the NCVS. For more information on NCVS *Methodology*, see the *Methodology* section of Criminal Victimization Statistical Tables on the BJS Web site. Homicide data are from the Supplementary Homicide Reports (SHR) to the

Uniform Crime Reporting Program (UCR), which are collected by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI).

Definition of household burglary in the NCVS

The legal definition for “household burglary” may vary among jurisdictions. For the NCVS, household burglary is defined as the entry or attempted entry to a residence or adjacent structure when a person has no right to be there. This crime usually, but not always, involves theft.

Forcible entry is a completed burglary in which force, such as breaking a window or slashing a door screen, was used to gain entry to the residence. Unlawful entry is a completed burglary committed by someone having no legal right to be on the premises even though no force was used to gain entry. Attempted forcible entry is a burglary in which force was used in an unsuccessful attempt to gain entry.

Missing data in the National Crime Victimization Survey

As with any data collection, in the NCVS missing data vary by survey item. The impact of missing data depends on the specific survey item under examination. In *Victimization During Household Burglary*, there was no missing data associated with any of the burglary or violent crime estimates that occurred when residents were present in the household. In contrast, the variable 'Household Income' is consistently characterized by high levels of missing data due to reluctance on the part of survey respondents to disclose their income. In this report, 22% of income data was missing for households victimized while no one was home and 20% for households that were victimized while someone was present in the household.

Appendix Table 1.

Standard errors and confidence intervals for key estimates in victimization during household burglary.

Characteristic	Estimate	One standard error	95%-confidence interval	
			Lower	Upper
Household member present	27.6 %	1.72 %	24.23 %	30.97 %
Percent violent of all household burglary	7.2	0.94	5.37	9.03
Percent violent of occupied household burglary	26.0	2.98	20.17	31.83

Note: Standard errors were calculated using programs developed by the Census Bureau to calculate NCVS general variance parameters.

This report, *Victimization During Household Burglary*, differs from other NCVS reports in that a different coding approach was constructed to combine burglaries where a household member was present and experienced a violent crime with burglaries that took place while no one was home. Presenting the analyses in this manner allows for a comparison of the characteristics of present and non-present burglaries and the examination of the co-occurrence of a resident's presence and subsequent victimization. As a result, estimates presented in this report are not comparable to victimization estimates of burglary or personal crime contained in other NCVS reports. This approach was used previously in *Household Burglary, 1985* (NCJ 96021).

Household member is defined as a household member if the individual is using the sample address as his or her usual place of residence at the time of the interview or is staying temporarily at the sample address at the time of the interview and does not have a usual place of residence elsewhere.

Household burglary with household member not present is defined as any household burglary (as classified in this report) that is committed while a residence is not occupied by any household members.

Household burglary with a household member present is defined as any household burglary committed while one or more household members are present in the household.

Violent household burglary is defined as any household burglary committed while one or more household members are present and violence occurs between the offender and household members.

General and specific risk

The estimates of risk in this report use measures that may include multiple victimizations per household, and as such do not represent a true risk measure based on the prevalence of victimizations in the population. However, the two estimates are close.

For example, in 2005, approximately 2.5% of households experienced a household burglary victimization (<http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/pub/pdf/cnh05.pdf>) while the current report estimates a rate of 3.2 household burglaries per 100 households (32 per 1,000 households), including ones in which violence occurred.

Standard error computations

Comparisons of percentages and rates were tested to determine if observed differences were statistically significant. Differences described as higher, lower, or different passed a test at the 0.05 level of statistical significance (95%-confidence level). Differences described as somewhat, lightly, or marginally passed a test at the 0.10 level of statistical significance (90%-confidence level). Caution is required when comparing estimates not explicitly discussed in the report. Estimates based on 10 or fewer cases have high relative standard errors. Care should be taken when comparing these estimates to other estimates, especially when both are based on 10 or fewer sample cases.



Washington, DC 20531

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use \$300

The Bureau of Justice Statistics is the statistical agency of the U.S. Department of Justice. James P. Lynch is director.

This Special Report was written by Shannan Catalano, Ph.D. Alexia Cooper verified the report.

Georgette Walsh and Jill Duncan edited the report, Tina Dorsey produced the report, and Jayne Robinson prepared the report for final printing under the supervision of Doris J. James.

September 2010, NCJ 227379

This report in portable document format and in ASCII and its related statistical data and tables are available at the BJS World Wide Web Internet site: <<http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=2172>>.

Office of Justice Programs

Innovation • Partnerships • Safer Neighborhoods
<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov>