Tactical Teams

Version 1.0 · Current · October 2026 · Codebook variable: `I_TOU`

Definition

A tactical team is a specialized, top-tier police unit activated for incidents assessed as exceeding the ordinary capabilities, equipment, or risk tolerance of general patrol. Depending on jurisdiction, these teams may be called Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT), Emergency Response Team (ERT), Tactical Unit, Tactical Operations Unit, Emergency Task Force, Special Response Team, or another jurisdiction-specific designation. For this evidence library, the label is less important than the capability and deployment standard. The variable records whether a specialized, top-tier tactical containment team was activated and physically at the scene before or during the dynamic phase of the encounter.

Strict coding definition

Code the tactical-team variable only where the responding resource has the defining characteristics of a top-tier tactical unit, including some combination of:

- dedicated high-risk incident training;
- coordinated containment capability;
- specialized tactical command and team structure;
- ballistic helmets and heavy body armor;
- ballistic shields or comparable protective equipment;
- specialized firearms or less-lethal systems;
- breaching capability;
- armored-vehicle integration;
- precision-observer or marksman capability;
- deliberate team movement and intervention tactics; and
- training for barricades, hostage incidents, high-risk apprehension, active threats, or comparable critical incidents.

What does not count

Street-level specialized enforcement or investigative units do not qualify merely because they are specialized, proactive, heavily armed, or assigned to higher-risk offenders. Examples that ordinarily do not qualify include narcotics teams or drug task forces, gang suppression units, proactive enforcement teams, fugitive or warrant squads without top-tier tactical-team deployment, violent-crime investigative teams, surveillance units, street-crime teams, proactive containment squads, interdiction units, and mixed enforcement task forces. These units may wear body armor, carry rifles, conduct warrants, encounter armed suspects, use containment tactics,

or include officers with tactical backgrounds, but that alone is insufficient. The Lab's variable is intended to measure the presence of a specialized top-tier tactical containment and intervention capability, not merely the presence of a specialized police unit.

Why the Strict Definition Matters

The distinction is methodologically important because the U.S. literature has often used overlapping but non-identical concepts–SWAT team, police paramilitary unit, tactical unit, militarized police unit, officers assigned to SWAT, 1033-program equipment receipt, and military-style equipment or appearance–that are not interchangeable. Kraska and Kappeler (Kraska & Kappeler, 1997a) documented the growth and normalization of police paramilitary units in the United States, while Kraska and Cubellis (Kraska & Cubellis, 1997b) showed that this expansion also extended into smaller jurisdictions. These studies are foundational for understanding the institutional growth of SWAT, but they do not mean that every specialized or heavily equipped police response is a qualifying tactical-team deployment.

The Lab therefore uses a narrower incident-level definition. The relevant question is not whether a specialized or heavily armed officer was present but whether the top-tier tactical containment and intervention team was activated and physically present during the relevant encounter phase. This prevents the variable from becoming a proxy for officer assignment, gang or narcotics enforcement, rifle availability, military-style equipment, agency participation in the 1033 Program, or post-incident tactical arrival. A useful methodological comparison comes from Canadian research showing that analyses can substantially overstate "SWAT deployments" when they count one or two tactical officers as equivalent to a full tactical-team response (Lair et al., 2024). That study is retained here as a definitional comparison, not as the primary substantive evidence base for an American audience.

How It Is Designed to Work

The tactical team changes the police response by introducing a coordinated specialist system rather than a single device. Its mechanism is organizational and tactical. The team may provide containment, protected approach, coordinated movement, deliberate arrest planning, ballistic protection, armored vehicles, shields, specialist firearms, less-lethal options, chemical agents, breaching, observation, marksmen, crisis negotiator integration, medical support, rescue capability, command-and-control structure, and rehearsed team tactics. Unlike a patrol officer responding individually, the tactical team is designed to distribute tasks across personnel, potentially including separate members responsible for containment, arrest, lethal-force cover, less-lethal force, shield protection, observation, precision-fire capability, breaching, negotiation liaison, tactical command, and emergency medical response. The intervention is therefore best understood as specialized people combined with specialized equipment, specialized command, and coordinated tactics.

Containment as a Core Function

The popular image of tactical teams emphasizes forced entry and heavily armed confrontation, but that is only one possible function. A central tactical-team capability is containment, which seeks to restrict the subject's access to potential victims, prevent escape into uncontrolled areas, establish distance, create protected positions, control avenues of movement, gather intelligence, permit negotiation, reduce uncertainty, and create time for deliberate decision-making. This matters especially for the Lab's edged-weapon focus. A tactical team may improve an incident without ever using physical force if its presence allows police to replace exposed patrol officers improvising around a dangerous subject with coordinated containment supported by armor, shields, observation, and specialist communication.

Tactical Team Versus Tactical Officer

A person may be assigned to SWAT, tactically trained, working a fugitive or gang detail, carrying a patrol rifle, wearing heavy armor, or assisting another specialty unit without the incident becoming a qualifying tactical-team deployment. The U.S. literature illustrates why these levels of analysis must remain separate. Williams and Westall (Williams & Westall, 2003) compared officers who were and were not SWAT members during non-SWAT police encounters and found no statistically significant relationship between SWAT status and use of force. That study tells us something about officer status and socialization, but not whether a full SWAT team was activated or whether tactical-team deployment changed the outcome of a critical incident. Likewise, agency receipt of military equipment through the federal 1033 Program measures organizational militarization, not incident-level tactical-team presence (Radil et al., 2017; Ramey & Steidley, 2018). For the Lab, individual capability, organizational militarization, and full tactical-team deployment are separate variables.

Evidence of Effectiveness

Overall assessment

Evidence is moderate for describing U.S. SWAT growth, deployment patterns, organizational roles, and militarization, and low for clean causal estimates of whether full tactical-team deployment reduces injury, force, or death in matched high-risk incidents. The United States has a substantial literature on SWAT and police militarization, but much less research directly answers the intervention question relevant to this variable: what changes when a qualifying top-tier tactical team is physically deployed to a specific high-risk incident. Research is strongest on the historical growth of SWAT and police paramilitary units, normalization of tactical deployment, agency acquisition of military equipment, tactical-officer characteristics, public legitimacy, lethal-force associations at the agency level, and tactical-unit raids or specialized enforcement activity. Research is much weaker on injury per qualifying tactical-team deployment, peaceful resolution per deployment, firearm discharge per deployment, rescue success, containment success, duration to resolution, edged-weapon incidents specifically, and matched tactical-team versus non-tactical-team outcomes.

U.S. SWAT growth and normalization

Kraska and Kappeler (Kraska & Kappeler, 1997a) surveyed U.S. police departments serving populations of 50,000 or more and documented substantial growth in police paramilitary units and expansion of their activities. Kraska and Cubellis (Kraska & Cubellis, 1997b) found similar normalization among smaller American agencies. Kraska and Paulsen (Kraska & Cubellis, 1997b), using participant observation, interviews, and quantitative data, described how tactical-unit culture and use could move from exceptional critical incidents toward mainstream policing functions. These studies are foundational because they show that SWAT is not merely an emergency capability; how often and for what purposes it is deployed is itself an important policy question.

Selection bias is severe

Tactical teams are intentionally sent to incidents assessed as unusually dangerous, which means a simple comparison finding that tactical-team incidents have more force than patrol incidents would tell us very little. The tactical team receives incidents involving more armed subjects, barricades, high-risk warrants, hostage events, active threats, serious violence, complex containment problems, and incidents already judged beyond ordinary patrol capacity. The realistic comparator is not a tactical team versus an ordinary low-risk patrol call but rather a tactical team versus how the same high-risk incident would likely have been managed without the specialist team.

Tactical experience and use of force

Williams and Westall (Williams & Westall, 2003) compared SWAT and non-SWAT officers and found no statistically significant relationship between SWAT status and use of force in the non-SWAT encounters they studied. That finding is useful because it challenges the assumption that tactical membership itself necessarily produces a more aggressive officer, but its limitation is equally important: the study did not evaluate force during full SWAT operations, and accordingly it should not be used to estimate the effectiveness or force rate of tactical-team deployment itself.

Tactical raids and crime effects

Phillips, Wheeler, and Kim (Phillips et al., 2016) examined police paramilitary-unit raids at micro-places in Buffalo, New York, providing useful evidence that moves beyond officer attitudes or organizational descriptions to examine a concrete tactical-unit activity; however, warrant and raid effects should not be generalized to barricades, hostage incidents, suicidal subjects, rescue operations, or edged-weapon containment, as the intervention represented by the Lab's variable is broader than a tactical raid.

Militarization Evidence Is Relevant but Not Equivalent to SWAT Deployment

A major portion of the modern U.S. literature measures police militarization using 1033 Program military-equipment transfers rather than tactical-team deployments. Those studies are important, but they answer a different question.

1033 Program and police violence

Delehanty and colleagues (Delehanty et al., 2017) found a positive association between receipt of military equipment through the 1033 Program and several measures of police violence, including officer-involved-shooting fatalities, in the jurisdictions studied. Lawson (Lawson, 2019), using more than 11,000 agency-quarter observations across all 50 states, likewise reported a positive association between militarization measured through military-equipment receipt and suspect deaths. These findings support concern that organizational militarization may be associated with more lethal police outcomes, but they do not establish that deploying a top-tier tactical team to an individual barricade or hostage incident causes the same effect.

Conflicting U.S. findings

Mummolo (Mummolo, 2018) analyzed U.S. militarization and SWAT-deployment data and found no detectable average benefit for violent-crime reduction or officer safety in the analyses reported; his survey experiment also found that militarized police imagery reduced public support and perceived legitimacy. The important interpretation is not that SWAT never improves safety but that the broader expansion of militarized policing has not been shown to produce clear aggregate public-safety benefits, and it may impose legitimacy costs.

Geography and acquisition

Radil, Dezzani, and McAden (Radil et al., 2017) examined the geography of U.S. police militarization and the 1033 Program. Ramey and Steidley (Ramey & Steidley, 2018) examined why U.S. agencies participate in the 1033 Program, including rational-choice and minority-threat explanations. Steidley and Ramey (Steidley & Ramey, 2019) later reviewed the U.S. police-militarization literature as a whole. Together these studies provide important institutional context, but none should be substituted for direct incident-level SWAT outcome research.

The evidence gap

The key U.S. evidence gap is that there is far more research on the existence, expansion, equipment, and symbolism of SWAT than on whether full tactical-team deployment causally improves outcomes in matched critical incidents. That absence is itself an important research finding.

Deployment Context

American deployment history

The U.S. literature shows that SWAT evolved from an extraordinary-response capability toward a resource used for a much broader range of police functions (Kraska & Kappeler, 1997a; Kraska & Cubellis, 1997b). That history matters for this variable because the meaning of "SWAT present" depends on why the team was activated. A team deployed for an active shooter, hostage rescue, an armed barricade, or a rapidly deteriorating lethal threat is responding to a fundamentally different risk problem from a team used primarily for routine drug-warrant service, proactive enforcement, or an operation whose risk could reasonably be managed without top-tier

tactical capability. The Lab should therefore record tactical-team presence as a factual variable while separately analyzing reason for activation, threat type, weapons information, containment, subject behaviour, presence of hostages, negotiation, tactical intervention, and actual force used.

Call labels are insufficient

A “mental health,” “domestic,” “welfare,” or “suicidal” call may still involve a firearm, edged weapon, hostage, barricade, active assault, prior violence, or inability to safely approach. Conversely, a “high-risk” enforcement label does not itself establish that top-tier tactical deployment was necessary. A useful comparative methodological study by Lair and colleagues (Lair et al., 2024) reinforces the need to examine actual incident context rather than broad labels, even though that study is Canadian rather than American.

When Its Use May Be Appropriate

Top-tier tactical-team deployment is most defensible where the incident requires capabilities beyond ordinary patrol, including armed barricades, hostage taking, active shooters, high-risk apprehensions, high-risk warrants involving credible weapons or violence risk, armed suicidal persons where containment is difficult, persons firing from structures, rescue under threat, incidents requiring ballistic shields or armored vehicles, threats requiring precision observation or marksman capability, dangerous fortified locations, incidents requiring deliberate breach capability, and prolonged armed crises where a dedicated containment structure is needed.

Early activation versus premature intervention

Activating a tactical team does not require immediately using tactical force. Early activation can provide specialized containment, better equipment, additional options, relief for exposed patrol officers, protected observation, negotiator integration, and a deliberate intervention capability if the situation later deteriorates. This distinction is important: activation is not the same as assault, and a tactical team can be physically present for hours without conducting a forced entry.

When Its Use May Be Inappropriate or Unnecessary

Low-risk specialty enforcement

The fact that an incident involves drugs, gangs, a wanted offender, proactive policing, intelligence, or a specialized investigative unit does not alone justify classification as a tactical-team event. Those circumstances may increase risk, but they remain analytically distinct from activation of a top-tier tactical team.

Routine deployment without specialist need

The militarization literature raises legitimate concerns where tactical teams move from exceptional high-risk response toward increasingly routine use (Kraska, 2007; Mummolo, 2018). Potential problems include unnecessary escalation in police posture, normalization of military-style tactics, legitimacy costs, increased use for warrant

service where lower-intensity alternatives exist, racial or socioeconomic disparities in exposure, and organizational expansion beyond the capability's original high-risk purpose.

Tactical presence without tactical function

The presence of tactical officers should not automatically be interpreted as evidence that a tactical intervention was necessary. The relevant analytical questions include why the team was activated, what capability it provided, whether the subject was contained, whether tactical personnel replaced exposed patrol officers, whether negotiation was occurring, whether a forced intervention was undertaken, whether the team was present only as contingency, and whether the team arrived before or after the dynamic phase. Those distinctions affect interpretation of `I_TOU`.

Relevance to Edged-Weapon Encounters

Tactical-team relevance to edged-weapon incidents is highly context dependent. Most people with knives encountered by police do not inherently require a top-tier tactical team. The specialist resource becomes most relevant when the edged-weapon incident has additional features creating prolonged risk, containment complexity, hostage danger, barricade, rescue requirements, difficult geography, repeated failed communication, serious self-harm risk, third-party exposure, or need for specialized protective equipment.

Potential role

In a contained edged-weapon incident, a tactical team may provide disciplined perimeter containment, ballistic or edged-weapon-resistant shields, heavy armor, armored vehicle support, protected observation, lethal and less-lethal role separation, specialist negotiator integration, coordinated arrest capability, tactical medics, rescue planning, and a preplanned response if the subject suddenly attacks. The team's value is therefore not merely greater force; it can provide greater control over the conditions under which force would become necessary.

Containment

For an edged weapon, containment can be especially important. If the subject cannot reach officers, cannot reach civilians, cannot leave the controlled area, and can be observed, then the need for immediate physical intervention may decrease substantially. This can create time for negotiation, CIT, mental health consultation, family or support input, changes brought about by fatigue or intoxication, voluntary surrender, or deliberate planning.

Safe replacement of exposed patrol

One practical benefit may occur before any tactical action. Patrol officers may initially be holding containment from positions that are exposed, improvised, too close, poorly protected, or difficult to sustain. A tactical team may replace them with shields, armored vehicles, heavier armor, coordinated positioning, and dedicated observation, which can reduce the pressure for an immediate resolution caused by officer vulnerability.

Does heavy tactical capability increase force?

The intuition that more heavily equipped officers may create a more aggressive response is understandable, but the empirical literature does not justify assuming that top-tier tactical personnel automatically use more force. Williams and Westall (Williams & Westall, 2003) did not find a significant officer-level force difference associated with SWAT status. Jenkins and colleagues (Jenkins et al., 2024) likewise caution against treating tactical experience as equivalent to greater force propensity. At the incident level, however, tactical teams are disproportionately present in high-risk events, so raw force rates cannot be interpreted without accounting for why the team was called.

Failure consequences

A tactical team does not guarantee containment. An edged-weapon subject may still break the perimeter, attack a hostage, suddenly charge, access another weapon, self-harm, move into an uncontrolled public area, or create a rescue emergency. The specialist advantage is that the team is designed to respond coordinately to such changes.

Risk trade-off

For officers and third parties, tactical teams may reduce risk through better protection, team coordination, containment, role specialization, and access to rescue and intervention capabilities. For the subject, those same capabilities create greater coercive capacity, more weapons, stronger control, potentially intimidating visual presence, and greater ability to impose force if negotiation fails. The critical question is not simply whether SWAT was present but whether specialist capability created safer containment and more options, or introduced coercive intensity that was disproportionate to the actual threat.

Tactical Teams, Negotiators, and Co-Responders

Tactical teams should not automatically be positioned as the opposite of de-escalation. In a well-integrated response, different specialist resources solve different parts of the problem. The tactical team provides physical containment, protection, rescue, observation, coordinated intervention capability, and contingency planning. A crisis negotiator provides sustained communication, rapport, behavioural influence, intelligence gathering, and peaceful-resolution strategy. A mental health co-responder provides clinical assessment, crisis interpretation, treatment-system knowledge, suicide-risk context, and disposition planning. These resources can operate simultaneously. An armed person in psychiatric crisis who barricades with a knife might be approached with a tactical team establishing protected containment while a negotiator communicates and a mental health professional provides clinical background and consultation, with an armored vehicle and shield team remaining available and no forced intervention occurring unless the threat changes. In that scenario, the tactical team can enable a less coercive outcome precisely because it makes prolonged waiting safer.

Tactical Teams and Police Militarization

Historical expansion in the United States

Tactical teams sit at the center of the American police-militarization debate. Kraska and Kappeler (Kraska & Kappeler, 1997a) documented the growth and normalization of U.S. police paramilitary units in larger agencies, and Kraska and Cubellis (Kraska & Cubellis, 1997b) found similar expansion into smaller jurisdictions. Kraska and Paulsen (Kraska & Cubellis, 1997b) documented cultural and organizational dimensions of paramilitary policing through grounded field research. Kraska (Kraska, 2007) later framed militarization as broader than equipment alone, encompassing material, cultural, organizational, and operational dimensions. This American literature should form the primary background for interpreting the specialist tactical-team variable.

Military equipment and tactical teams are related but distinct

The federal 1033 Program increased access to armored vehicles, rifles, protective equipment, and other military surplus. An agency can possess militarized equipment without deploying a qualifying SWAT team in the incident being coded, and a tactical team may deploy using commercially produced police equipment rather than transferred military surplus. The Lab should therefore avoid treating 1033 participation as equivalent to SWAT deployment, or SWAT deployment as proof of agency militarization, as if these were interchangeable measures.

Aggregate outcome studies

Delehanty et al. (Delehanty et al., 2017) and Lawson (Lawson, 2019) reported positive associations between 1033-based militarization measures and lethal police outcomes. Mummolo (Mummolo, 2018), using different data and methods, did not find detectable aggregate crime or officer-safety benefits from militarization and documented reputational costs. This literature is not perfectly consistent, which is itself another reason not to make a simple claim that tactical-team deployment is either inherently protective or inherently escalatory.

Public legitimacy

Mummolo (Mummolo, 2018) found that exposure to militarized police imagery reduced public support for police. The public-perception effect matters because top-tier tactical teams are visually distinctive–heavy armor, rifles, shields, armored vehicles, helmets, and coordinated military-style movement–but public-perception findings should not be converted into an unsupported claim that a crisis subject will necessarily become more aggressive when SWAT arrives.

U.S. review literature

Steidley and Ramey (Steidley & Ramey, 2019) reviewed the American militarization literature and emphasized that militarization occurs across multiple dimensions of police work. That synthesis is useful for this evidence library because it helps maintain a distinction between specialist critical-incident capability, organizational militarization, military equipment acquisition, and how tactical resources are actually deployed.

Race, Equity, and Disparate Exposure

Equity concerns are central to the U.S. militarization literature. Mummolo (Mummolo, 2018) found that SWAT deployments in the data examined were disproportionately concentrated in communities of color. Ramey and Steidley (Ramey & Steidley, 2018) also evaluated minority-threat explanations for agency participation in the 1033 Program. These findings do not establish that race caused any individual tactical-team activation, but they do establish that tactical policing should be evaluated not only at the incident level but also at the population and institutional level. Relevant questions include which communities experience SWAT deployment, for what incident types, how often teams are used for emergency containment versus warrant service, whether activation thresholds are consistent, how frequently tactical presence results in force, and how race, neighborhood disadvantage, crime, and agency policy can be disentangled. Canadian findings on tactical-force disproportionality may be useful as comparative evidence, but they should not lead the core analysis for a predominantly American audience.

U.S. Legal Considerations

Tactical-team deployment is not itself a separate force category

Activating or positioning a tactical team does not automatically constitute a separate Fourth Amendment use of force. Legal analysis generally focuses on the seizure, warrant, entry, detention, firearm or other force, property damage, or overall reasonableness of the police operation.

Show of force may matter

A tactical team can create a substantial show of authority through armored officers, rifles, shields, vehicles, commands, perimeter control, and physical domination of space. Depending on circumstances, courts may consider the manner and intensity of that show of force when assessing reasonableness.

Tactical planning and force remain analytically distinct

A tactical team's decision to establish containment, deploy a shield, stage a rescue team, or position a marksman does not automatically mean force has been used against the subject. Conversely, specialist status does not provide broader constitutional authority to use force; the same underlying objective-reasonableness principles apply.

Ethical and Moral Considerations

Specialist capability should correspond to specialist need

The central ethical justification for tactical deployment is that the incident presents hazards beyond what ordinary patrol can safely and effectively manage. The stronger the specialist capability, the stronger the case should be that the capability addresses a real operational need.

Containment before confrontation

One of the strongest ethical uses of tactical capability is to create safer conditions in which immediate force becomes less necessary. Heavy equipment can paradoxically support restraint if it allows police to remain behind cover, wait, negotiate, observe, rescue, and avoid improvised close contact.

Capability creep

The principal ethical concern is mission expansion. A resource created for extraordinary threats can gradually become normalized for routine warrants, low-level enforcement, proactive policing, or situations where specialist force capability is unnecessary. That concern is central to militarization scholarship (Kraska, 2007; Mummolo, 2018).

Appearance and legitimacy

Top-tier tactical teams are intentionally visually and operationally imposing, which may reassure some observers that police are prepared, frighten or intimidate others, affect the subject's interpretation of police intentions, create public legitimacy costs, or increase perceptions that police are functioning as military rather than civilian institutions. The evidence is stronger for general public-perception effects than for claims that tactical-team arrival directly causes crisis subjects to escalate.

Duty to avoid false equivalence

It would be misleading to treat a top-tier team containing an armed hostage taker as equivalent to a proactive gang team serving a routine enforcement function merely because both use rifles and body armor. The Lab's strict definition protects against that analytical error.

Evidence Limitations

The term "SWAT deployment" is inconsistently defined across studies and agencies, and some studies count any tactical officer attendance while others examine full-team callouts. Tactical teams are strongly selected into the highest-risk incidents, and good denominator data are rare. Tactical-unit force may be underreported or inconsistently classified (Sidhu, 2025), and many studies examine tactical officers rather than tactical-team deployment. U.S. militarization research and Canadian tactical-unit research arise from different institutional contexts, and full-team deployment can involve very different functions–containment, warrant service, rescue, active-threat response, or forced entry–with a tactical team often present without ever using force. The availability of negotiators, armored vehicles, shields, less-lethal tools, and tactical medics confounds attempts to isolate a single team effect. There is very little controlled evidence on tactical-team outcomes in edged-weapon incidents specifically, and raw force rates are difficult to interpret because the team is deliberately deployed to incidents where force risk is already elevated. Public legitimacy effects do not directly establish behavioural escalation by the subject, and post-incident arrival must not be conflated with presence during the dynamic phase relevant to the Lab's variable.

Bottom Line

Definition: strict. The variable should represent activation and physical presence of a top-tier tactical containment and intervention team–not merely a specialized enforcement unit or an officer with tactical affiliation.

Operational capability is strong. Tactical teams provide coordinated containment, protection, rescue, observation, specialist weapons, and deliberate intervention capability beyond ordinary patrol.

Effectiveness is moderately supported operationally and weakly quantified causally. The evidence suggests specialist capability and high-risk deployment but does not provide a reliable universal estimate that tactical-team activation reduces injuries, force, or deaths.

Use of force is not inherently higher because of officer tactical status. Existing officer-level and systematic-review evidence does not support assuming that tactical experience automatically produces more force (Williams & Westall, 2003; Jenkins et al., 2024).

Edged-weapon relevance is most important in prolonged or complex incidents rather than ordinary spontaneous knife encounters. A tactical team can replace improvised patrol containment with armor, shields, armored vehicles, observation, role specialization, negotiation support, and coordinated intervention capability.

De-escalation is potentially enabling. Specialist protection and containment can create the time and safety required for negotiation or clinical crisis intervention.

Militarization is a genuine competing concern. Tactical teams are central to the militarization literature, and their expansion can create legitimacy, equity, and normalization concerns even where specialist capability is useful in individual high-risk events.

Risk-benefit assessment: the strongest justification for tactical-team activation is an incident whose risk, complexity, containment problem, rescue requirement, or intervention demands exceed what ordinary patrol can reasonably manage. Its weakest justification is deployment primarily because an incident involves a specialized enforcement objective, a stigmatized call category, or an available tactical resource without a corresponding top-tier operational need.

Core Peer-Reviewed Evidence

1. Kraska, P. B., & Kappeler, V. E. (1997)
Militarizing American Police: The Rise and Normalization of Paramilitary Units.
Social Problems, 44(1), 1–18.
DOI: 10.2307/3096870

Citation key: `<span class="cite">(Kraska & Kappeler, 1997a)</span>`

Priority: Essential foundational U.S. SWAT evidence.

Contribution: National survey of U.S. police departments serving populations of 50,000 or more.

Key finding: Documented substantial growth in police paramilitary units, increasing deployment activity, and normalization of SWAT into mainstream policing.

Key value: Foundational evidence for understanding why the reason for tactical-team activation matters.

Limitation: Historical institutional/deployment research rather than critical-incident outcome analysis.

---

2. Kraska, P. B., & Cubellis, L. J. (1997)
Militarizing Mayberry and Beyond: Making Sense of American Paramilitary Policing.
Justice Quarterly, 14(4), 607–629.
DOI: 10.1080/07418829700093521

Citation key: `<span class="cite">(Kraska & Cubellis, 1997b)</span>`

Priority: Essential U.S. deployment-normalization evidence.

Contribution: National data on police paramilitary units in smaller U.S. jurisdictions.

Key finding: Tactical-team growth and expanding activities were not limited to major metropolitan departments.

Limitation: Does not estimate injury, force, or peaceful-resolution effects.

---

3. Kraska, P. B., & Paulsen, D. J. (1997)
Grounded research into U.S. paramilitary policing: Forging the iron fist inside the velvet glove.
Policing and Society, 7(4), 253–270.
DOI: 10.1080/10439463.1997.9964777

Citation key: `<span class="cite">(Kraska & Cubellis, 1997b)</span>`

Priority: Important U.S. organizational/cultural evidence.

Contribution: Participant observation, interviews, and quantitative data concerning a U.S. police paramilitary unit.

Key value: Shows how tactical-unit culture and deployment can become normalized within everyday policing.

Limitation: Single-department grounded research and not an outcome study.

4. Williams, J. J., & Westall, D. (2003)

SWAT and non-SWAT police officers and the use of force.

Journal of Criminal Justice, 31(5), 469–474.

DOI: 10.1016/S0047-2352(03)00051-5

Citation key: `<span class="cite">(Williams & Westall, 2003)</span>`

Priority: Important U.S. officer-level force evidence.

Key finding: SWAT status was not significantly associated with greater force in the non-SWAT encounters studied.

Key value: Challenges assumptions that tactical membership necessarily produces a more force-oriented officer.

Critical limitation: Did not examine use of force during SWAT operations.

---

5. Phillips, S. W., Wheeler, A., & Kim, D.-Y. (2016)

The effect of police paramilitary unit raids on crime at micro-places in Buffalo, New York.

International Journal of Police Science & Management, 18(3), 206–219.

DOI: 10.1177/1461355716660568

Citation key: `<span class="cite">(Phillips et al., 2016)</span>`

Priority: Important U.S. tactical-operation evidence.

Contribution: Examines crime effects associated with tactical-unit raids at specific places.

Key value: One of the relatively uncommon empirical studies examining a concrete U.S. tactical-unit activity.

Limitation: Raid/warrant context should not be generalized to barricades, hostage incidents, rescue, or edged-weapon containment.

---

6. Delehanty, C., Mewhirter, J., Welch, R., & Wilks, J. (2017)

Militarization and police violence: The case of the 1033 program.

Research & Politics, 4(2).

DOI: 10.1177/2053168017712885

Citation key: `<span class="cite">(Delehanty et al., 2017)</span>`

Priority: Essential U.S. militarization-and-force evidence.

Contribution: Examines relationships between military-equipment transfers and measures of police violence.

Key finding: Found positive associations between 1033 transfers and officer-involved-shooting fatalities in the jurisdictions analyzed.

Critical limitation: 1033 equipment receipt is an agency-level militarization measure, not incident-level SWAT deployment.

---

7. Radil, S. M., Dezzani, R. J., & McAden, L. D. (2017)

Geographies of U.S. Police Militarization and the Role of the 1033 Program.
The Professional Geographer, 69(2), 203–213.
DOI: 10.1080/00330124.2016.1212666

Citation key: `<span class="cite">(Radil et al., 2017)</span>`

Priority: High U.S. institutional-context evidence.

Contribution: Examines spatial patterns of police militarization and federal military-equipment transfers.

Key value: Helps distinguish geographic and organizational patterns of militarization from incident-level tactical-team presence.

---

8. Mummolo, J. (2018)

Militarization fails to enhance police safety or reduce crime but may harm police reputation.
Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 115(37), 9181–9186.
DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1805161115

Citation key: `<span class="cite">(Mummolo, 2018)</span>`

Priority: Essential U.S. outcomes and legitimacy evidence.

Contribution: Combines administrative SWAT/militarization data with survey experiments.

Key finding: Found no detectable average violent-crime or officer-safety benefit in the analyses reported; militarized police imagery reduced public support.

Critical limitation: Aggregate militarization findings do not establish the effect of deploying a tactical team to a particular high-risk critical incident.

---

9. Ramey, D. M., & Steidley, T. (2018)
Policing through subsidized firepower: An assessment of rational choice and minority threat explanations of police participation in the 1033 Program.
Criminology, 56(4), 812–856.
DOI: 10.1111/1745-9125.12193

Citation key: `<span class="cite">(Ramey & Steidley, 2018)</span>`

Priority: High U.S. institutional/equity evidence.

Contribution: Examines why agencies participate in federal military-equipment acquisition.

Key value: Adds organizational and minority-threat context to the U.S. militarization debate.

Limitation: Equipment acquisition rather than tactical-team incident outcomes.

---

10. Lawson, E., Jr. (2019)
TRENDS: Police Militarization and the Use of Lethal Force.
Political Research Quarterly, 72(1), 177–189.
DOI: 10.1177/1065912918784209

Citation key: `<span class="cite">(Lawson, 2019)</span>`

Priority: High U.S. lethal-force evidence.

Contribution: Uses more than 11,000 agency-quarter observations across all 50 states to examine militarization and suspect deaths.

Key finding: Reports a positive and statistically significant association between militarization and suspects killed.

Critical limitation: Agency militarization is not equivalent to deployment of a qualifying tactical team in the fatal encounter.

---

11. Steidley, T., & Ramey, D. M. (2019)
Police militarization in the United States.
Sociology Compass, 13(4), e12674.
DOI: 10.1111/soc4.12674

Citation key: `<span class="cite">(Steidley & Ramey, 2019)</span>`

Priority: Essential U.S. synthesis.

Contribution: Reviews the conceptual, normative, and empirical U.S. police-militarization literature.

Key value: Useful for separating militarization into multiple dimensions rather than equating it solely with SWAT or military equipment.

---

12. Kraska, P. B. (2007)
Militarization and policing–Its relevance to 21st century police.
Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice, 1(4), 501–513.
DOI: 10.1093/police/pam065

Citation key: `<span class="cite">(Kraska, 2007)</span>`

Priority: Foundational conceptual evidence.

Contribution: Defines police militarization across material, cultural, organizational, and operational dimensions.

Key value: Provides the framework needed to distinguish specialist critical-incident capability from broader institutional militarization.

Comparative / Methodological Evidence

The following non-U.S. studies are useful primarily because they address methodological issues that remain poorly studied in the American literature.

Lair, Z., Jenkins, B., Semple, T., & Bennell, C. (2024)
The importance of context: re-examining the 'deployments' of SWAT teams in Canada.
Policing and Society.
DOI: 10.1080/10439463.2024.2311921

Citation key: `<span class="cite">(Lair et al., 2024)</span>`

Why retained: Provides unusually direct evidence that counting one or two tactical officers as a "SWAT deployment" can distort deployment estimates. This supports the Lab's strict incident-level definition.

Limitation: Canadian institutional context.

Jenkins, B., Semple, T., Suss, J., & Bennell, C. (2024)
Primed to use force? A systematic review examining the relationship between tactical experience and use of force.

Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology.
DOI: 10.1007/s11896-024-09647-0

Citation key: `<span class="cite">(Jenkins et al., 2024)</span>`

Why retained: International systematic evidence relevant to whether tactical experience itself produces more force-oriented decisions.

Limitation: Tactical experience is not equivalent to full-team deployment.

Evidence Rating

U.S. SWAT growth / deployment-normalization evidence: ★★★★☆
Strong historical and institutional evidence documents expansion and normalization of tactical units.

Strict incident-level team-definition evidence: ★★★☆☆
Conceptually strong, but direct U.S. research distinguishing individual tactical officers from full-team activation is limited.

Specialist capability: ★★★★★
The organizational and equipment distinction from ordinary patrol is clear and well established.

Containment / high-risk operational utility: ★★★☆☆ to ★★★★☆
Strong operational rationale; relatively weak matched-outcome evidence.

Use-of-force propensity of tactical officers: ★★★☆☆
Available evidence does not support assuming SWAT membership inherently increases force, but direct studies are sparse.

Full-team injury reduction: ★★☆☆☆
Plausible through protection, containment, and role specialization, but direct causal U.S. estimates are weak.

Peaceful-resolution effect: ★★☆☆☆ to ★★★☆☆
Tactical containment may create time for negotiation and surrender, but the team effect is difficult to isolate.

Militarization / legitimacy evidence: ★★★★★
Substantial U.S. literature exists on SWAT growth, 1033 equipment, militarization, lethal-force associations, and public legitimacy.

Equity / disparate exposure evidence: ★★★★☆
Meaningful U.S. evidence indicates disparities in SWAT/militarization exposure, though incident-level causation remains difficult to establish.

Edged-weapon-specific evidence: ★☆☆☆☆

Direct tactical-team research specific to edged-weapon encounters is extremely limited.

Overall confidence: Moderate.

Research-library conclusion

For a primarily American evidence library, a tactical team should be treated as a specialist organizational intervention, not simply as heavily armed police. The Lab's strict definition is therefore essential: the variable should identify activation and physical presence of a top-tier tactical containment and intervention team during the relevant encounter phase, while excluding narcotics teams, gang units, proactive enforcement squads, investigative task forces, and other specialty units that do not provide equivalent tactical-team capability. The research increasingly supports this distinction; recent Canadian studies show that counting any tactical-officer attendance as a SWAT deployment can materially distort analysis. Operationally, tactical teams add containment, protection, rescue capability, heavy armor, shields, armored vehicles, observation, role specialization, negotiation integration, and coordinated intervention options. In edged-weapon incidents, those capabilities are most relevant in prolonged, barricaded, hostage, rescue, or otherwise complex events–not ordinary spontaneous knife encounters. Tactical containment can reduce officer exposure and create time for negotiation or clinical crisis response, but specialist capability also introduces greater coercive capacity and sits squarely within the broader police-militarization debate. Existing evidence does not justify assuming that tactical officers inherently use more force, nor does it establish a clean causal estimate that full-team deployment reduces injury or death. The most defensible interpretation is that tactical teams are a high-capability resource whose value depends on whether the incident genuinely exceeds patrol capability and whether the team is used to create safer containment and additional options rather than unnecessary coercive escalation.

References

Delehanty, C., Mewhirter, J., Welch, R., & Wilks, J. (2017). Militarization and police violence: The case of the 1033 program. *Research & Politics*, *4*(2), 2053168017712885. https://doi.org/10.1177/2053168017712885

Jenkins, B., Semple, T., Suss, J., & Bennell, C. (2024). Primed to Use Force? a Systematic Review Examining the Relationship Between Tactical Experience and Use of Force. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, *39*(3), 509–526. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11896-024-09647-0

Kraska, P. B., & Kappeler, V. E. (1997a). Militarizing American Police: The Rise and Normalization of Paramilitary Units. *Social Problems*, *44*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.2307/3096870

Kraska, P. B., & Cubellis, L. J. (1997b). Militarizing mayberry and beyond: Making sense of American paramilitary policing. *Justice Quarterly*, *14*(4), 607–629. https://doi.org/10.1080/07418829700093521

Kraska, P. B. (2007). Militarization and Policing–Its Relevance to 21st Century Police. *Policing*, *1*(4), 501–513. https://doi.org/10.1093/police/pam065

Lair, Z., Jenkins, B., Semple, T., & Bennell, C. (2024). The importance of context: re-examining the 'deployments' of swat teams in Canada. *Policing and Society*, *34*(6), 581–595. https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2024.2311921

Lawson, E. (2019). Police militarization and the use of lethal force. *Political Research Quarterly*, *72*(1), 177–189. https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912918784209

Mummolo, J. (2018). Militarization fails to enhance police safety or reduce crime but may harm police reputation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *115*(37), 9181–9186. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1805161115

Phillips, S. W, Wheeler, A., & Kim, D. Y. (2016). The effect of police paramilitary unit raids on crime at micro-places in Buffalo, New York. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, *18*(3), 206–219. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461355716660568

Radil, S. M., Dezzani, R. J., & McAden, L. D. (2017). Geographies of u.s. Police Militarization and the Role of the 1033 Program. *The Professional Geographer*, *69*(2), 203–213. https://doi.org/10.1080/00330124.2016.1212666

Ramey, D. M., & Steidley, T. (2018). Policing through subsidized firepower: an assessment of rational choice and minority threat explanations of police participation in the 1033 program*. *Criminology*, *56*(4), 812–856. https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9125.12193

Sidhu, T. (2025). Contain and Callout: a Critical Investigation of swat Team Use of Force Reporting and the Limits of Institutional Statistics. *Sociology Compass*, *19*(11), e70128. https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.70128

Steidley, T., & Ramey, D. M. (2019). Police militarization in the United States. *Sociology Compass*, *13*(4), e12674. https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12674

Williams, J. J, & Westall, D. (2003). SWAT and non-swat police officers and the use of force. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *31*(5), 469–474. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2352(03)00051-5

HOW TO CITE

Edged-Weapon Response Lab. (2026). *Tactical Teams*. In *EWRL Evidence Library* (Version 1.0). https://droptheknife.org/evidence-base/I_TOU (https://droptheknife.org/evidence-base/I_TOU)