

**DEFENSE CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE  
FOR PSYCHOLOGICAL HEALTH AND TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**Subject:** “Brothers at War” documentary and “Companion Workbook”

**Participants:** Jake Rademacher (Brothers at War Producer and Director), CDR George Durgin (Resilience Division Chief, R & P Directorate), Rick Keller (Resilience SME, Resilience Division, R & P Directorate), and Dr. Penny Brierley-Bowers (Program Effectiveness Team, Research Directorate)

**Date and Location:** 15 June 2011, 1500 hours, Fort Carson Post Theater, Fort Carson, CO

**Background:** The “Brothers at War” documentary movie ([brothersatwarmovie.com](http://brothersatwarmovie.com)) highlights the film maker’s family and brothers (USA CPT and USA SGT) who were deployed to Iraq and the interaction with their nine member family. Discussion has been held with the film maker for potentially showing the documentary at the Warrior Resilience Conference IV – Restoring Readiness: Individual, Unit, Community, & Family as the film highlights the Social Domain of Total Force Fitness, inclusion on the Real Warriors website, as well as the potential of further study to assess the film’s therapeutic value through journaling and post-discussion).

**Discussion topics:**

- The audience (n = 244) was comprised of Active Duty Service Members, Family members, and civilian employees. Army Community Service’s civilian employees were required to be there and many left at 1700, at the end of their work day, before the end of the film.
- Immediately when the film concluded a large portion of the audience left, possibly due to lack of formal coordination of activities related to showing.
- Mr. Rademacher walked the audience through three questions from the workbook to which the audience did respond to facilitate journaling and to initiate discussion.
- DCoE team collected survey data, which is summarized in attachment A. Approximately 1/3 of the original audience participated in the survey (n = 81) and the majority reported that they found the film evocative, worthwhile personally, and worth recommending to others.

**Action items for DCoE:**

- Conduct additional analysis of survey data from Fort Carson.
- Develop a white paper of potential next steps whose goal will be to advance the state of medical science in the area of PH and TBI (SO3), including:
  - Formal study to ensure coordination of events
  - Applied research (IO3.3) to analyze the therapeutic value of journaling vs. therapeutic discussion and combination of both
- Coordinate showing and study at Warrior Resilience Conference, 29-30 Mar 2012.
- Determine potential for vignettes for Real Warriors Campaign
- Complete exsums for other site visits conducted at Fort Carson (e.g., resilience campus and additional resilience program)

**Prepared by:** CDR George Durgin, Resilience Division Chief, R&P, DCoE

**Approved by:** Dr Mark Bates, R&P Director, DCoE

## ATTACHMENT A

### Brothers at War Film, Presentation and Workbook Survey Results

A survey to assess the acceptance of the *Brothers at War* film, presentation and workbook was completed at FT Carson on 15 June 2011. Of the 244 people in the audience, 122 completed and returned surveys. Analysis of the *Brothers at War* survey showed an overall positive reaction to the film presentation, with respondents rating it as honest (4.6/5), worthwhile (4.2/5), engaging (4.2/5), deep (4.5/5), powerful (4.5/5), strong (4.5/5), sympathetic (4.1/5), and energized (4.0/5). This was further evidenced by the majority of respondents who reported willingness to recommend the film to others (94%). Additionally, it was well received by service members with a diverse background in that there was no statistically significant difference between service members by history of deployment or by experience in combat.

The following tables provide supporting data.

**Table 1. Demographic description of survey respondents by Army rank and family member status demonstrating that the majority of respondents were junior enlisted. Additionally, some service members were also family members.**

Rank	Frequency
Junior Enlisted (E1 – E4)	81
NCO (E5 – E6)	13
Senior NCO (E7 – E9)	1
Junior Officer (O1 – O3)	2
Senior Officer (O4 +)	1
DFMWR	1
Retired	2
No Answer	18
Family members	54

**Table 2. Demonstrates that 23.5% of the service members had been deployed with 11.2% having direct exposure to combat, IED's, etc.**

Deployment to Iraq and/or Afghanistan			Direct exposure to combat, IED's, etc.	
Response	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	23	23.5%	11	11.2%
No	74	75.5%	84	85.7%
No Answer	1	1.0%	3	3.1%

**Table 3. Demonstrates that the majority of respondents report that they will complete the workbook and recommend the film to others.**

Will complete the workbook			Would recommend the film to others	
Response	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	73	60%	115	94%
No	43	35%	3	2%
No Answer	6	5%	4	3%

**Table 4. Demonstrates that there is no statistically significant difference among service members who have been deployed versus service members who have not been deployed (5 most positive - 1 most negative) in the reaction to the film**

Semantic Differential	Deployed Service members (n = 23)	Service members not deployed (n = 74)	p-value
Honest — Phony	4.7	4.6	0.57
Worthwhile—Waste of time	4.4	4.2	0.42
Engaging—Repellent	4.3	4.2	0.69
Deep —Superficial	4.5	4.4	0.63
Powerful — Powerless	4.5	4.4	0.60
Strong—Weak	4.6	4.4	0.32
Sympathetic—Angry	4.3	4.0	0.20
Energized—Indifferent	3.9	4.1	0.39
Total Average	4.4	4.3	0.33

P-value > 0.05 is not significant

**Table 5. Demonstrates that there is no statistically significant difference among service members who have had direct exposure to combat, IED's etc. versus service members who have not (5 most positive - 1 most negative) in their reaction to the film.**

Semantic Differential	Direct exposure to combat, IED's (n =11)	No direct exposure to combat, IED's (n = 84)	p-value
Honest — Phony	4.6	4.6	1.00
Worthwhile—Waste of time	4.3	4.2	0.76
Engaging—Repellent	4.1	4.2	0.76
Deep —Superficial	4.3	4.5	0.44
Powerful — Powerless	4.6	4.4	0.43
Strong—Weak	4.5	4.5	1.00
Sympathetic—Angry	4.1	4.1	1.00
Energized—Indifferent	3.9	4.0	0.75
Total Average	4.30	4.31	0.92

P-value > 0.05 is not significant