INTRODUCTION
A number of self-help tools have been introduced during last decades, especially bearing in mind strives for cost-effectiveness and accessibility of psychological help (Norcross, 2006; Peck, 2010). Self-help refers to “a standardized treatment method with which patient can help himself without major help from the therapist. In (self-help) it is necessary that treatment be described in sufficient detail, so that the patient can work it through independently” (Gulzigers, 1997, as cited in Williams, Whitefield, 2001, p. 134). Self-help stands on the idea that people are capable of changing their lives on their own. Partly this idea can be supported by the common factors research showing that up to 40 % of change in psychotherapy can be explained by client’s and extra therapeutic factors and another 15 – % by placebo, hope and expectancy (Hubble, Dunsan, Miller, 2006). Besides, research demonstrates that up to 75% of the people who change behavioral and addictive disorders do this on their own (Norcross, 2006).

In the beginning of self-help era APA task forces on self-help therapies concluded that self-help methods offer tremendous potential to the public but stressed the necessity of outcome studies, because the untested methods can pose risks to the consumers (Rosen, 2004). Recent studies and meta-analyses repeatedly demonstrate the effectiveness of self-help methods and comparability to the outcomes of traditional psychotherapy (Norcross, 2006, Peck, 2010; Williams, Whitefield, 2001).

Researches show that solution-focused approach, which emphasizes strengths and resources of a person as well as continual change, could be a good base for self-help (Grant, 2012). Our previous research in university students’ sample demonstrated the usefulness of solution-focused paper and pencil worksheet comparing to other study conditions, such as: free observation, no intervention and cognitive restructuring self-help worksheet.

AIM OF THE STUDY
Continuing the search for evidence of the effectiveness of the solution-focused self-help, current study analyses the outcome of computerized solution-focused self-help tool comparing to no intervention comparison group in the sample of university students.

STUDY DESIGN + SOLUTION-FOCUSED SELF-HELP OUTLINE

TABLE 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures (applied during Initial and Final evaluations)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standardized measures:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Self-Reflection and Insight Scale (by Grant, 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Engagement in self-reflection (6 items, Cronbach α = .911)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Need to self-reflection (6 items, Cronbach α = .799)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Insight (7 items, Cronbach α = .749)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Self-reflection sum (19 items, Cronbach α = .861)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Solution Building Inventory (by Smuck, McCallum, Stevenson, 2010) (14 items, Cronbach α = .840)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Outcome Questionnaire (OQ-45.2 by Lambert and Burlingame, 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Symptom distress (25 items, Cronbach α = .829)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Interpersonal relationships (11 items, Cronbach α = .841)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Social role (9 items, Cronbach α = .724)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Total score (45 items, Cronbach α = .947)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subjective scales:**
- Difficulty of the situation in the life area chosen by participants for change
- Life satisfaction
- Usefulness of the intervention
- Level of difficulty while performing the intervention
- Acceptability of the intervention as the mean for personal growth

RESULTS

(1) Analysis of life areas chosen for change by participants

**Figure 1.** Life areas chosen by participants for change

(2) Analysis of changes in the life area chosen for change

**Figure 2.** Changes of subjective evaluation of the life area chosen for change inside groups and comparison of magnitude of these changes between groups

**Figure 3.** Changes of subjective evaluation of the life area chosen for change inside groups and comparison of magnitude of these changes between groups

(3) Analysis of data obtained from standardized measures

**Figure 4.** Distribution of participants according to the life areas chosen for change inside intervention groups (p = .006, χ² = 12.88)

**Figure 5.** Distribution of participants according to the life areas chosen for change inside intervention groups (p = .006, χ² = 12.88)

**Figure 6.** Comparisons of Self-Reflection and Insight Scale results between initial and final evaluations inside SFSH and No intervention groups

**Figure 7.** Comparisons of Solution Building Inventory results between initial and final evaluations inside SFSH and No intervention groups

**Figure 8.** Comparisons of Outcome Questionnaire (OQ-45.2) results between initial and final evaluations inside SFSH and No intervention groups

(4) Other results

**Figure 9.** Between group comparison of the magnitude of change applied measures

**Figure 10.** Changes of subjective evaluation of life satisfaction inside SFSH and No intervention groups and comparison of magnitude of these changes between groups

**Figure 11.** The evaluation of intervention usefulness, difficulty and acceptability at SFSH group

**Figure 12.** Would you recommend the program as a self-help tool to your friends or other close people?

CONCLUSIONS
- Statistically significant positive changes in the life area chosen for change were recorded in both study groups, however the SFSH group did significantly better than No intervention group. Besides in the SFSH group as many as 97 % of participants indicated the positive change on the scale while in No intervention group this number was significantly smaller (only 15 %).
- The percentage of participants attributing positive changes to their personal efforts was significantly larger in the SFSH group.
- Participation in the Solution-Focused Self-Help program was related to positive changes in the broader life context: difficulties of interpersonal relationships decreased and evaluation of life satisfaction increased significantly.
- In the SFSH group there was significant increase for self-reflection and the self-reflectivity in general increased significantly more comparing to No intervention group.
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