

Why Some Seek AI, Others Seek Therapists: Mental Health in the Age of Generative AI

JUNSANG PARK, University of Florida, USA

SARAH BROWN, University of Florida, USA

SHARON LYNN CHU, University of Florida, USA




Fig. 1. Overview of the study design using a Health Belief Model approach across two samples, and resulting design implications for developing Generative AI (GenAI) for mental health.

As generative artificial intelligence (GAI) enters the mental health landscape, questions arise about how individuals weigh AI tools against human therapists. Drawing on the Health Belief Model (HBM), this study examined belief-based predictors of intention to use GAI and therapists across two populations: a university sample ($N = 1,155$) and a nationally representative adult sample ($N = 651$). Using repeated-measures ANOVA and LASSO regression, we found that therapists were consistently valued for emotional, relational, and personalization benefits, while GAI was favored for accessibility and affordability. Yet structural advantages alone did not predict adoption; emotional benefit and personalization emerged as decisive factors. Adoption patterns diverged across groups: students treated GAI as a complement, whereas national adults approached it as a substitute. Concerns about privacy and reliability constrained GAI use in both groups. These findings extend HBM to multi-modality contexts and highlight design implications for trustworthy, emotionally resonant digital mental health tools.

CCS Concepts: • **Human-centered computing** → User studies; HCI theory, concepts and models; • **Computing methodologies** → Artificial intelligence; • **Applied computing** → Psychology.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI), Digital Mental Health, Human-AI Interaction, Help-Seeking Intentions, Health Belief Model (HBM)

Authors' Contact Information: Junsang Park, junsangpark@ufl.edu, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, USA; Sarah Brown, sarah.brown@ufl.edu, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, USA; Sharon Lynn Chu, slchu@ufl.edu, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, USA.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

© 2018 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

Manuscript submitted to ACM

Manuscript submitted to ACM

ACM Reference Format:

Junsang Park, Sarah Brown, and Sharon Lynn Chu. 2018. Why Some Seek AI, Others Seek Therapists: Mental Health in the Age of Generative AI. In *Proceedings of the 2026 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '26)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 23 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 Introduction

Across the globe, digital technologies are becoming central to how individuals navigate mental health support. While rates of anxiety, depression, and stress continue to rise, particularly among younger populations and those facing socioeconomic pressures, traditional care systems remain constrained by cost, stigma, and limited availability [1, 6, 31]. This gap has fueled interest in interactive tools—especially those powered by generative artificial intelligence (GAI)—that promise scalable, on-demand, and low-cost support.

Conversational agents such as ChatGPT have introduced new ways for people to access guidance, validation, and psychoeducational resources [23, 25, 30]. At the same time, many continue to rely on human therapists for relational depth, diagnostic nuance, and long-term growth. Rather than replacing one another, these modalities are increasingly encountered side by side, creating a socio-technical ecosystem where users must navigate decisions between AI-driven and human-provided care. This moment thus raises critical questions: How do users perceive and evaluate the respective roles of GAI tools and human therapists? Are these modalities viewed as complementary supports that can coexist, or as interchangeable options competing for preference? And, from a design perspective, which aspects of GAI are perceived as most influential in shaping users' intention to engage with such tools?

While prior work has examined barriers to therapy or the adoption of mental health apps, most studies treat each modality in isolation [1, 29, 40]. This fragmented approach limits our understanding of the comparative processes that drive real-world help-seeking decisions. In practice, users often evaluate their options across modalities, weighing the strengths of GAI against the perceived limitations of therapy, or vice versa. However, empirical research that systematically compares these decisions is lacking. Our work draws on the Health Belief Model (HBM) as a guiding framework to study users' decision-making. The HBM has been widely used to explain health-related behaviors by identifying how perceived benefits, perceived barriers, and contextual factors shape individuals' engagement with care [28]. By applying this model to both GAI and human therapy, we assess how users' beliefs about each modality contribute to their intention to use it. Rather than assuming individuals view mental health support as a single choice, we investigate whether GAI and human therapists are perceived as mutually exclusive options, where increased reliance on one leads to decreased use of the other, or as complementary supports, each offering unique benefits in different situations. This perspective reflects how choices are often shaped not just by attraction to one option or dissatisfaction with another, but by how the options function together in a broader mental health ecosystem.

Therefore, our study posed the following research questions:

- **RQ1:** How do individuals' perceptions of GAI and human therapists differ across psychological dimensions (e.g., emotional support, personalization, trust)?
- **RQ2:** Do these perceptions vary across populations, and what population-specific patterns emerge when comparing a university sample to a national adult sample?
- **RQ3:** Do intentions to use GAI and therapists for mental health support influence one another? For example, if a person intends to use GAI, does that decrease their intention to seek support from a therapist?
- **RQ4:** What belief-based factors most strongly predict intention to use GAI versus human therapists?

By examining these questions across two distinct populations, a university student sample and a nationally representative adult sample, we are also able to explore how different populations have distinctive modality preference. This study provides a side-by-side analysis of GAI and human therapists as socio-technical supports, advancing theoretical understanding of user decision-making and offering actionable design implications for the future development of mental health technologies. To summarize, our contributions include:

- The extension of the Health Belief Model into a multimodality framework that captures how beliefs about GAI and human therapists interact in shaping help-seeking decisions,
- The identification of belief-based factors that most strongly predict intention to use each modality, revealed through LASSO regression across a university student sample and a national adult sample, and
- A set of design implications for developing GAI-enabled mental health tools that address individuals' needs for GAI in relation to the mental health care within the broader socio-technical ecosystem.

2 Background and Related Work

2.1 Mental Health and Technology Adoption

A growing body of HCI research has explored how digital technologies can help bridge gaps in mental health support. Traditional barriers to accessing human therapists, including high costs, provider shortages, long wait times, and stigma, have driven many individuals toward more scalable, on-demand alternatives [1, 4]. In this context, mental health chatbots and generative AI (GAI) tools have gained traction as promising supplemental resources. These tools simulate therapeutic conversations, deliver psychoeducational content, and offer behavioral exercises with 24/7 accessibility and reduced perceived judgment [23, 25, 30]. Notable examples include Woebot, applications that use scripted or AI-driven dialogue to guide users through mood tracking, cognitive reframing, and mindfulness practices [17].

More recently, large language models (LLMs) such as ChatGPT have introduced open-ended conversational capabilities that users have begun informally repurposing for emotional support [3, 53]. Despite limited clinical validation, recent surveys indicate that a significant proportion of people are experimenting with AI-based tools for mental health conversations [57]. These developments raise critical questions about user preferences, expectations, and beliefs when choosing between AI-mediated support and traditional human therapy, particularly as both modalities become more accessible and socially normalized.

2.2 The Health Belief Model in Digital Mental Health

The Health Belief Model (HBM) [28] is a widely used framework for explaining why individuals initiate or avoid health-related actions. It posits that behavior is a function of core belief components: perceived *susceptibility* (likelihood of experiencing a condition) and *severity* (anticipated consequences), which jointly shape perceived threat; perceived *benefits* (expected gains from the action) weighed against perceived *barriers* (anticipated costs or obstacles); *self-efficacy* (confidence in one's ability to perform the action); and *cues to action* (internal or external triggers that prompt behavior). Although originally developed for preventive behaviors (e.g., vaccination, screening), the HBM has been adapted to help-seeking contexts where the target action is engaging with a service, adhering to treatment, or adopting a technology-supported health tool [7].

Applied to mental health help-seeking from human clinicians, HBM constructs map naturally onto common determinants of therapy use [24]. Perceived susceptibility and severity reflect a person's recognition of symptoms and their impact; perceived benefits capture expectations about symptom relief, emotion regulation, or relational gains

through therapeutic alliance; perceived barriers encompass direct and indirect costs (fees, time, travel), access constraints (waitlists, provider shortages), stigma, cultural mismatch, and confidentiality concerns; self-efficacy represents confidence in finding, initiating, and sustaining treatment; and cues to action include referral, screening outcomes, or acute stressors. In digital mental health, the HBM has been used to explain uptake and continued engagement with mobile apps, telehealth, and web-based interventions [40, 56, 59]. Here, perceived benefits often include immediacy, convenience, personalization, and on-demand psychoeducation, while perceived barriers center on privacy/security risks, uncertainty about reliability or clinical effectiveness, low mental health literacy, and technology literacy or access constraints. Across these settings, HBM-guided studies consistently show that higher perceived benefits and self-efficacy, together with manageable barriers, predict stronger intentions and greater use, whereas heightened perceived barriers and low self-efficacy suppress adoption and adherence [40, 56, 59].

A limitation of prior HBM applications in this domain is that they typically evaluate a *single* support modality in isolation (e.g., therapists *or* a particular digital tool), implicitly assuming that beliefs about one option do not affect intentions toward the other. In practice, individuals often consider multiple, partially substitutable options simultaneously (e.g., a human therapist and a generative-AI tool) [55]. Under such conditions, beliefs about one modality may carry *cross-modal* consequences: for example, perceiving strong benefits of GAI (e.g., 24/7 access, anonymity, affordability) could *reduce* intention to seek a therapist, while perceived barriers to therapy (e.g., cost, wait times, stigma) could *increase* intention to use GAI; conversely, doubts about GAI’s effectiveness or data practices could *increase* preference for human care.




Fig. 2. Comparison of a single-modality versus multi-modality Health Belief Model (HBM) approach for explaining intentions to use Generative AI (GAI) or a human therapist. The single-modality panel models benefits and barriers separately for GAI and for therapists with direct effects on each intention. The multi-modality panel adds cross-modality influences, where benefits and barriers for both GAI and therapists jointly increase or decrease intention to use GAI.

To address this gap, our study operationalizes parallel, modality-specific HBM constructs (multi-modality HBM) for both GAI and human therapists and analyzes them *jointly* (see Figure 2). This design enables estimation of both *within-modality* effects (e.g., how GAI benefits predict GAI intention) and *cross-modality* effects (e.g., how therapist

barriers predict GAI intention, and vice versa), offering a more complete account of how perceived benefits, barriers, and efficacy shape real-world mental health support choices.

2.3 Perceived Benefits and Barriers of Therapists and Generative AI

Emotional and Relational Support. One of the most commonly cited motivations for seeking mental health services is the need for emotional understanding and interpersonal connection [18, 19]. Human therapists are uniquely positioned to deliver empathic presence, attuned feedback, and relationship-based support. These elements not only facilitate trust and vulnerability but also serve as active ingredients in therapeutic change. The therapeutic alliance has been repeatedly shown to predict outcomes across modalities, especially for complex or identity-laden concerns [19]. In contrast, GAI tools can simulate empathic responses and offer immediate emotional validation, but their lack of lived experience and authentic presence limits the perceived depth of this connection [38, 43]. For some, GAI’s nonjudgmental nature may be a relief; for others, it may feel emotionally insufficient or uncanny [46, 50].

Practical and Psychoeducational Needs. Beyond emotional support, individuals seek mental health tools for structured strategies, skill-building, and psychoeducation, especially when managing stress, anxiety, or depressive symptoms [15, 44]. Human therapists can offer highly tailored interventions, drawing from diverse clinical frameworks and adapting them to each client’s context. This tailoring is supported by dialogue, intuition, and training. GAI tools, on the other hand, excel in scalable delivery of structured content, such as mindfulness scripts, coping techniques, and explanations of psychological principles [27]. For users seeking immediate guidance or knowledge—especially in moments of distress—GAI can fulfill a practical function [13, 44]. Such tools may offer immediate guidance during moments of distress, but they remain limited in personalizing their responses based on complex clinical histories, comorbidities, or nuanced client context.

Accessibility, Cost, and Anonymity. Structural barriers remain among the strongest deterrents to engaging with traditional therapy. High costs, limited insurance coverage, long waitlists, and geographic shortages of providers are pervasive, especially for marginalized or rural populations [11, 39]. GAI tools mitigate many of these concerns: they are available 24/7, typically free or low-cost, and easily accessed via smartphone or computer [47, 54]. Moreover, for those who fear social stigma or feel uncomfortable disclosing sensitive issues to another person, GAI tools offer relative anonymity and control over disclosure pacing [47, 54]. These practical affordances position GAI as a promising alternative or supplement to traditional services—particularly for those who are not ready or able to seek human care.

Trust, Reliability, and Literacy Barriers. Substantial barriers limit engagement with both GAI and therapists. For therapists, trust may be impeded by past negative experiences, mismatches in cultural background, or fear of judgment [2, 21, 51]. For GAI, skepticism often centers on reliability and privacy: can the tool offer helpful or safe responses? How is data stored or used? These concerns are heightened in sensitive domains like trauma or suicidality, where precision and accountability are critical [47, 54]. Additionally, both types of support may be limited by the user’s mental health or technology illiteracy, users may not recognize when they need help, or know how to initiate and navigate the support available [54].

Tailoring These Dynamics to Benefit and Barrier Constructs. Collectively, these motivations and hesitations map onto the key benefit and barrier constructs assessed in this study. Individuals may value emotional validation, practical guidance, personalization, relational support, psychoeducation, accessibility, and affordability—whether provided by humans or machines. Conversely, their help-seeking behavior may be constrained by privacy concerns, doubts about reliability, stigma, cultural norms around self-reliance or professional help, and gaps in either mental health or technology illiteracy. Importantly, different support modalities address these needs and concerns in distinct ways. Our

study builds on this understanding by examining how people evaluate the trade-offs between GAI and therapists, and how these evaluations predict intention to use one, both, or neither.

3 Method

All research procedures were approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the first author’s affiliated institution. Data collection took place between April and May 2025. Participants in the university sample received course credit, while participants recruited via Prolific were compensated in accordance with platform standards (\$10.81/hour; estimated survey duration: 18–20 minutes).

3.1 Participants

3.1.1 University Sample. We conducted an online survey using Qualtrics and recruited participants through departmental research pools in psychology and computer science at a university located in the southeastern United States. A total of 784 students were recruited from the computer science department and 482 from the psychology department, yielding an initial sample of 1,266 students. Participants received one course credit upon completing the survey. After excluding 111 participants who did not complete the survey, the final analytic sample consisted of 1,155 students.

The mean age of participants was 20.57 years ($SD = 4.06$). In terms of gender identity, 50.0% identified as female, 47.4% as male, and 2.6% as nonbinary or another gender. Regarding racial identity, the majority identified as White (35.06%), followed by Asian (24.68%) and Multiracial (18.70%). Hispanic participants comprised 9.70% of the sample, and 4.42% identified as Black or African American. Smaller proportions identified as Middle Eastern or North African (1.39%), Other (0.78%), Native American or Alaska Native (0.17%), and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (0.17%). An additional 0.43% selected “Multiracial” as a single-race category, and 4.50% did not report racial identity.

In terms of educational attainment, 55.03% reported having completed some college or an associate degree, while 26.32% had a high school diploma or GED. A smaller portion had completed a bachelor’s degree (9.37%), and fewer had completed only some high school (2.58%). Additionally, 1.72% held a master’s degree, and 0.52% had earned a doctoral or professional degree (e.g., JD, MD, Ph.D.).

Household income levels varied across the sample. The largest group (40.46%) reported an annual household income of \$100,000 or more. Other income brackets included less than \$20,000 (17.77%), \$20,000–39,999 (9.18%), \$40,000–59,999 (8.83%), \$60,000–79,999 (8.31%), and \$80,000–99,999 (8.23%).

Regarding generative AI (GAI) use, participants were asked how frequently they engage with tools such as ChatGPT. Most reported at least some use, with 33.99% indicating “sometimes,” 22.86% “about half the time,” 18.93% “most of the time,” and 13.58% “always.” A smaller proportion (7.10%) reported never using such tools.

Participants also indicated the roles they believe GAI tools play in mental health support (select-all-that-apply format). The most frequently endorsed role was as an informational resource (79.03%). Other common roles included motivational coach (22.02%), friend (20.50%), and emotional support (19.83%). A smaller subset (9.72%) selected therapist substitute, indicating a more limited view of AI as a replacement for human therapists.

3.1.2 National Sample. We collected a national sample through an online survey administered via Qualtrics and distributed using Prolific, an online crowdsourcing platform commonly used for academic research. Prolific enables targeted recruitment based on demographic criteria and provides built-in quality control measures, including pre-screening and attention checks. A total of 702 U.S.-based adults were recruited, of which 51 were excluded for failing attention checks or not completing the survey, resulting in a final analytic sample of 651 participants.

Participants ranged in age from 18 to 83 years ($M = 45.62$, $SD = 16.00$). The majority identified as White (61.54%), followed by Black or African American (12.92%) and Multiracial (8.62%). Hispanic participants comprised 6.46% of the sample, while 5.38% identified as Asian. Smaller proportions identified as Native American or Alaska Native (1.54%), Multiracial as a single-race category (1.08%), Other (0.62%), Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (0.31%), and Middle Eastern or North African (0.15%). A total of 1.38% of participants did not report their racial identity.

The sample was highly educated overall. The largest proportion of participants had completed a bachelor's degree (39.77%), followed by those with some college or an associate degree (28.95%) and a master's degree (20.30%). Smaller proportions had completed a high school diploma or GED (12.35%), a doctoral or professional degree (7.11%), or only some high school (0.34%).

Employment status varied across the sample. Just over half were employed full-time (51.38%), and an additional 25.86% were employed part-time. Other participants were retired (11.91%), unemployed and seeking work (10.41%), or unemployed and not seeking work (5.37%). A small number (2.69%) were students not currently employed.

Participants reported a broad range of household income levels. The largest group (29.23%) reported an annual household income of \$100,000 or more. Other commonly reported income brackets included \$20,000–39,999 (19.16%), \$60,000–79,999 (18.97%), and \$40,000–59,999 (18.14%). Smaller proportions reported earning \$80,000–99,999 (11.75%) or less than \$20,000 (10.75%).

In terms of AI engagement, participants were asked how frequently they use generative AI (GAI) tools such as ChatGPT. The majority reported at least occasional use, with 51.25% selecting “sometimes,” 21.36% “most of the time,” 12.68% “about half the time,” and 12.18% “always.” A minority (10.19%) reported never using such tools.

Participants also selected all applicable roles they believe GAI tools play in supporting mental health. The most frequently endorsed role was as an *informational resource* (77.32%). Other commonly selected roles included *motivational coach* (34.49%), *emotional support* (32.91%), and *therapist substitute* (29.76%). Additionally, 25.98% identified GAI tools as serving the role of a *friend*, reflecting perceived relational or affective dimensions of interaction with these technologies.

3.2 Measures

To guide our measurement development, we reviewed prior literature exploring the benefits and barriers of GAI- and therapist-based mental health support (see Section 2.3). Across these sources, recurring themes included emotional trust, accessibility, personalization, stigma, and cost. We also incorporated additional constructs—such as psychoeducation and mental health literacy—drawn from broader research on digital mental health engagement and barriers to care. All items were written in a parallel comparison format—that is, the same items were instantiated twice to assess perceived benefits and barriers for each modality (once for GAI and once for therapists). Where validated instruments existed, we adapted wording from established scales to preserve construct validity while enabling parallel, modality-specific comparisons (e.g., Barriers to Access to Care Evaluation (BACE) scale [9]; eHealth Literacy [41]; psychometric properties of the credibility and expectancy [14]). However, most available measures are modality-bound (e.g., therapist-only or technology-only) and are not designed for side-by-side assessment across AI and human care. We therefore created parallel item pairs that (1) retained the core meaning of validated measures and (2) could be administered identically for both GAI and therapists, supporting cross-modal analysis. Developed items were then reviewed by HCI and counseling psychology researchers with 3+ years of domain experience to ensure clarity and coverage.

Perceived Benefits. Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement with a series of statements describing potential benefits of using either a human therapist or a generative artificial intelligence (GAI) tool for mental health support. Perceived benefits were measured across 7 constructs: emotional benefit (e.g., feeling emotionally supported

and validated), practical benefit (e.g., learning effective coping skills and strategies), relational benefit (e.g., improving one’s ability to manage relationships or social situations), educational benefit (e.g., receiving information in a clear and understandable format), personalization (e.g., tailored advice or interventions that meet individual needs), accessibility (e.g., immediate availability when needed), and financial affordability (e.g., being a more affordable option for mental health support). Each construct was assessed using three items. Reliability analyses indicated acceptable internal consistency, with Cronbach’s alpha values exceeding 0.70 for all constructs. For analysis, mean scores were computed for each construct.

Perceived Barriers. Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement with a series of statements describing potential barriers to using either a human therapist or a generative artificial intelligence (GAI) tool for mental health support. Perceived barriers were measured across 5 constructs (6 for GAI): concern of privacy (e.g., discomfort with sharing sensitive or personal information), concern of reliability (e.g., doubts regarding the reliability or helpfulness of the support provided), concern of stigma (e.g., feeling embarrassed or ashamed about seeking mental health support), help seeking norm (e.g., preference for informal support from family or friends), mental health illiteracy (e.g., lack of awareness or understanding of available resources), and technology illiteracy (only for GAI; e.g., fear of technical issues or distrust in AI-generated responses). Each construct was assessed using three items. Reliability analyses indicated acceptable internal consistency for all constructs, with Cronbach’s alpha values exceeding 0.70. For analysis, mean scores were computed for each construct.

Intention to Use. Participants’ intention to use each type of mental health support was assessed using two single-item measures: (1) “I intend to use GAI to support my mental health regularly,” and (2) “I intend to use a human professional to support my mental health regularly.” Each item was rated on a continuous scale ranging from 0 to 100. For analysis, mean scores were computed for each construct.

3.3 Data Analysis

To examine how individuals evaluate generative AI (GAI) and human therapists for mental health support, we employed a three-part analytic strategy integrating both inferential and predictive approaches.

First, we conducted repeated-measures ANOVA (RM-ANOVA) to profile how participants perceive the benefits and barriers of each support modality. This analysis allowed us to determine whether the same type of benefit (e.g., emotional support, personalization) or barrier (e.g., privacy concern, cost) was rated differently when attributed to GAI versus therapists. Post hoc comparisons were conducted to examine pairwise differences and identify which specific benefit or barrier domains diverged across modalities. This step established a foundational understanding of the perceived strengths and weaknesses of each modality.

Second, we assessed the overall relationship between the two support types by regressing intention to use GAI on intention to use human therapists, controlling for key covariates including age, gender, previous GAI use, and previous therapy experience. This analysis enabled us to explore whether GAI and therapist support are perceived as substitutes or complements. A negative association suggests a substitution pattern, where greater intention to use one modality predicts lower intention to use the other. Conversely, a non-significant or positive association implies a complementary relationship.

Third, to identify the specific belief-based factors most predictive of intention to use each modality, we employed Least Absolute Shrinkage and Selection Operator (LASSO) regression. LASSO is a regularized regression technique that constrains the sum of the absolute values of the model coefficients, simultaneously performing variable selection

and model regularization [49]. This approach is particularly well-suited to models with many potentially correlated predictors, such as the multiple perceived benefits and barriers measured in this study [35, 60].

Separate LASSO regressions were conducted for two dependent variables: intention to use GAI and intention to use a human therapist. Analyses were also conducted independently for the university and national samples to identify population-specific patterns. Each model included all belief-based constructs (benefits and barriers) associated with both modalities. This setup allowed us to capture both within-modality predictors (e.g., how beliefs about GAI predict GAI use) and cross-modality influences (e.g., how barriers to therapist use predict intention to use GAI). LASSO models were implemented using the `glmnet` package in R.

4 Results

In this section, we present the findings in the order of the four research questions.

4.1 RQ1: How do individuals' perceptions of GAI and human therapists differ across benefits and barriers?

Initial descriptive analyses examined trends in perceived benefits and barriers for Generative AI (GAI) versus human therapists across two distinct samples (national and university).

Table 1. Means and standard deviations of perceived benefits and barriers for mental health support, separately for Generative AI (GAI) and human therapists, in the national and university samples. Higher scores indicate stronger endorsement.

Type	Construct	National Sample		University Sample	
		GAI	Therapist	GAI	Therapist
Benefit	Emotional Benefit	53.15 (27.87)	74.68 (19.64)	45.47 (25.34)	73.39 (20.71)
	Practical Benefit	60.65 (26.15)	73.16 (20.58)	53.90 (24.71)	72.89 (21.07)
	Relational Benefit	51.15 (27.52)	72.39 (21.05)	39.46 (25.55)	72.13 (22.01)
	Educational Benefit	66.92 (24.67)	73.64 (20.12)	60.66 (25.53)	72.22 (21.24)
	Personalization	60.54 (27.28)	73.39 (20.74)	52.74 (26.30)	73.19 (21.30)
	Accessibility	82.72 (21.14)	52.57 (25.59)	82.83 (23.29)	49.76 (24.14)
	Affordability	76.25 (24.94)	50.81 (29.79)	80.70 (25.00)	44.64 (27.84)
Barrier	Concern of Privacy	65.67 (31.12)	57.03 (29.13)	70.59 (29.06)	51.82 (28.02)
	Concern of Reliability	62.65 (28.46)	56.66 (26.09)	69.44 (26.60)	48.96 (26.82)
	Concern of Stigma	29.25 (27.74)	49.36 (30.16)	38.37 (29.42)	46.77 (27.90)
	Help Seeking Norm	32.60 (26.53)	44.75 (28.44)	40.64 (26.61)	45.39 (26.64)
	Mental Health Illiteracy	40.80 (27.81)	48.43 (27.97)	41.63 (28.95)	46.77 (26.96)
	Technology Illiteracy	53.42 (28.37)	- (-)	56.37 (28.46)	- (-)
Intention	Intention to Use	36.61 (31.42)	58.54 (28.63)	26.04 (27.44)	55.79 (28.85)

Table 1 presents the mean ratings and standard deviations for each benefit and barrier type, separated by source of support within each sample. To examine overall perceptions, we conducted repeated-measures ANOVAs with benefit (or barrier) type as a within-subjects factor, collapsing across the university and national samples.

Therapist perceptions. The main effect of benefit type was significant, $F(6, 10296) = 935.93$, $p < .001$, indicating substantial differences across benefit categories. Participants rated therapists significantly higher on emotional, practical, relational, educational, and personalized benefits compared to accessibility and affordability. For example, emotional benefit was rated substantially higher than accessibility ($M_{\text{diff}} = 23.02$, $SE = 0.63$, $t(1716) = 36.73$, $p < .001$) and

affordability ($M_{\text{diff}} = 26.57, SE = 0.76, t(1716) = 35.03, p < .001$). Personalization was similarly favored over affordability ($M_{\text{diff}} = 25.67, SE = 0.74, t(1716) = 34.57, p < .001$) and accessibility ($M_{\text{diff}} = 22.12, SE = 0.61, t(1716) = 36.09, p < .001$). Minor differences among the higher-rated benefits (e.g., personalization vs. practical) were statistically nonsignificant. Overall, therapists were valued most for emotional, relational, practical, and educational support, with accessibility and affordability seen as weaker dimensions.

For barriers, the main effect of barrier type was also significant, $F(4, 6648) = 75.95, p < .001$. Privacy concerns emerged as the most prominent barrier, rated significantly higher than stigma ($M_{\text{diff}} = 6.67, SE = 0.68, t(1662) = 9.84, p < .001$), mental health illiteracy ($M_{\text{diff}} = 7.13, SE = 0.75, t(1662) = 9.50, p < .001$), reliability ($M_{\text{diff}} = 1.82, SE = 0.63, t(1662) = 2.91, p < .05$), and help-seeking norm ($M_{\text{diff}} = 9.60, SE = 0.73, t(1662) = 13.17, p < .001$). Help-seeking norm was the least endorsed barrier overall.

GAI perceptions. For GAI, the main effect of benefit type was significant, $F(6, 10032) = 1165.20, p < .001$. Participants most strongly endorsed accessibility and affordability. Accessibility was rated significantly higher than affordability ($M_{\text{diff}} = 4.40, SE = 0.45, t(1672) = 9.71, p < .001$), personalization ($M_{\text{diff}} = 26.13, SE = 0.65, t(1672) = 40.25, p < .001$), and psychoeducation ($M_{\text{diff}} = 18.97, SE = 0.57, t(1672) = 33.56, p < .001$). In contrast, emotional and relational support were rated substantially lower (e.g., accessibility vs. emotional support: $M_{\text{diff}} = 33.28, SE = 0.70, t(1672) = 47.52, p < .001$). GAI also received moderate endorsement for practical and educational benefits.

For barriers, the main effect of barrier type was significant, $F(5, 7885) = 747.15, p < .001$. Privacy and reliability concerns were most strongly endorsed, significantly higher than stigma, help-seeking norm, and technology illiteracy. For example, privacy concerns exceeded stigma ($M_{\text{diff}} = 34.07, SE = 0.93, t(1577) = 36.61, p < .001$) and help-seeking norms ($M_{\text{diff}} = 31.49, SE = 0.92, t(1577) = 34.39, p < .001$).

Taken together, RQ1 results suggest that therapists are primarily valued for interpersonal and psychological benefits, while GAI is valued for structural advantages. Across both modalities, privacy and reliability consistently emerged as leading barriers.

Figure 3 summarizes the profiles of perceived benefits and barriers across the combined samples. These results reflect the mean scores of each benefit and barrier, collapsed across the university and national samples ($N = 1806$).

4.2 RQ2: Do these perceptions vary across populations?

We next examined group effects and group-by-benefit/barrier interactions to identify population-specific differences between the national and university samples.

Therapist perceptions. The main effect of group was not significant for benefits, $F(1, 1716) = 2.63, p = .105$, suggesting that both samples valued therapists similarly across dimensions. However, group differences emerged for barriers: national participants reported significantly greater concerns about therapist reliability ($M_{\text{diff}} = 7.04, SE = 1.33, t(1662) = 5.28, p < .001$) and privacy ($M_{\text{diff}} = 4.50, SE = 1.42, t(1662) = 3.17, p < .01$) than university participants.

GAI perceptions. For GAI, the main effect of group was significant, $F(1, 1672) = 22.92, p < .001$, as was the group-by-benefit interaction, $F(6, 10032) = 44.28, p < .001$. National participants rated GAI higher on relational ($M_{\text{diff}} = 11.85, SE = 1.32, t(1672) = 8.98, p < .001$), emotional ($M_{\text{diff}} = 7.04, SE = 1.32, t(1672) = 5.35, p < .001$), and educational benefits ($M_{\text{diff}} = 6.07, SE = 1.26, t(1672) = 4.82, p < .001$) than university participants.

For barriers, the main effect of group was also significant, $F(1, 1577) = 23.65, p < .001$, as was the interaction, $F(5, 7885) = 9.62, p < .001$. University students consistently reported higher perceived barriers than national participants. This included greater concerns about stigma ($M_{\text{diff}} = 9.24, SE = 1.47, t(1577) = 6.28, p < .001$), help-seeking norms ($M_{\text{diff}} = 7.75, SE = 1.35, t(1577) = 5.73, p < .001$), and ineffectiveness ($M_{\text{diff}} = 6.31, SE = 1.40, t(1577) = 4.51, p < .001$).




Fig. 3. Profiles of the top three perceived benefits and barriers for Generative AI (GAI) and human therapists, aggregated across the combined university and national samples ($N = 1,806$). The figure shows that GAI is most valued for accessibility, affordability, and educational benefits, but is limited by privacy, reliability, and technology literacy concerns. Human therapists are valued for emotional benefit, personalization, and practical benefit, but face barriers of privacy, reliability, and stigma.

In sum, RQ2 results highlight population-specific patterns: national adults were more favorable toward GAI's relational and emotional potential, while university students expressed stronger concerns about barriers, particularly privacy, reliability, and stigma. For therapists, both groups valued benefits similarly, but national adults reported greater sensitivity to privacy and reliability concerns.

4.3 RQ3: Do intentions to use GAI and therapists influence one another?

We also examined how intention to use one modality influences intention to use the other. To do so, we conducted multivariate regression analyses in both the national and university samples, controlling for age, gender, and prior experience with each modality. In the national sample, a weak substitution effect was observed: intention to use GAI negatively predicted intention to use a therapist ($b = -0.10$, $SE = 0.04$, $p < .05$), and intention to use a therapist negatively predicted intention to use GAI ($b = -0.09$, $SE = 0.04$, $p < .05$). This suggests that individuals in this sample tended to view the two modalities as alternatives, with greater interest in one associated with reduced interest in the other. In contrast, the university sample showed no such pattern: intention to use GAI was not significantly related to intention to use a therapist ($b = 0.02$, $SE = 0.04$, $p = .44$), nor was intention to use a therapist significantly related to intention to use GAI ($b = 0.02$, $SE = 0.03$, $p = .44$). This indicates a more complementary perception, where participants may be open to engaging with both GAI and human therapists simultaneously.

Table 2. Perceived benefits and barriers predicting intention to use Generative AI (GAI) and therapist support for mental health across the university ($N = 1,155$) and national ($N = 651$) samples, based on LASSO regression coefficients. Larger coefficients indicate stronger influence; blank cells reflect predictors not selected by the model.

Type	Category	Predictor	University Sample		National Sample	
			GAI	Therapist	GAI	Therapist
GAI	Benefit	Emotional Benefit	0.19	-0.04	0.40	-0.03
		Practical Benefit			0.04	
		Relational Benefit	0.21	-0.00	0.06	
		Educational Benefit				
		Personalization	0.17		0.16	-0.01
		Accessibility		-0.03		-0.03
		Affordability	-0.05	-0.01		-0.06
GAI	Barrier	Concern of Privacy		0.07	-0.03	0.06
		Concern of Reliability	-0.18		-0.12	0.00
		Concern of Stigma	0.02		0.07	0.03
		Help Seeking Norm	0.11			
		Mental Health Illiteracy				0.08
		Technology Illiteracy		0.23	-0.08	0.14
Therapist	Benefit	Emotional Benefit	-0.09	0.15	-0.03	0.33
		Practical Benefit	-0.04	0.06		
		Relational Benefit		0.08		0.04
		Educational Benefit	-0.03			
		Personalization	-0.00	0.11	-0.06	0.03
		Accessibility			0.02	0.01
		Affordability	-0.00	0.22		0.24
Therapist	Barrier	Concern of Privacy		-0.04	0.01	-0.05
		Concern of Reliability	0.11	-0.04		-0.01
		Concern of Stigma		-0.02	0.02	
		Help Seeking Norm	0.01		0.09	-0.13
		Mental Health Illiteracy	0.05		0.06	0.02
R ²			0.42	0.28	0.52	0.29

4.4 RQ4: What perceived benefits/barriers most strongly predict intention to use GAI/human therapists?

We then examined which psychological beliefs most strongly predict individuals' intentions to use each modality by applying LASSO regression. This method allowed us to identify the most influential predictors from a comprehensive set of perceived benefits and barriers, entered simultaneously for both GAI and therapist support. By isolating the factors most predictive of intention for each modality, we gain insight into the specific drivers of use and how GAI tools can be designed to leverage the intersecting benefits and barriers of each modality to maximize adoption in the mental health landscape. Standardized beta coefficients (β) are reported to enable interpretation and comparison across predictors. Full LASSO coefficients are presented in Table 2, with corresponding visualizations provided in each results subsection.

University Sample

Figure 4 illustrates the significant perceived benefits and barriers for GAI and human therapist in the university sample.




Fig. 4. Summary of influential perceived benefits and barriers predicting intention to use Generative AI (GAI) or a human therapist in the university sample ($N = 1,155$). For visibility, only the two largest coefficients in each category are shown. Full results are reported in Table 2.

For GAI, three benefits of GAI emerged as significant facilitators. Emotional benefit ($\beta = .19$), relational benefit ($\beta = .21$), and personalization ($\beta = .17$) were positively associated with students' intention to use GAI for mental

health support. These findings suggest that students value emotionally responsive, personalized, and socially attuned interactions with GAI systems. However, concern about reliability ($\beta = -0.18$) stood out as the strongest negative predictor, highlighting skepticism toward the intention to use GAI tools. Notably, one of the most compelling insights lies in how beliefs about therapists influence GAI usage. Students who were concerned about the reliability of human therapists were more likely to turn to GAI ($\beta = .11$), suggesting that perceived weaknesses in one modality may increase interest in the other.

Interestingly, a counterintuitive result emerged for the “help-seeking norm” barrier, which had a positive coefficient ($\beta = .11$), suggesting that students who perceive greater normative barriers to formally seeking help from GAI may still turn to GAI. One possible interpretation is that students who are hesitant to engage with GAI may have higher barriers toward human therapists, so they may view GAI as a casual, low-stakes alternative. A similar dynamic may explain the weak but negative effect of affordability ($\beta = -0.05$): students who view GAI as highly affordable may actually have access to a broader range of support options including human therapist, thereby reducing their exclusive reliance on GAI.

As for the intention to use therapists, students were more likely to engage when they perceived emotional benefit ($\beta = .15$), practical benefit ($\beta = .06$), relational benefit ($\beta = .08$), and personalization ($\beta = .11$) from therapy. These findings reflect the multifaceted value students place on traditional therapeutic relationships. Importantly, affordability was also a strong predictor ($\beta = .22$), underscoring the central role of financial access in the decision to pursue therapy, a factor that did not significantly predict GAI use in this sample. Barriers to using therapy, however, were more limited in their influence. Additional barriers such as privacy concerns ($\beta = 0.07$) and technology illiteracy ($\beta = 0.23$) for using GAI also contributed to students’ intention to engage with therapist. Conversely, therapist reliability concerns had a weak negative effect ($\beta = -0.04$), while privacy concerns ($\beta = -0.04$) showed similarly minimal influence.

In sum, university students appear to adopt a pragmatic stance toward mental health support. They turn to GAI when it offers emotional and relational engagement and when they question the reliability of traditional services. However, concerns about GAI’s own reliability remain critical obstacles. On the other hand, students prefer therapists when the relationship offers strong emotional and practical benefits and when services are financially accessible.

National Sample

Figure 5 illustrates the significant perceived benefits and barriers for GAI and human therapist in the national sample.

In the national sample, the most influential predictor for the intention to use GAI was emotional benefit of GAI ($\beta = .40$), marking it as the strongest single factor in the national sample. This suggests that individuals are drawn to GAI primarily when they perceive it can offer emotional support. This contrasts with the university sample, where relational benefits were the strongest predictor. Here, personalization also showed a moderate effect ($\beta = .16$), indicating that the capacity of GAI to adapt to users’ needs is an important motivator across populations.

Technology illiteracy was more salient in the national sample. It was a significant negative predictor of GAI use ($\beta = -0.08$), suggesting that lack of familiarity or confidence with digital tools may hinder adoption of GAI services more severely among the general population than among university students. Also, concern about the reliability of GAI was the strongest barrier ($\beta = -0.12$). Therapists factors also played subtle roles. Individuals who viewed therapists as providing emotional benefit ($\beta = -0.03$) or personalization ($\beta = -0.06$) were slightly less inclined to choose GAI.

When considering the intention to use therapists, the national sample again highlighted affordability of therapist as a decisive factor ($\beta = .24$). Emotional benefit was also a strong positive predictor ($\beta = .33$), further reinforcing that emotional responsiveness is a key dimension of perceived therapeutic value. Notably, technology illiteracy ($\beta = .14$)




Fig. 5. Summary of influential perceived benefits and barriers predicting intention to use Generative AI (GAI) or a human therapist in the national sample ($N = 651$). For visibility, only the two largest coefficients in each category are displayed. Full results are reported in Table 2.

was associated with higher intention to use therapists, perhaps reflecting a preference for human interaction when digital tools are seen as inaccessible or intimidating. Additionally, individuals with limited mental health literacy to

use GAI, those unsure of what kind of support exists or how GAI could help, were more inclined to rely on therapists instead ($\beta = .08$). This suggests that unfamiliarity with AI-driven tools may redirect users to more conventional options.

In summary, while both GAI and therapists are seen as viable options for mental health support, their selection hinges on different belief structures. For GAI, emotional benefits and personalization are key drivers, but concerns about reliability and technological competence remain significant barriers. For therapists, affordability and emotional benefit remain dominant motivators, particularly in populations less comfortable with or informed about digital mental health tools.

5 Discussion

This study investigated how individuals choose between generative AI (GAI) tools and human therapists for mental health support, using the Health Belief Model (HBM) as a guiding framework. Drawing on data from both university students and a nationally representative adult sample, and applying LASSO regression to identify salient belief structures, we aimed to uncover the psychological reasoning behind help-seeking preferences. To our knowledge, this is the first study to empirically compare user perceptions of GAI and human therapists side by side, offering insights that inform the design of interactive systems for mental health support.

Overall, we identified key perceived benefits and barriers associated with each modality. Interestingly, some beliefs that were highly endorsed did not necessarily play central roles in shaping users' intentions, suggesting a complex relationship between endorsement and behavioral influence. Based on these findings, we discuss how insights from this study can inform the design and development of GAI tools for mental health support. For example, what makes a GAI tool appealing to users? What potential pitfalls should developers consider when designing AI-driven support systems? We also outline directions for future research to further investigate how users decide between GAI and human therapists, or whether they choose to engage with both, as part of their mental health journey.

5.1 Design beyond Accessibility

Across both the university and national samples, participants highlighted accessibility and affordability as clear advantages of generative AI (GAI). These perceptions are consistent with prior research documenting how digital tools can circumvent long-standing barriers to mental health care, such as provider shortages, scheduling constraints, and high costs [26, 47]. Yet, our analysis revealed that these structural benefits, while acknowledged, did not significantly predict intention to use GAI. This discrepancy underscores a critical insight: reducing logistical barriers is necessary but not sufficient. For GAI to become a trusted part of mental health support, it must also demonstrate emotional credibility.

The strongest predictors of GAI intention were not access-related but affective in nature: emotional benefit, relational support, and personalization. These findings suggest that users look for more than convenience when deciding whether to engage with AI systems; they seek evidence that the system can meet core psychological needs. Notably, respondents consistently rated GAI lower than therapists in personalization and emotional support. This is striking because personalization is often promoted as a hallmark of AI systems. The gap points to a disconnect between technical capacity and subjective user experience: while large language models can generate contextually tailored responses, users remain skeptical about whether these responses translate into genuine care.

This skepticism may stem from how current GAI tools convey empathy. Simulated warmth or validation may appear formulaic, lacking the adaptive nuance and nonverbal attunement characteristic of human therapists. Prior work emphasizes that trust in AI-mediated health support grows when systems actively demonstrate responsiveness and sensitivity to user context [20]. Our findings align with this perspective, showing that intentions to use GAI rise when

users perceive the tool as capable of emotional resonance, rather than merely informational accuracy or logistical efficiency.

The implications for design are clear: future GAI systems must move beyond optimizing for access and instead cultivate emotional presence. This can be pursued through features such as adaptive dialogue that evolves with user disclosures, mechanisms for validating emotional experiences in real time, and consistency in tone that conveys warmth and attentiveness. Moreover, integrating feedback loops where users can signal whether responses feel supportive could help bridge the gap between technical outputs and subjective trust. Such design choices are not cosmetic but central to adoption. Without them, GAI risks being dismissed as efficient yet emotionally hollow.

In short, structural advantages open the door, but emotional benefits sustains engagement. To meaningfully complement or substitute for traditional therapy, GAI must earn users' trust by demonstrating that it can "show up" emotionally. This means treating empathy, personalization, and validation not as optional add-ons but as core design priorities.

5.2 Match the Tool to the Terrain of Support

Our findings reveal that perceptions of generative AI (GAI) do not exist in isolation but are shaped by the broader "terrain of support" in which users are embedded. For university students, who typically have access to counseling centers, peer support networks, and mental health awareness initiatives [42], GAI was not positioned as a replacement for therapy. Instead, it functioned as a complement, a flexible tool to fill gaps between sessions, offer immediacy, or provide low-barrier engagement. This aligns with prior work showing that digitally literate youth often adopt "assemblage" approaches to care, combining digital and in-person supports to create layered pathways of help-seeking [33, 45]. Within this environment, GAI appears most effective as an adjunct, extending the reach of existing services without displacing them.

In contrast, the national sample, representing a wider range of ages, occupations, and geographic contexts, often approached GAI as a substitute. Here, intention to use GAI was negatively associated with intention to use therapists. This pattern suggests that where professional services are less accessible due to financial, geographic, or logistical barriers, individuals may feel compelled to choose between modalities rather than combine them [32, 37]. For these populations, GAI becomes a primary scaffold for support, valued not only for convenience but as a functional alternative when traditional pathways are unavailable or impractical. This substitution dynamic is consistent with prior evidence that digital health tools frequently serve as first-line interventions in contexts of scarcity [8].

Taken together, these contrasting patterns highlight that adoption is less about the inherent qualities of GAI and more about the ecosystem in which it is situated. The same tool can flex into different roles depending on users' social resources and structural constraints. This insight has important design implications. In resource-rich settings such as universities, GAI should be optimized for complementarity, offering features that extend therapeutic processes, reinforce coping strategies, or prepare users for in-person sessions. In resource-scarce contexts, however, GAI must be equipped to act as a primary support, requiring greater emphasis on breadth of psychoeducational content, emotional responsiveness, and trust-building safeguards. Ultimately, the value of GAI lies not in its uniform application but in its adaptability to diverse terrains of support. Designing systems that can flex between companion and scaffold, depending on whether users are supplementing existing resources or compensating for their absence, will be critical to ensuring GAI's relevance and equity across populations.

5.3 Build for Literacy Before Building New Features

Our findings underscore that adoption of generative AI (GAI) for mental health support is constrained less by what the technology can do and more by whether people feel capable of using it. In the national sample, barriers such as technological illiteracy and limited mental health literacy strongly shaped preferences, often steering individuals toward traditional therapy despite recognizing GAI’s affordability and accessibility. This suggests that for many, the decisive factor is not the presence of advanced features but the confidence to navigate the system in the first place.

Prior research on digital health adoption echoes this point: usability and literacy consistently predict engagement more reliably than system sophistication [36, 52]. When users struggle to understand how to interact with a system, interpret its outputs, or trust its data practices, even the most innovative features remain underutilized. Our results reinforce this dynamic. Participants who doubted their digital skills or mental health knowledge reported higher therapist intention, not necessarily because they preferred human care but because they lacked the efficacy to engage with AI-based support. This highlights an important boundary condition: without scaffolding user literacy, GAI will remain inaccessible to those who might benefit most.

Designing for literacy requires rethinking priorities. Instead of racing to integrate new capabilities, developers should focus on onboarding flows and educational scaffolds that demystify system use. For example, transparent explanations of what the tool can and cannot do, interactive tutorials that model effective dialogue, and in-context prompts that guide users through difficult moments can reduce cognitive burden and build user confidence. Clear communication about data use and privacy protections is equally essential, as uncertainty about information handling amplifies distrust [34].

Importantly, scaffolding literacy is not only about technology but also about mental health understanding. Users with limited familiarity with psychological terms or coping strategies may need psychoeducational support to interpret AI outputs meaningfully. Embedding accessible explanations, normalizing mental health concepts, and offering tiered pathways of information can help users make sense of suggestions and apply them effectively. In this way, literacy-building becomes a foundation for both trust and sustained engagement. In short, before layering on advanced capabilities, GAI systems must lower the cognitive barrier to entry. Building for literacy first ensures that tools are not only powerful but also usable, equitable, and genuinely supportive for diverse populations.

5.4 Design for Pathways, Not Silos

Another key implication is that system design should account for the pathways users construct, rather than assuming linear or siloed choices. Our findings suggest that individuals do not approach help-seeking through neat “either/or” decision trees. Instead, they build adaptive and sometimes messy pathways shaped by their resources, trust levels, and literacy. A user may begin with self-help strategies, shift to GAI when seeking low-barrier support, and eventually engage a therapist for deeper work (or reverse this order depending on circumstances). Designing as though GAI and therapy are discrete, siloed options risks overlooking the fluid ways people actually navigate care.

Supporting pathways means enabling smooth transitions between self-help, AI-based support, and professional services. Features such as context-aware referral prompts could encourage users to escalate care when needed, while data-sharing mechanisms (implemented with strict consent and privacy protections) could help therapists build on insights gathered during AI interactions. Likewise, in-the-moment nudges might help users move between modalities, such as suggesting therapy preparation questions after a series of GAI self-check-ins. Prior research emphasizes that blended or layered care is often more effective than single-mode interventions [12, 48], and our results reinforce the value of designing systems that can flexibly interconnect rather than compete. By prioritizing pathways, GAI developers

can reframe their tools not as standalone silos but as integral threads within a broader ecosystem of care. This shift in design perspective acknowledges the reality of users' lived decision-making and maximizes the likelihood that GAI will be experienced as a bridge rather than a barrier in mental health journeys.

5.5 Fill the Gaps Therapists Can't Always Cover

Our findings reaffirm that therapists remain unmatched in their capacity for depth, trust, and empathy. Participants consistently rated human therapists higher than GAI in personalization, emotional benefit, and relational support, echoing longstanding evidence that therapeutic alliances are grounded in human attunement and contextual understanding [58]. Yet therapy is not without constraints. Structural barriers such as limited appointment availability, high costs, and the natural boundaries of session-based work mean that even the most effective therapists cannot offer continuous, real-time support.

This is where GAI has the potential to complement rather than compete. By leaning into what human providers cannot always deliver, including immediacy, scalability, and constant availability, GAI can occupy the “between-session” spaces that often go unsupported. For example, GAI systems could provide daily emotion check-ins, suggest coping strategies in moments of distress, or help clients track progress over time. These functions extend therapeutic continuity, ensuring that support does not vanish once the session ends. Prior work on digital mental health tools highlights that continuity of care is critical for maintaining engagement and reinforcing skill practice [17, 27], a role well-suited for AI's scalable presence.

Importantly, positioning GAI in this complementary space avoids framing it as a rival to therapy. Rather than replicating the deep relational work of human therapists, GAI can strategically focus on coverage gaps, which include supporting immediacy when crises arise outside of office hours, reinforcing psychoeducation, and offering low-barrier engagement for users hesitant to reach out directly. When designed with this role in mind, GAI tools can strengthen the overall care ecosystem by catching what might otherwise slip through the cracks.

By filling gaps that therapists cannot always cover, GAI can transform from a perceived substitute into a trusted extension of care. This requires careful calibration: ensuring emotional benefits and trustworthiness while being transparent about limitations. Done well, GAI can act as the connective tissue of mental health support, offering continuity without competition and amplifying the therapeutic process rather than diluting it.

5.6 Limitations and Future Directions

While this study provides important insights into how individuals consider generative AI (GAI) and human therapists for mental health support, several limitations suggest promising avenues for future research.

First, the cross-sectional design limits causal inference. Although LASSO regression allowed us to identify belief structures that predict help-seeking intentions, the findings do not indicate how these beliefs develop or shift over time. Longitudinal or experimental studies are needed to examine how real-world exposure to GAI systems influences user attitudes and behaviors. For example, tracking individuals before and after engaging with a GAI-based support tool could illuminate whether concerns—such as skepticism about emotional resonance or personalization—diminish with actual use.

Second, the generalizability of our findings is constrained by sample characteristics. The university sample consisted of students from a single institution with concentrations in psychology and computer science, which may have influenced their attitudes toward both mental health and emerging technologies. The national sample, although broader, was limited to individuals with internet access and a baseline level of digital literacy. To improve inclusivity and relevance,

future studies should engage more diverse populations, including offline, underserved, and clinical communities who may face distinct barriers or hold different perceptions of mental health technologies.

Third, even though this study is grounded in psychological beliefs—such as the idea that people seek emotional or relational support from GAI tools—we still do not know what specifically promotes the subjective feeling of being “psychologically supported.” Identifying predictors of intention is not the same as uncovering the underlying mechanisms of felt support. Future research should draw on clinically validated concepts such as perceived empathy, therapeutic alliance, expectation of users and patients, and emotion regulation [5, 10, 16, 22]. For example, it remains unclear whether users interpret AI validation as empathy, whether description of AI tools enhances user’s expectation, or whether repeated engagement contributes to emotion regulation. Experimental and qualitative studies could help unpack these processes, offering a more precise understanding of how and why GAI interactions are experienced as supportive.

Finally, while this study identifies beliefs that predict intention to use GAI and therapists, it does not directly reveal the cognitive or behavioral mechanisms underlying decision-making. Future research should explore how individuals frame their mental health support choices in real-world contexts, particularly under conditions of emotional distress or limited access. Qualitative or mixed-methods approaches could be especially useful in unpacking how users weigh trade-offs, compare modalities, and define trust or emotional adequacy in technology-mediated care. Understanding these psychological processes will be essential for designing tools that are not only functional but also meaningful and supportive in users’ lived experiences.

6 Conclusion

This study provides important insights into how individuals navigate choices between generative AI (GAI) and human therapists for mental health support. By integrating the Health Belief Model (HBM) and multi-modality frameworks, we uncovered distinct psychological mechanisms influencing help-seeking behaviors across two populations, university students and a nationally representative adult sample. Our findings highlight that individuals’ perceptions of benefits and barriers significantly shape their intentions toward GAI and therapist modalities, though these perceptions function differently across populations. University students primarily adopted a complementary approach, leveraging GAI for its emotional responsiveness, relational support, and personalized interactions, while still valuing therapists for deeper emotional and practical engagement. Conversely, the national sample exhibited a substitution pattern, viewing GAI and therapists as interchangeable resources, with decisions largely driven by affordability, emotional support, and perceived reliability. These results have meaningful implications for the future design and deployment of GAI tools in mental health contexts. Developers should prioritize building emotional resonance, trustworthiness, and personalization into AI-driven support systems rather than solely focusing on structural advantages like accessibility or affordability. Additionally, understanding population-specific dynamics can guide tailored interventions, ensuring both GAI and traditional therapeutic options coexist effectively within mental health ecosystems. Future research should further explore how demographic factors, digital literacy, and evolving technology perceptions shape these complex decisions, ultimately informing more nuanced integration strategies for GAI in mental health care.

7 Acknowledgments

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by the Department of Psychology at the University of Florida through the Trish Calvert Ring Graduate Research Award.

References

- [1] Antonia Aguirre Velasco, Ignacio Silva Santa Cruz, Jo Billings, Magdalena Jimenez, and Sarah Rowe. 2020. What are the barriers, facilitators and interventions targeting help-seeking behaviours for common mental health problems in adolescents? A systematic review. *BMC psychiatry* 20, 1 (2020), 293.
- [2] Nafiso Ahmed, Sally Barlow, Lisa Reynolds, Nicholas Drey, Fareha Begum, Elizabeth Tuudah, and Alan Simpson. 2021. Mental health professionals' perceived barriers and enablers to shared decision-making in risk assessment and risk management: a qualitative systematic review. *BMC psychiatry* 21, 1 (2021), 594.
- [3] Fahad Alanezi. 2024. Assessing the Effectiveness of CHATGPT in delivering Mental health support: A Qualitative study. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Healthcare* Volume 17 (1 2024), 461–471. doi:10.2147/jmdh.s447368
- [4] Laura Helena Andrade, Jordi Alonso, Zeina Mneimneh, JE Wells, Ali Al-Hamzawi, Guilherme Borges, Evelyn Bromet, Ronny Bruffaerts, G De Girolamo, R De Graaf, et al. 2014. Barriers to mental health treatment: results from the WHO World Mental Health surveys. *Psychological medicine* 44, 6 (2014), 1303–1317.
- [5] Matthias Berking, Peggilee Wupperman, Alexander Reichardt, Tanja Pejic, Alexandra Dippel, and Hansjörg Znoj. 2008. Emotion-regulation skills as a treatment target in psychotherapy. *Behaviour research and therapy* 46, 11 (2008), 1230–1237.
- [6] William Bor, Angela J Dean, Jacob Najman, and Reza Hayatbakhsh. 2014. Are child and adolescent mental health problems increasing in the 21st century? A systematic review. *Australian & New Zealand journal of psychiatry* 48, 7 (2014), 606–616.
- [7] Christopher J Carpenter. 2010. A meta-analysis of the effectiveness of health belief model variables in predicting behavior. *Health communication* 25, 8 (2010), 661–669.
- [8] Jie Chen and John Rizzo. 2010. Racial and ethnic disparities in use of psychotherapy: evidence from US national survey data. *Psychiatric Services* 61, 4 (2010), 364–372.
- [9] Sarah Clement, Elaine Brohan, Debra Jeffery, Claire Henderson, Stephani L Hatch, and Graham Thornicroft. 2012. Development and psychometric properties the Barriers to Access to Care Evaluation scale (BACE) related to people with mental ill health. *BMC psychiatry* 12, 1 (2012), 36.
- [10] Shauna Concannon and Marcus Tomalin. 2024. Measuring perceived empathy in dialogue systems. *Ai & Society* 39, 5 (2024), 2233–2247.
- [11] Nicholas C Coombs, Wyatt E Meriwether, James Caringi, and Sophia R Newcomer. 2021. Barriers to healthcare access among US adults with mental health challenges: A population-based study. *SSM-population health* 15 (2021), 100847.
- [12] Peter A Cornish, Gillian Berry, Sherry Benton, Patricia Barros-Gomes, Dawn Johnson, Rebecca Ginsburg, Beth Whelan, Emily Fawcett, and Vera Romano. 2017. Meeting the mental health needs of today's college student: Reinventing services through Stepped Care 2.0. *Psychological services* 14, 4 (2017), 428.
- [13] Raziye Dehbozorgi, Sanaz Zangeneh, Elham Khooshab, Donya Hafezi Nia, Hamid Reza Hanif, Pooya Samian, Mahmoud Yousefi, Fatemeh Haj Hashemi, Morteza Vakili, Neda Jamalimoghadam, et al. 2025. The application of artificial intelligence in the field of mental health: a systematic review. *BMC psychiatry* 25, 1 (2025), 132.
- [14] Grant J Devilly and Thomas D Borkovec. 2000. Psychometric properties of the credibility/expectancy questionnaire. *Journal of behavior therapy and experimental psychiatry* 31, 2 (2000), 73–86.
- [15] Tara Donker, Kathleen M Griffiths, Pim Cuijpers, and Helen Christensen. 2009. Psychoeducation for depression, anxiety and psychological distress: a meta-analysis. *BMC medicine* 7, 1 (2009), 79.
- [16] Rachel Elvins and Jonathan Green. 2008. The conceptualization and measurement of therapeutic alliance: An empirical review. *Clinical psychology review* 28, 7 (2008), 1167–1187.
- [17] Kathleen Kara Fitzpatrick, Alison Darcy, and Molly Vierhile. 2017. Delivering cognitive behavior therapy to young adults with symptoms of depression and anxiety using a fully automated conversational agent (WoeBot): a randomized controlled trial. *JMIR Mental Health* 4, 2 (6 2017), e19. doi:10.2196/mental.7785
- [18] Christoph Flückiger, AC Del Re, Daniel Wlodasch, Adam O Horvath, Nili Solomonov, and Bruce E Wampold. 2020. Assessing the alliance–outcome association adjusted for patient characteristics and treatment processes: A meta-analytic summary of direct comparisons. *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 67, 6 (2020), 706.
- [19] Christoph Flückiger, Aaron C Del Re, Bruce E Wampold, and Adam O Horvath. 2018. The alliance in adult psychotherapy: A meta-analytic synthesis. *Psychotherapy* 55, 4 (2018), 316.
- [20] Moshe Glickman and Tali Sharot. 2025. How human–AI feedback loops alter human perceptual, emotional and social judgements. *Nature Human Behaviour* 9, 2 (2025), 345–359.
- [21] Narayan Gopalkrishnan. 2018. Cultural diversity and mental health: Considerations for policy and practice. *Frontiers in public health* 6 (2018), 179.

- [22] Roger P Greenberg, Michael J Constantino, and Noah Bruce. 2006. Are patient expectations still relevant for psychotherapy process and outcome? *Clinical psychology review* 26, 6 (2006), 657–678.
- [23] Zhijun Guo, Alvina Lai, Johan H Thygesen, Joseph Farrington, Thomas Keen, Kezhi Li, et al. 2024. Large language models for mental health applications: systematic review. *JMIR mental health* 11, 1 (2024), e57400.
- [24] Erin J Henshaw and Carol R Freedman-Doan. 2009. Conceptualizing mental health care utilization using the health belief model. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice* 16, 4 (2009), 420.
- [25] Yining Hua, Fenglin Liu, Kailai Yang, Zehan Li, Hongbin Na, Yi-han Sheu, Peilin Zhou, Lauren V Moran, Sophia Ananiadou, Andrew Beam, et al. 2024. Large language models in mental health care: a scoping review. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.02984* (2024).
- [26] Yining Hua, Hongbin Na, Zehan Li, Fenglin Liu, Xiao Fang, David Clifton, and John Torous. 2025. A scoping review of large language models for generative tasks in mental health care. *npj Digital Medicine* 8, 1 (2025), 230.
- [27] Becky Inkster, Shubhankar Sarda, Vinod Subramanian, et al. 2018. An empathy-driven, conversational artificial intelligence agent (Wysa) for digital mental well-being: real-world data evaluation mixed-methods study. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth* 6, 11 (2018), e12106.
- [28] Nancy K. Janz and Marshall H. Becker. 1984. The health belief model: a decade later. *Health Education Quarterly* 11, 1 (3 1984), 1–47. doi:10.1177/109019818401100101
- [29] Jacinta Jardine, Camille Nadal, Sarah Robinson, Angel Enrique, Marcus Hanratty, and Gavin Doherty. 2024. Between rhetoric and reality: real-world barriers to uptake and early engagement in digital mental health interventions. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction* 31, 2 (2024), 1–59.
- [30] Emily G Lattie, Colleen Stiles-Shields, and Andrea K Graham. 2022. An overview of and recommendations for more accessible digital mental health services. *Nature Reviews Psychology* 1, 2 (2022), 87–100.
- [31] Sarah Ketchen Lipson, Emily G Lattie, and Daniel Eisenberg. 2019. Increased rates of mental health service utilization by US college students: 10-year population-level trends (2007–2017). *Psychiatric services* 70, 1 (2019), 60–63.
- [32] Johanna Löchner, Per Carlbring, Björn Schuller, John Torous, and Lasse Bosse Sander. 2025. Digital interventions in mental health: an overview and future perspectives. *Internet Interventions* 40 (2025), 100824.
- [33] Deborah Lupton. 2021. Young people’s use of digital health technologies in the global north: Narrative review. *Journal of Medical Internet Research* 23, 1 (2021), e18286.
- [34] Yuri Reina Marín, Omer Cruz Caro, Angelica María Carrasco Rituay, Katia Araceli Guimac Llanos, Doris Tarrillo Perez, Einstein Sánchez Bardales, Judith Nathaly Alva Tuesta, and River Chávez Santos. 2025. Ethical Challenges Associated with the Use of Artificial Intelligence in University Education. *Journal of Academic Ethics* (2025), 1–25.
- [35] Daniel M McNeish. 2015. Using lasso for predictor selection and to assuage overfitting: A method long overlooked in behavioral sciences. *Multivariate behavioral research* 50, 5 (2015), 471–484.
- [36] Siddharth Mehrotra, Chadha Degachi, Oleksandra Vereschak, Catholijn M Jonker, and Myrthe L Tielman. 2024. A systematic review on fostering appropriate trust in Human-AI interaction: Trends, opportunities and challenges. *ACM Journal on Responsible Computing* 1, 4 (2024), 1–45.
- [37] David C Mohr, Michelle Nicole Burns, Stephen M Schueller, Gregory Clarke, and Michael Klinkman. 2013. Behavioral intervention technologies: evidence review and recommendations for future research in mental health. *General hospital psychiatry* 35, 4 (2013), 332–338.
- [38] Carlos Montemayor, Jodi Halpern, and Abrol Fairweather. 2022. In principle obstacles for empathic AI: why we can’t replace human empathy in healthcare. *AI & society* 37, 4 (2022), 1353–1359.
- [39] Tom Nadarzynski, Nicky Knights, Deborah Husbands, Cynthia Graham, Carrie D Llewellyn, Tom Buchanan, Ian Montgomery, Alejandra Soruco Rodriguez, Chimeremumma Ogueri, Nidhi Singh, et al. 2025. Chatbot-assisted self-assessment (CASA): Co-designing an AI-powered behaviour change intervention for ethnic minorities. *PLOS Digital Health* 4, 2 (2025), e0000724.
- [40] John A Naslund, Kelly A Aschbrenner, Sunny Jung Kim, Gregory J McHugo, Jürgen Unützer, Stephen J Bartels, and Lisa A Marsch. 2017. Health behavior models for informing digital technology interventions for individuals with mental illness. *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal* 40, 3 (2 2017), 325–335. doi:10.1037/prj0000246
- [41] Cameron D Norman and Harvey A Skinner. 2006. eHealth literacy: essential skills for consumer health in a networked world. *Journal of medical Internet research* 8, 2 (2006), e506.
- [42] Tom G Osborn, Siying Li, Rob Saunders, and Peter Fonagy. 2022. University students’ use of mental health services: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Mental Health Systems* 16, 1 (2022), 57.
- [43] Dariya Ovsyannikova, Victoria Oldemburgo de Mello, and Michael Inzlicht. 2025. Third-party evaluators perceive AI as more compassionate than expert humans. *Communications Psychology* 3, 1 (2025), 4.
- [44] Junsang Park, Anne Q Zhou, Sharon L Chu, and Sungjae Lee. 2025. Integrating generative AI into psychoeducation: undefined strategies across organizational, scholarly, and individual domains. *Theory Into Practice* just-accepted (2025).
- [45] Ilaria Riboldi, Angela Calabrese, Susanna Piacenti, Chiara Alessandra Capogrosso, Susanna Lucini Paioni, Francesco Bartoli, Giuseppe Carrà, Jo Armes, Cath Taylor, and Cristina Crocamo. 2024. Understanding university students’ Perspectives towards digital tools for mental health support: A cross-country study. *Clinical Practice and Epidemiology in Mental Health: CP & EMH* 20 (2024), e17450179271467.
- [46] Lennart Seitz. 2024. Artificial empathy in healthcare chatbots: Does it feel authentic? *Computers in Human Behavior: Artificial Humans* 2, 1 (2024), 100067.
- [47] Emre Sezgin and Ian McKay. 2024. Behavioral health and generative AI: a perspective on future of therapies and patient care. *npj Mental Health Research* 3, 1 (2024), 25.

- [48] Anja Thieme, Maryann Hanratty, Maria Lyons, Jorge Palacios, Rita Faia Marques, Cecily Morrison, and Gavin Doherty. 2023. Designing human-centered AI for mental health: Developing clinically relevant applications for online CBT treatment. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction* 30, 2 (2023), 1–50.
- [49] Robert Tibshirani. 1996. Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* 58, 1 (1996), 267–288.
- [50] Riccardo Volpato, Lisa DeBruine, and Simone Stumpf. 2025. Trusting emotional support from generative artificial intelligence: a conceptual review. *Computers in Human Behavior: Artificial Humans* (2025), 100195.
- [51] Zbyněk Vybíral, Benjamin M Ogles, Tomáš Riháček, Barbora Urbancová, and Veronika Gocieková. 2024. Negative experiences in psychotherapy from clients' perspective: A qualitative meta-analysis. *Psychotherapy Research* 34, 3 (2024), 279–292.
- [52] Sarah Wamala Andersson and Marta Pisano Gonzalez. 2025. Digital health literacy—a key factor in realizing the value of digital transformation in healthcare. *Frontiers in Digital Health* 7 (2025), 1461342.
- [53] Yimeng Wang, Yinzhou Wang, Kelly Crace, and Yixuan Zhang. 2025. Understanding Attitudes and Trust of Generative AI Chatbots for Social Anxiety Support. In *Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–21.
- [54] Xuechang Xian, Angela Chang, Yu-Tao Xiang, Matthew Tingchi Liu, et al. 2024. Debate and dilemmas regarding generative AI in mental health care: scoping review. *Interactive Journal of Medical Research* 13, 1 (2024), e53672.
- [55] Jordyn Young, Laala M Jawara, Diep N Nguyen, Brian Daly, Jina Huh-Yoo, and Afsaneh Razi. 2024. The role of AI in peer support for young people: A study of preferences for human-and AI-generated responses. In *Proceedings of the 2024 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–18.
- [56] Karim Zahed, Ranjana Mehta, Madhav Erraguntla, Khalid Qaraqe, and Farzan Sasangohar. 2023. Understanding patient beliefs in using technology to manage diabetes: Path Analysis model from a National Web-Based sample. *JMIR Diabetes* 8 (3 2023), e41501. doi:10.2196/41501
- [57] Marc Zao-Sanders. 2025. How people are really using gen AI in 2025. <https://hbr.org/2025/04/how-people-are-really-using-gen-ai-in-2025>
- [58] Zhihui Zhang and Jing Wang. 2024. Can AI replace psychotherapists? Exploring the future of mental health care. *Frontiers in psychiatry* 15 (2024), 1444382.
- [59] Yuxiang Chris Zhao, Mengyuan Zhao, and Shijie Song. 2022. Online health information seeking among patients with Chronic Conditions: Integrating the health belief model and social Support Theory. *Journal of Medical Internet Research* 24, 11 (11 2022), e42447. doi:10.2196/42447
- [60] Di Jody Zhou, Rajpreet Chahal, Ian H Gotlib, and Siwei Liu. 2024. Comparison of lasso and stepwise regression in psychological data. *Methodology* 20, 2 (2024), 121–143.

Received 20 February 2007; revised 12 March 2009; accepted 5 June 2009