

Characteristics Associated with the Use of the Mindfulness Meditation App Headspace in a Large Public Health Deployment: A Cross-sectional Survey Study

Judith Borghouts, Elizabeth V Eikey, Cinthia De Leon, Stephen M Schueller, Margaret Schneider, Nicole A Stadnick, Kai Zheng, Dana B Mukamel, Dara H Sorkin

Submitted to: JMIR Formative Research
on: March 04, 2025

Disclaimer: © The authors. All rights reserved. This is a privileged document currently under peer-review/community review. Authors have provided JMIR Publications with an exclusive license to publish this preprint on its website for review purposes only. While the final peer-reviewed paper may be licensed under a CC BY license on publication, at this stage authors and publisher expressly prohibit redistribution of this draft paper other than for review purposes.

Table of Contents

Original Manuscript..... 5

Supplementary Files..... 27

 Figures 28

 Figure 1..... 29

Multimedia Appendixes 30

 Multimedia Appendix 1..... 31

 Multimedia Appendix 2..... 31

 Multimedia Appendix 3..... 31

Characteristics Associated with the Use of the Mindfulness Meditation App Headspace in a Large Public Health Deployment: A Cross-sectional Survey Study

Judith Borghouts¹ PhD; Elizabeth V Eike^{2,3} PhD; Cinthia De Leon¹ MPH; Stephen M Schueller^{4,5} PhD; Margaret Schneider⁶ PhD; Nicole A Stadnick^{7,8,9} MPH, PhD; Kai Zheng⁴ PhD; Dana B Mukamel¹ PhD; Dara H Sorkin¹ PhD

¹ Department of Medicine University of California, Irvine Irvine US

² Herbert Wertheim School of Public Health and Human Longevity Science University of California, San Diego San Diego US

³ The Design Lab University of California, San Diego San Diego US

⁴ Department of Informatics University of California, Irvine Irvine US

⁵ Department of Psychological Science University of California, Irvine Irvine US

⁶ Department of Public Health University of California, Irvine Irvine US

⁷ Department of Psychiatry University of California, San Diego San Diego US

⁸ Dissemination and Implementation Science Center UC San Diego Altman Clinical and Translational Research Institute La Jolla US

⁹ Child and Adolescent Services Research Center San Diego US

Corresponding Author:

Judith Borghouts PhD

Department of Medicine
University of California, Irvine
100 Theory
Irvine
US

Abstract

Background: Mindfulness-based apps can be an effective and accessible resource to mental health support. However, little is known about their use outside of research settings and what user characteristics relate to app use.

Objective: This study aimed to examine the characteristics of people who decided to use, not use, or stop using Headspace within the context of a large-scale public health deployment, which offered the mindfulness meditation app Headspace as a free mental health resource to community members.

Methods: Nearly 100,000 community members received Headspace. All members (N = 92,311) received an email inviting them to complete a voluntary and unpaid survey. Participants (n = 2,725) completed the survey. The 20-minute survey asked about use of Headspace, user experience, mental health problems, mental health stigma, and mental health utilization. Logistic regression models were used to examine relationships between predictors and non-use, past use, or current use of Headspace.

Results: Participants who were still using Headspace at the time of completing the survey (76%) were more likely to experience mental health challenges, distress, and made more use of other digital mental health resources (i.e., online tools and connecting with people online) than people who were not using Headspace. Additionally, current Headspace users rated the app higher on user experience compared to past users. The most common reasons for abandoning Headspace were that people were already using other strategies to support their mental health (35%), no longer needed Headspace (13%), and/or did not think Headspace was useful (8%).

Conclusions: Results indicate that a person's mental health challenges, a perceived need for support, and familiarity with digital resources were associated with continued Headspace use. While the most common reason for not using Headspace was that people were already using other resources, it is important to consider the continuity of mental health support beyond these free programs for those who may not have easy access to other resources. We discuss potential implications of our findings for offering and using apps such as Headspace as a mental health resource, along with factors that influence engagement with this app.

(JMIR Preprints 04/03/2025:73457)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2196/preprints.73457>

Preprint Settings

1) Would you like to publish your submitted manuscript as preprint?

✓ **Please make my preprint PDF available to anyone at any time (recommended).**

Please make my preprint PDF available only to logged-in users; I understand that my title and abstract will remain visible to all users.

Only make the preprint title and abstract visible.

No, I do not wish to publish my submitted manuscript as a preprint.

2) If accepted for publication in a JMIR journal, would you like the PDF to be visible to the public?

✓ **Yes, please make my accepted manuscript PDF available to anyone at any time (Recommended).**

Yes, but please make my accepted manuscript PDF available only to logged-in users; I understand that the title and abstract will remain visible to all users.

Yes, but only make the title and abstract visible (see Important note, above). I understand that if I later pay to participate in [JMIR Publications](#)

No. Please do not make my accepted manuscript PDF available to anyone.

Original Manuscript

Characteristics Associated with the Use of the Mindfulness Meditation App Headspace in a Large Public Health Deployment: A Cross-sectional Survey Study

Abstract

Background: Mindfulness-based apps can be an effective and accessible resource to mental health support. However, little is known about their use outside of research settings and what user characteristics relate to app use.

Objective: This study aimed to examine the characteristics of people who decided to use, not use, or stop using Headspace within the context of a large-scale public deployment, which offered the mindfulness meditation app Headspace as a free mental health resource to community members.

Method: Nearly 100,000 community members received Headspace. All members (N = 92,311) received an email inviting them to complete a voluntary and unpaid survey. Participants (n = 2,725) completed the survey. The 20-minute survey asked about use of Headspace, user experience, mental health problems, mental health stigma, and mental health utilization. Logistic regression models were used to examine relationships between predictors and non-use, past use, or current use of Headspace.

Results: Participants who were still using Headspace at the time of completing the survey (76%) were more likely to experience mental health challenges, distress, and made more use of other digital mental health resources (i.e., online tools and connecting with people online) than people who were not using Headspace. Additionally, current Headspace users rated the app higher on user experience compared to past users. The most common reasons for abandoning Headspace were that people were already using other strategies to support their mental health (35%), no longer needed Headspace (13%), and/or did not think Headspace was useful (8%).

Discussion: Results indicate that a person's mental health challenges, a perceived need for support, and familiarity with digital resources were associated with continued Headspace use. While the most common reason for not using Headspace was that people were already using other resources, it is important to consider the continuity of mental health support beyond these free programs for those who may not have easy access to other resources. We discuss potential implications of our findings for offering and using apps such as Headspace as a mental health resource, along with factors that influence engagement with this app.

Keywords: Headspace, mental health, mindfulness, mHealth, real-world use.

Introduction

Mental health is an increasing societal concern. The Center for Disease and Prevention, for example, has formally recognized mental and psychological health as a major and global public health issue [1]. Around 1 in 5 adults in the United States are estimated to experience a mental illness every year, and a 2022 survey found that 90% of Americans believe that the United States is facing a mental health crisis [2].

Digital mediums can considerably increase access to mental health care. The development of digital mental health interventions (DMHIs) has accelerated in recent years, due to a desire to find more scalable and cost-effective options that can overcome access barriers to care [3]. Examples of digital mental health mediums include virtual therapy, as well as self-guided platforms such as websites and apps that provide psychoeducation, journaling tools, peer support, and mindfulness meditation. Mindfulness meditation is a mental training technique of bringing attention to the present experience,

and mindfulness meditation apps tend to be some of the most popular and commonly downloaded DMHIs [4]. An analysis of 578 DMHIs found that mindfulness was the third most common feature, behind only psychoeducation and goal setting and habit, with 38% of products containing mindfulness features [5]. Mindfulness meditation can have several mental health benefits, such as reducing stress, anxiety [6–8], depression [9,10], and psychological distress [11]. Thus, better understanding aspects about mindfulness meditation DMHIs provides useful information to the field.

DMHIs are beginning to be used as broad scale supports for mental health, especially from a public health perspective where they can be made widely available. To increase awareness of and access to DMHIs, various initiatives by schools, workplaces, and other organizations have offered DMHIs to their community members free of charge [12,13]. DMHI companies themselves have also made their products available to specific populations or the general public in times of need. For example, during the COVID-19 pandemic some products were made freely available to help people cope with mental health concerns [14]. However, little is known about the characteristics of those who make use of these initiatives, as well as information about their engagement and experience with the DMHIs offered. Additionally, few data are available about free-range, naturalistic DMHI use outside of research contexts. Research studies often provide compensation to complete study procedures which may also impact use and engagement with DMHIs. Though these studies can demonstrate the potential and effectiveness of DMHIs [15,16], their effectiveness is ultimately related to their usage. For instance, past research studies focusing specifically on the mindfulness meditation app Headspace with relatively small sample sizes [7,17] showed that Headspace was effective in improving depressive symptoms [7] and psychological distress [18], but only among study participants who used the app frequently.

Engagement in real-world studies has shown considerable variation [19,20]. One study found that when metrics were available, research usage was more than four times higher than real-world usage across the same DMHI programs [21]. Unfortunately, data from broad deployments and real-world contexts are rarely available for others to learn from.

The current study draws from a California-based innovation program which offered the mindfulness meditation app Headspace for free to community members as a mental health resource. The evaluation of this program provides a unique opportunity to understand factors in the context of real-world use rather than a research environment. The aim of the study was to understand the characteristics of people who decide to use, stop using, or not use an app like Headspace within the context of the program, as well as their experience with the app.

Method

Program Description

The dissemination of Headspace was part of the Help@Hand project, a statewide innovation project in California that aimed to understand how DMHIs fit within the public mental health system of care. The project explored how technology could be used to reach people who are likely to go either unserved or underserved by traditional mental health care. The project was funded and directed by multiple participating counties and cities (referred to as sites throughout the rest of the paper) in California and overseen by the California Mental Health Service Authority (CalMHSA).

To be eligible to enroll in the Headspace program, participants had to enter a zip code of the participating site where they lived, worked, or attended school at the time of enrollment. Participants did not have to be new users to Headspace, but they could not have an existing paid subscription at the time of enrollment. Participants enrolled via a specific webpage launched by each site. After

enrolling, participants had free access to Headspace up until the end of the program (see Table 1 for the different end dates of the programs across sites). Participants could enroll at any time during the program.

The Headspace program launch and end dates differed by site (see Table 1), but the first program launched in April 2020 by Los Angeles County and last programs were launched in October 2021 by the City of Berkeley and Santa Barbara County.

Table 1. Implementation launch and end dates of the Headspace Program in the four sites.

Site	Launch date	End date	Length of program
Los Angeles County	April 2020	February 2023	2 years and 11 months
San Mateo County	September 2020	September 2021	1 year and 1 month
City of Berkeley	October 2021	September 2023	2 years
Santa Barbara County	October 2021	September 2023	2 years

Headspace Description

Headspace is a commercially-available meditation app that aims to improve mental wellness. The app offers meditation and mindfulness exercises in both audio and video format. Its content is organized into four categories: *Meditate*, *Sleep*, *Move*, and *Focus*.

- *Meditate* offers a library of single meditations as well as courses consisting of a series of meditations that vary in length and topic. For example, it offers meditation exercises and

courses focused on reducing anxiety and stress, as well as on improving mood and productivity. It also offers a beginner's course for users who are new to meditation.

- *Sleep* has guided sessions, meditations and soundscapes intended for nighttime and to help with relaxation and falling asleep.
- *Move* has low impact workout videos, such as yoga exercises, ranging from 10 to 30 minutes. The workouts are focused on incorporating mindfulness during movement.
- *Focus* offers music and meditation playlists that are intended to help focus during work.

The content is accessible through a mobile application, available on Android and Apple iOS, or the Headspace website, and content is available in English, Spanish, French, German, and Portuguese.

Headspace was selected by the Help@Hand project after a vetting and approval process intended to assess the extent to which it met Help@Hand's needs (e.g., by considering how Headspace addressed privacy and security of their product, and whether content was offered in multiple languages). It was able to meet the necessary specifications for use in this project and was available in languages other than English. Its popularity and reputation were also attractive. Headspace has over 70M subscribers worldwide [22], and is one of the most downloaded mindfulness apps in the world [23]. As Headspace, together with the meditation app Calm, represent the majority (ca. 90%) of users of DMHIs [4], capturing characteristics of Headspace use can be valuable in contributing to a better understanding of DMHI use.

Survey Development

A community-based participatory approach was used to engage community members in the survey development. The research team initiated a workgroup with key individuals from the four participating sites; the group met five times between January and July 2021. Workgroup members met to discuss and make decisions related to the survey method, instruments, and recruitment strategies. These key individuals included mental health advocates and project and program managers of behavioral health programs and site departments.

Workgroup members provided multiple rounds of feedback on the draft surveys created by the research team. For example, concerns were raised about the tone of particular survey items and questions that may feel intrusive to participants. In response to this feedback, survey items were added to ensure balance of positively worded items while maintaining items from validated scales that captured the necessary information. Some survey items aimed at measuring mental health stigma were removed based on their feedback (see the Measures section for a description of the included stigma measures).

In addition, workgroup members vocalized the importance of highlighting wellness and well-being, while also being representative of the communities to whom the survey would be sent. Workgroup members recommended commissioning artwork from community members with lived mental health needs experiences, who were familiar with the diverse communities and could approach the task from a recovery perspective. Four art pieces were created by community members that incorporated themes of peer support, resilience, and multiformity. These art pieces were included in the emails sent out to participants to complete the survey (Figure 1 shows one of the art pieces).



Figure 1. One of the art pieces created by community members to include in recruitment emails.

The survey included questions related to people's Headspace use and experience, their use of mental health resources, and their health and well-being. Based on participants' answers regarding their Headspace use, different follow-up questions were asked (see Multimedia Appendix 1 for the survey instrument and the Measures section for a description of the survey measures).

Ethical Considerations

The study was approved by the University of California, Irvine, Institutional Review Board (IRB; review number No. 20195406). The survey included a study information sheet that was reviewed and approved by the IRB. Respondents were able to download a copy of the sheet. All research data collected were stored securely and confidentially on a password-protected secure server. Completing or not completing the survey did not affect people's access to Headspace.

Study Design and Procedure

This paper reports on survey data collected between July 1, 2021 and October 21, 2022.

After obtaining IRB and key individual approvals, the survey was finalized and deployed on July 1, 2021. Everyone in the participating sites who had signed up for Headspace up until that point were sent a survey. After that, the survey was sent once per week to all new people who had signed up in the past week. Participants were sent up to five email reminders (sent once every three days) to complete the survey. Once participants completed a survey, their email address was removed from the reminder email list so they did not receive any further reminders.

The research team was granted access to a dashboard which contained email addresses of participants who had signed up for the Headspace program via their site. All enrolled participants were sent an email to complete a web-based survey on their Headspace use and experience, their use of other mental health resources, and their health and well-being. The survey was distributed via REDCap (Research Electronic Data Capture) [24,25], a secure, web-based software platform designed to support data capture for research studies. Participants had to self-report to be 18 years or older to be eligible to complete the survey but did not need to have used Headspace as we also wanted to be able consider 'non-use' within the program, that is people who signed up for the program but did not use Headspace. The survey could be completed on a computer, mobile phone or tablet, was available in English and Spanish, took approximately 20 minutes to complete, and completing the survey was voluntary and unpaid.

The survey was sent to 92,311 people and received by 92,261 people (50 emails bounced back). A total of 3,399 participants started the survey, resulting in a response rate of 3.7% (3,399/92,261). A total of 2,725 participants completed the survey (completion rate of 3.0%). Survey responses were anonymous and not linked to respondents' email addresses. Only 1% (28/2,725) of survey respondents completed the survey in Spanish; the other respondents completed the survey in English.

Measures

A description of each survey measure is given below. We primarily focus on dichotomous measures as these have been validated using standard cut-off points. Further details about the measures are included in Multimedia Appendix 2.

Length of Headspace Use

Respondents were asked when they signed up for the Headspace program. Respondents could choose from 'Less than a week ago', '2 weeks to 1 month ago', '2 to 6 months ago', '6 months to a year ago', and 'Longer than a year ago'.

Adoption of Headspace

Respondents were asked one multiple-choice question on whether they were using Headspace. Respondents could choose from the following answers: 'Yes', 'No, but I did use it in the past', or 'No, and I never used it'. Based on respondents' answers, we made a distinction between three types of users, which throughout the paper we call current users (who answered yes), past users (who used it in the past), and non-users (who never used it).

Frequency of Headspace Use

Respondents were asked one question on how frequently they used Headspace. While there is no gold standard on how to group frequency of use [26], past research has identified 'active' users as individuals who use a mental health app daily [27], weekly or more [28], or monthly or more [29]. Based on the distribution of our sample, we grouped and dichotomized frequency of use into those who use it several times a week or more, and those who use it less than that. Frequency of use was thus examined as a dichotomous measure as follows: 1 for 'Daily'/'Several times a week', 0 for 'Several times a month/About once a month/I only used it once'.

Mental Health Challenges

Respondents were asked one multiple-choice question on whether they had experienced any mental health challenges ("Have you or do you experience mental health challenges?"). Respondents could indicate that they had 'not experienced any challenges', 'had been diagnosed with a mental health condition', 'had not been diagnosed but were experiencing challenges', or they could self-describe their experience. On the survey, it was explained that many different terms could be used to refer to these experiences, such as mental health challenge, emotional distress, and psychological disorder. The variable was operationalized as a dichotomous measure (1 for experiencing or having been diagnosed with a mental health challenge, 0 for not experiencing any challenges) in the analyses.

Distress

Psychological distress was measured using the Kessler Psychological Distress (K10) scale [30]. Respondents were asked to rate ten statements related to how they had been feeling during the past 30 days (e.g. 'During the past 30 days, how often did you feel tired out for no good reason?'). The statements were rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from None of the time (1) to All of the time (5), with a total sum score in the range of 10–50. A higher score indicates a higher level of psychological distress.

The internal consistency of this measure in the current study was excellent (Cronbach's alpha = .91). The score was operationalized as a dichotomous measure in the analyses. In accordance with previous work [31–33], a cut-off score of >19 was used to categorize respondents as having distress.

Loneliness

Loneliness was measured using the Three-Item Loneliness Scale [34], a shortened version of the University of California, Los Angeles Loneliness scale [35]. Participants were asked to rate three statements related to loneliness on a 3-point Likert scale ranging from Hardly ever (1) to Often (3) (e.g. 'How often do you feel left out?'), with a total sum score in the range of 3–9.

The internal consistency of this measure in the current study was adequate (Cronbach's alpha = .78). The score was operationalized as a dichotomous measure in the analyses, and consistent with previous work [36], a cut-off score of ≥ 6 was used to categorize respondents experiencing loneliness.

Mental Health Stigma

Participants were asked to rate four statements related to mental health stigma (e.g. 'Being around people who don't have mental health challenges makes me feel out of place or inadequate'), using a Likert scale ranging from Strongly disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5). The questions related to internalized stigma (one item), perceived stigma (one item), resilience (one item), and stigma resistance (one item). Items were taken from Internalized Stigma of Mental Illness Inventory (ISMI) [37] for internalized stigma and stigma resistance, the Perceived Stigma subscale of the Depression Stigma Scale [38] for perceived stigma, and the RAS-R [39] for resilience. One item was used from each of these four subscales instead of all subscale items, based on input from the survey workgroup to keep the survey brief to mitigate response burden.

Items were chosen based on feedback to balance positive and negatively worded items, as well as key individual feedback from a 2019 in-person workgroup focused on stigma [40] and a subsequent factor analysis of responses from 6,304 participants.

As the items measured different types of stigma and there was low internal consistency between stigma items (Cronbach's alpha = .58), the stigma items were analyzed separately and were not combined into a single score. Item scores were operationalized as dichotomous measures (1 for 'Agree' and 'Strongly agree', 0 for 'Neither agree nor disagree', 'Disagree', or 'Strongly Disagree').

Mental Healthcare Utilization

Four dichotomous (yes or no) response items from the California Health Interview Survey [41] were used to identify whether respondents had used online tools other than Headspace for problems related to mental health, whether they had connected online with people with similar mental health problems, whether they had used online tools to connect to a mental health professional, and whether they had seen a mental health professional in the past 12 months.

User Experience

Respondents who indicated they had used Headspace were asked questions related to their experience using Headspace. Participants were asked to rate 12 statements (e.g. 'I find Headspace useful in my daily life') on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly disagree (1) to Strongly agree (5). Survey items were based on the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) questionnaire [42], a questionnaire used to evaluate technology acceptance and adoption. The items showed high internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha = .91) and were combined as a single mean score that could range from 1-5. A higher score indicates a more positive experience with and

opinion of Headspace. The score was operationalized as a dichotomous measure in the analyses, using a cutoff of >3 to constitute a positive experience [43].

Reasons for Abandonment and Non-Use & Intention to Use Headspace

Respondents who indicated they were not currently using Headspace were asked to indicate their reasons for not using Headspace. Respondents were instructed to 'select all that apply' from a list of 14 options, and/or give an answer in their own words. The list of reasons was based on common barriers to engagement from the literature regarding mental health technology [44], as well as common answers given by community members in prior studies of the Help@Hand project. The full list of options is included in Multimedia Appendix 1.

Respondents were also asked a multiple-choice question on whether they intended to use Headspace in the future. Respondents could choose from 'Yes', 'No' and 'I'm not sure'.

Digital Literacy

Respondents were asked to rate one statement related to digital literacy ('I am confident using technology to look up information') taken from the Mental Health Literacy Scale [45] on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly disagree (1) to Strongly agree (5).

Demographic measures

Respondents' age was collected as a categorical variable to adhere to project requirements, with answer options '18-25', '26-59' and '60+'. Respondents' age was operationalized as mutually exclusive dummy variables (0-1) for 18-25, 26-59, and 60+.

Respondents' gender identity was operationalized as mutually exclusive dummy variables (0-1) for man/male, woman/female, and another identity (the survey included options to select transgender man, transgender woman, genderqueer/gender non-conforming/non-binary, questioning or unsure of gender, or they could self-describe their identity).

Respondents' race/ethnic identity was operationalized as mutually exclusive dummy variables (0-1) for Non-Hispanic White, Hispanic/Latino/a/x, Asian, Black or African American, and another identity (the survey included options to select two or more races, American Indian/Native American/Native Alaskan, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, or they could self-describe their identity).

We first report on demographics and mental health symptoms of people who signed up. In the Results section, we explore the relationship between continued Headspace use and demographics, prevalence of mental health problems, mental healthcare utilization, frequency of Headspace use, user experience with Headspace and mental health stigma. Lastly, we report on respondents' reasons for abandonment and non-use of the app.

Participants

The majority (2,238/2,725, 82.1%) of survey respondents were between 26-59 years old. 288 (10.6%) respondents were between 18-25, and 199 (7.3%) were 60 years of older. 1,983 (72.8%) identified as woman/female. 1,246 (45.4%) identified as Non-Hispanic White, 496 (18.2%) identified as Hispanic/Latinx, 421 (15.3%) identified as Asian, and 119 (4.3%) identified as Black or African American. 2,003 (2,003/2,725, 73.5%) respondents indicated they experienced mental health challenges. 1462 (1462/2,725, 53.7%) respondents were likely to experience distress, and approximately half (1,469/2,725, 53.9%) of respondents scored high on loneliness. The majority (94.5%, 2575/2,725) of survey respondents used Headspace in English. 1.5% (40/2,725) used it in

Spanish, 0.9% (24/2,725) used it in German, and 0.1% (4/2,725) used the app in French. Further demographic characteristics are shown in Table 2.

Table 3 shows the demographics for the sites, based on county census data [46]. When comparing demographics of survey respondents to the county data, our survey sample had a higher proportion of women/females, a lower proportion of Hispanic/Latinx respondents, and individuals with higher levels of education.

Table 2. Survey respondents' characteristics (N = 2,725).

Demographics	n (%)
Age	
18-25	288 (10.6%)
26-59	2,238 (82.1%)
60+	199 (7.3%)
Gender^a	
Man / Male	599 (22.0%)
Woman / Female	1983 (72.8%)
Other gender identity	143 (5.2%)
Race/ethnicity^a	
Non-Hispanic White	1246 (45.4%)
Hispanic/Latino/a/x	496 (18.2%)
Asian	421 (15.3%)
Black or African American	119 (4.3%)
Other race/ethnic identity	443 (16.3%)
Highest Education Level	
Bachelor's degree	1211 (44.4%)
Graduate or professional degree	1004 (36.8%)
Some college with no degree	221 (8.1%)
Associates degree	126 (4.6%)
High school or less than high school	79 (2.9%)
Language they used Headspace in	

English	2575 (94.5%)
Spanish	40 (1.5%)
German or French ^b	28 (1%)

^aSee Multimedia Appendix 1 for all gender and race/ethnicity options.

^bProportions of German and French users are merged given the small number of respondents in each category.

Table 3. Comparison of survey sample with county population sociodemographic characteristics.

Demographics	Survey sample	Aggregated county census data of Los Angeles, San Mateo, and Santa Barbara Counties, and City of Berkeley
Gender		
Woman / Female	72.8%	50.3%
Race/ethnicity		
Non-Hispanic White	45.4%	39.3%
Hispanic/Latino/a/x	18.2%	33.1%
Asian	15.3%	18.8%
Black or African American	4.3%	5.4%
Highest Education Level		
Bachelor's degree or higher	81.2%	48.8%

Data Analysis

Based on respondents' answers on whether they were using Headspace, we made a distinction between three user groups:

- *Current users*: respondents who indicated they were using Headspace at the time of the survey
- *Past users*: respondents who indicated they were not using Headspace anymore at the time of the survey, but had used it in the past
- *Non-users*: respondents who indicated they never used Headspace

We analyzed the survey data using descriptive statistics (such as frequency counts) and inferential statistics. For each of the measures, we report proportions, means and standard deviation (SD) by user group. Chi-square tests were used to analyze differences between user groups in terms of age, gender, and race/ethnicity.

Logistic regressions were conducted for each outcome to control for site, length of Headspace use and covariates (age was added a covariate as there were significant differences in age between user groups), and to make sure that length of Headspace use and any variations between sites did not affect the results. We report odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs). The analyses were performed using statistical software R (version 4.2.2) [47].

Total scores on loneliness, distress and user experience with Headspace were only computed for respondents that completed 50% or more of the items on these respective scales. For respondents that

completed 50% or more of the scale items, any missing data was imputed using mean imputation. 2% of participants had missing data imputed; less than 1% had a missing total score.

Results

Throughout this section, we report on the number of people who provided a particular survey answer and the total number of people who responded to the survey question.

Table 4 shows the number of respondents who were still using Headspace, were no longer using Headspace, and those who indicated they never used Headspace at the time of the survey. Approximately half of respondents (1,445/2,725, 53.0%) had signed up for the Headspace program over a year ago. 879 (879/2,725, 32.3%) respondents had signed up between two months to a year ago, and (398/2,725, 14.6%) had signed up less than two months ago.

Table 4. The number of people who were still using Headspace (Current Users), were no longer using Headspace (Past Users), and had never used Headspace (Non-Users) at the time of completing the survey (N = 2,725).

User Group	n (%)
Current Users	2,076 (76.2%)
Past Users	570 (20.9%)
Non-Users	79 (2.9%)

Differences in Adoption by Demographics

There was a significant association between age and adoption of using Headspace ($\chi^2_4=21.12$; $P<0.001$): older people (i.e., aged 60 years or older) were more likely to have never used Headspace (19%, 15/79) than be a current user (6.4%, 133/2,076) or past user (8.9%, 51/570) (Table 5).

Though there was no association between adoption and the proportion of women/females / men/males ($\chi^2_2=1.96$; $P=.37$), there was a significant association between adoption and the proportion of people who identified with another gender identity or did not answer the question: non-users were more likely to identify with another gender identity or not disclose their gender identity (12.7%, 10/79) than current users (4.4%, 93/2,076) and past users (7.0%, 40/570) ($\chi^2_4=16.63$; $P=.002$). There were no significant race/ethnicity differences in adoption ($\chi^2_8=15.12$; $P=.06$).

Table 5. Demographics by adoption (%).

	Age***	Gender**	Race/Ethnicity

	18-25	26-59	60+	Male	Female	Other identity	Non-Hispanic White	Latinx	Asian	Black	Other race/identity
Current Users	10.9	82.7	6.4	22.6	72.9	4.4	46.5	18.5	14.3	4.4	16.3
Past users	9.6	81.4	8.9	20.5	72.5	7.0	42.6	17.5	19.8	4.7	15.3
Non-Users	8.9	72.2	19	15.2	72.2	12.7	48.1	17.7	15.2	0	19.0

Note: Table values are percentages of the sample. E.g., the first cell indicates that 10.9% of current users were aged between 18-25.

*** $p < .001$

** $p < .01$

Frequency of Headspace Use

When thinking about what best describes their (past) use of Headspace, current users indicated they used Headspace more frequently than past users did before they stopped using it (OR = 0.32, 95% CI = .26, .39, $P < .001$): 63.1% (1,310/2,076) of current users indicated they used Headspace daily or several times a week, compared to 33.4% (190/570) of past users.

Mental Health

73.5% (2,003/2,725) of respondents indicated they currently experienced mental health challenges. Current Headspace users were more likely to report having mental health challenges (75.1%, 1,560/2,076) than non-users (50.6%, 40/79), (OR = 0.41, 95% CI = .25, .66, $P < .001$). Respondents who reported to experience distress were more likely to be current users (57.0%, 1,184/2,076) than non-users (32.9%, 26/79) (OR = 0.44, 95% CI = .27, .72, $P = .001$).

48.9% (1,333/2,725) of respondents scored high on loneliness, with no significant differences in loneliness between user groups (see Multimedia Appendix 3 Table A1 for odds ratios).

Mental Health Stigma

Respondents who agreed that most people believe that having mental health challenges is a sign of personal weakness (a perceived stigma measure) were more likely to be current users (43.5%, 904/2,076) than non-users (30.4%, 24/79), (OR = 0.59, 95% CI = 0.35, 0.97, $P = .04$). There were no

differences on the other stigma items between users (see Multimedia Appendix 3 Table A2 for odds ratios).

Mental Healthcare Utilization

Respondents who had made use of online mental health tools were more likely to be current users (43.4%, 900/2,076) than non-users (29.1%, 23/79) (OR = 0.59, 95% CI = .35, .95, $P = .04$). Respondents who had connected with online with people that had mental health concerns were also more likely to be current users (29.3%, 609/2,076) than non-users (17.7%, 14/79) (OR = 0.52, 95% CI = .26, .94, $P = .04$).

There were no significant differences in use of professional mental health services or in using online tools to be referred to professional mental health services between user groups (see Multimedia Appendix 3 Table A1 for odds ratios).

Headspace User Experience

Overall, experience with Headspace was positive ($M = 4.10$, $SD = 0.68$), with current users more likely to report a positive Headspace user experience ($M = 4.24$, $SD = 0.58$) than past users ($M = 3.60$, $SD = 0.77$), (OR = 0.11, 95% CI = .08, .14, $P < .001$).

Only a third of respondents (901/2,743, 32.8%) indicated they could get help from others with using Headspace if they had any difficulties, and this was true for current users (703/2,076, 33.9%), past users (190/570, 33.3%), and non-users (8/97, 8.2%).

Reasons for Not Using Headspace and Intention to Use Headspace

The most common reasons for not using Headspace *anymore* were that past users were already using other strategies and resources to support their mental health (198/570, 34.7%), they just wanted to try Headspace out (167/570, 29.3%), they no longer needed Headspace (73/570, 12.8%), and/or they felt Headspace was not useful (46/570, 8.1%).

The most common reasons for not using Headspace *at all* were that non-users were already using other strategies and resources to support their mental health (24.1%, 19/79), they thought Headspace would not be useful (12.7%, 10/79), they could not find the time to use it (6.3%, 5/79), and/or they only wanted to use traditional mental health services (6.3%, 5/79).

Past users who were not currently using Headspace were more likely to indicate they intended to use Headspace in the future at 51.6% (294/570) compared to only 19.6% (19/97) of non-users.

Digital Literacy

The majority of respondents (96.1%, 2,620/2,725) felt confident using technology to look up information, and there were no differences in digital literacy between user groups (see Multimedia Appendix 3 Table A2 for odds ratios).

Discussion

The aim of this paper was to describe characteristics of people who decided to use, stop using, or not use Headspace within the context of a widescale deployment of Headspace for free to community members.

Demographics and Headspace Use

Similar to other studies assessing meditation app users [48,49], the majority of survey respondents were women/female and non-Hispanic White. Respondents' gender and racial/ethnic background was not related to adoption or continued use of Headspace in our study. This is in contrast with previous studies that found that females were more likely than other genders to engage with DMHIs [50] and use meditation [51].

Age, however, was found to be related to use. Older respondents (i.e., those over 60 years) were more likely to have not used Headspace. This is consistent with past research on DMHIs. Older adults can experience challenges with technology [52] and may be less comfortable using digital tools, which can impact DMHI use [53,54]. Such users might need additional support both to start using a DMHI and sustain long-term use. This relates to the growing trend of using digital navigators to support these processes [55]. One evaluation of the impact of digital care navigation in routine care found a large increase in registration rates, especially when a digital navigator reached out on the day of referral [56]. In public health models, navigation might need to focus specifically on the types of users who need the most help, such as older adults.

Mental Health Symptoms and Headspace Use

More than half of respondents reported experiencing mental health challenges, distress, and loneliness, and respondents who experienced mental health challenges and distress were more likely to be current users than non-users. Presence of mental health symptoms has been reported as a motivator to use DMHIs [50,57,58], and those with greater mental health concerns may be more likely to continue to use Headspace. Furthermore, a recent meta-review showed that app-delivered mindfulness interventions can significantly improve perceived stress, anxiety, and depression [59]. People may be more motivated to continue using an intervention if it has potential benefits for mental health challenges they are experiencing [44].

Headspace Experience and Use of Other Resources to Support Mental Health

Respondents overall rated Headspace highly on user experience, with current users indicating a more positive experience than past users. Prior studies on Headspace showed that a positive attitude towards use of the app enabled Headspace use [60].

Despite a positive experience with Headspace, 21% of respondents indicated they had already stopped using Headspace by the time they were surveyed. This is consistent with past work that has shown that nearly 1 in 4 people stop using DMHIs after only one use [61]. Given that such use is likely not an adequate dose of the intervention, supporting sustained use may be important to drive interventions impacts. In our study, the most common reasons for not using or abandoning Headspace were that respondents were already using other strategies to support their mental health and/or no longer needed Headspace. Other work has highlighted that a positive impact on one's mental health can drive sustained use [29], however at some point when people have received sufficient benefits they are likely to stop using a DMHI. This type of "happy abandonment", where people no longer need the intervention was more common in our sample than those who did not find Headspace useful (12.8% vs. 8.1%). Most studies do not receive information for those who stop using a DMHI and although "happy abandonment" has been posited elsewhere [29], our study is one of the first of its kind to be able to quantify it in a sample of users.

People's use of other strategies and resources further that highlights that although apps are often

evaluated in isolation, people use a combination of various tools to support their health and well-being [62]. Each tool can have its own function within an individual's life, and rather than understanding each tool in isolation, it may be worthwhile to understand this ecosystem of tools. Future studies can explore how Headspace fits into existing resources people are using. Current users were more likely to have made use of other online tools besides Headspace for their mental health, with almost half of current users having used another online tool. Past research has shown that increasing familiarity with DMHIs can impact user perceptions of DMHIs [63], and a past positive experience with digital health tools can increase likelihood to adopt other DMHIs in the future [64–66]. Our findings build on this work indicating that past experience and familiarity with digital tools may not only increase initial adoption but also facilitate continued use of apps like Headspace.

Need for Support

Only a third of respondents reported they had access to help if they had difficulties using the app, with no differences between current and past users. Though overall experience with Headspace was positive in our study, technical issues are one of the most common barriers to using DMHIs [44]. People may be enthusiastic about a technology, but be dissuaded from using it if they are experiencing technical barriers. This is another opportunity for digital navigators as discussed earlier. The Efficiency Model of Human Support [67] posits five potential failure points to using DMHIs including usability, engagement, fit, knowledge, and implementation. Overcoming technical barriers and usability issues has been found in other studies to be a main activity supporters engage in [67]. Studies should further explore what types of help people are interested in and design support programs to address these issues.

Implications and Future Directions

Mindfulness meditation apps can be a useful mental health resource to provide to communities. Our findings identified user characteristics associated with continued app use in the context of an innovation program. The results of this study can inform outreach strategies, especially within programs that aim to use DMHIs as a public mental health intervention. We outline several implications that may be important to consider.

Understand the relationship between use and mental health symptoms. Current users were more likely to experience mental health challenges and distress, which is a potential indication that people who need support are more likely to use it when options are made available. Future studies should seek to further elucidate the relationship between Headspace use and mental health symptoms. For example, it may be worthwhile to explore if continued use and engagement is associated with any improvement in mental health symptoms over time, and whether the severity of distress impacts perceived usefulness and ability to use meditation apps.

Engagement metrics alone are only part of the story. Despite continued concerns regarding poor engagement rates in real-world contexts of DMHI, future work should look beyond user engagement and understand reasons for not using an intervention. As our study found, the number of people who stopped using Headspace because they no longer needed it outnumbered those who stopped using it because they did not find it useful. We should not assume that non-use equals bad use. It is also possible that people might return to these tools overtime if they found them useful. Indeed, we found that past users of Headspace were more likely to report an expectation of using Headspace in the future than those who never started using it (non-users). Future studies could examine these processes of re-engagement, especially if data were available over longer periods of time.

Consider ecologies of care. Respondents used other mental health resources beyond Headspace and the most common reason for not using Headspace was that they already had other strategies in place

to support their mental health. Tools are often not used in isolation, but exist within an ecosystem of tools used to manage one's mental health and well-being [62]. Furthermore, DMHIs may fit into a continuum of care that could include formal (i.e., treatment) and non-formal (i.e., social support, religious communities, etc.). Future work could further investigate how Headspace fits into people's existing toolbox of digital and non-digital mental health resources.

Limitations

Our study had considerable strengths including the large sample and real-world deployment. It is worth considering these strengths in light of the study's limitations as well. A common issue with survey studies evaluating app use is reporting and response bias [48]. Headspace use was self-reported, and the majority of our survey respondents indicated they were current users, who may have had more positive opinions on Headspace. Indeed, despite our large sample, we only received responses from 3% of the 92,311 users identified in the deployment. Our study sample did not match the overall population demographics of the participating sites instead having more individuals with higher levels of education, a higher proportion of women/females, and a lower proportion of Hispanic/Latinx individuals. We cannot conclude, however, if this was reflective of those who started using Headspace or merely those who completed our survey. Community members who did not sign up at all may have experienced additional barriers, such as comfort and/or experience with apps and access to required resources to use apps.

Furthermore, our survey was launched after the program had started. Launch dates differed by site, and respondents had signed up for the program at different time points at the time of the survey launch. While adding length of use as a control variable did not affect any of the reported relationships between continued use and dependent variables, individuals who had signed up and stopped using Headspace a while ago, never used Headspace, and/or had a bad experience may have been less likely to participate.

Lastly, the demographic survey items were designed according to project requirements which limited certain types of analyses. Age, for example, was asked as a categorical rather than continuous variable. This limits our ability to make conclusions on any correlations between age and Headspace use. Some of the other measures may not conform to typical research measures, however, our community-based participatory approach to survey development incorporated and centered the views of partners from the sites as well as those with lived-experience. Collecting data in real-world deployments often requires balancing the views and priorities of multiple invested parties.

Conclusion

To our knowledge, this is the first paper reporting the characteristics of app use with a large sample of potential and naturalistic users with the mindfulness app Headspace. Results showed that people who were still using Headspace were more likely to experience mental health challenges and distress and had made more use of other digital mental health resources (i.e., online tools and connecting with people online) than people who were not using Headspace. Additionally, current Headspace users used the app more frequently than people who abandoned the app and rated the app higher on usefulness. The most common reasons for not using Headspace were that people were already using other strategies to support their mental health, could not find the time to use Headspace, and/or did not think Headspace would be useful. These results can be used to inform future outreach strategies and implementations of future digital mental health programs.

Acknowledgments

This work was funded by the Help@Hand Project (agreement 417-ITS-UCI-2019), a project overseen by the California Mental Health Service Authority (CalMHSA). CalMHSA reviewed the manuscript to ensure its confidentiality. The information or content and conclusions presented here are those of the authors and should not be construed as the official position or policy of nor should any endorsements be inferred by the participating Help@Hand Counties or CalMHSA.

We acknowledge the participating sites for their invaluable contributions to survey development and community members Amanda Kirk, Vanessa Hamill-Meeriya, and Mimi Mier-Rosales for creating artwork to include in recruitment emails.

Multimedia Appendix 1

The survey instrument.

Multimedia Appendix 2

The survey measures as defined in the analyses.

Multimedia Appendix 3

Logistic regression tables showing odds ratios and 95% CIs for all measures.

Conflicts of Interest

One of the authors has received consulting payments from Boehringer Ingelheim and Otsuka Pharmaceuticals and is a member of the Headspace Scientific Advisory Board, for which they receive compensation. The authors have no further interests to declare.

References

1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Mental Health is a Global Public Health Issue. 2020. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/pcd/collections/Mental_Health_Is_a_Global_Public_Health_Issue.htm
2. Lopes L, Kirzinger A, Sparks G, Stokes M, Brodie M. KFF/CNN Mental Health In America Survey. 2022. Available from: <https://www.kff.org/report-section/kff-cnn-mental-health-in-america-survey-findings/>
3. Torous J, Keris M, Myrick J, Rauseo-Ricupero N, Firth J. Digital Mental Health and COVID-19: Using Technology Today to Accelerate the Curve on Access and Quality Tomorrow. *JMIR Ment Heal* 2020;7(3):18848. doi: 10.2196/18848
4. Wasil AR, Gillespie S, Shingleton R, Wilks CR, Weisz JR. Examining the Reach of Smartphone Apps for Depression and Anxiety. *Am J Psychiatry American Psychiatric Association*; 2020 May 1;177(5):365–468. PMID:32354266
5. Camacho E, Cohen A, Torous J. Assessment of Mental Health Services Available Through Smartphone Apps. *JAMA Netw Open* 2022;5(12):E2248784. PMID:36576737
6. Creswell JD. Mindfulness Interventions. *Annu Rev Psychol* 2017;68:491–516. doi: 10.1146/annurev-psych-042716-051139
7. Flett JAM, Hayne H, Riordan BC, Thompson LM, Conner TS. Mobile Mindfulness Meditation: a Randomised Controlled Trial of the Effect of Two Popular Apps on Mental Health. *Mindfulness (N Y)* 2019 May;10(5):863–876. doi: 10.1007/s12671-018-1050-9
8. Kabat-Zinn J, Massion AO, Kristeller J, Peterson LG, Fletcher KE, Pbert L, Lenderking WR, Santorelli SF. Effectiveness of a meditation-based stress reduction program in the treatment of

- anxiety disorders. <https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.149.7.936> American Psychiatric Publishing; 2006 Apr 1;149(7):936–943. PMID:1609875
9. Shapiro SL, Schwartz GE, Bonner G. Effects of Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction on Medical and Premedical Students. *J Behav Med* 1998;21(6).
 10. Speca M, Carlson LE, Goodey E, Angen M. A randomized, wait-list controlled clinical trial: The effect of a mindfulness meditation-based stress reduction program on mood and symptoms of stress in cancer outpatients. *Psychosom Med* 2000;62(5):613–622. PMID:11020090
 11. Baer RA, Smith GT, Hopkins J, Krietemeyer J, Toney L. Using Self-Report Assessment Methods to Explore Facets of Mindfulness. *Assessment* 2006;13(1):27–45.
 12. Calm. Calm Schools Initiative. 2022. Available from: <https://www.calm.com/schools>
 13. Verge T. Headspace is now free for health care professionals because of the pandemic. The Verge. 2020. Available from: <https://www.theverge.com/2020/3/16/21181773/headspace-free-health-care-provider-public-health>
 14. Psyberguide OM. Coping with COVID-19: Free Mental Health Apps.
 15. Himle JA, Weaver A, Zhang A, Xiang X. Digital Mental Health Interventions for Depression. *Cogn Behav Pract* 2022;29:50–59. Available from: www.elsevier.com/locate/cabp [accessed Sep 26, 2023]
 16. Garrido S, Millington C, Cheers D, Boydell K, Schubert E, Meade T, Vinh Nguyen Q, Gega L, Riaz Choudhry F, Knapp P. What Works and What Doesn't Work? A Systematic Review of Digital Mental Health Interventions for Depression and Anxiety in. *Front Psychiatry* 2019;10(759). doi: 10.3389/fpsy.2019.00759
 17. Plaza I, Marcos M, Demarzo P, Herrera-Mercadal P, García-Campayo J. Mindfulness-Based Mobile Applications: Literature Review and Analysis of Current Features. *JMIR mHealth uHealth* 2013;1(2):e24. doi: 10.2196/mhealth.2733
 18. Flett JAM, Conner TS, Riordan BC, Patterson T, Hayne H. App-based mindfulness meditation for psychological distress and adjustment to college in incoming university students: a pragmatic, randomised, waitlist-controlled trial. *Psychol Heal* 2020;35(9):1049–1074. doi: 10.1080/08870446.2019.1711089
 19. Baumel A, Muench F, Edan S, Kane JM. Objective User Engagement With Mental Health Apps: Systematic Search and Panel-Based Usage Analysis. *J Med Internet Res* 2019;21(9)e14567 <https://www.jmir.org/2019/9/e14567> *Journal of Medical Internet Research*; 2019 Sep 25;21(9):e14567. PMID:31573916
 20. Lattie EG, Schueller SM, Sargent E, Stiles-Shields C, Tomasino KN, Corden ME, Begale M, Karr CJ, Mohr DC. Uptake and usage of IntelliCare: A publicly available suite of mental health and well-being apps. *Internet Interv* 2016;4:152–158. doi: 10.1016/j.invent.2016.06.003
 21. Baumel A, Edan S, Kane JM. Is there a trial bias impacting user engagement with unguided e-mental health interventions? A systematic comparison of published reports and real-world usage of the same programs. *Transl Behav Med Transl Behav Med*; 2019 Oct 11;9(6):1020–1033. PMID:31689344
 22. Headspace. About Headspace. 2022. Available from: <https://www.headspace.com/about-us>
 23. Perez S. Meditation and mindfulness apps continue their surge amid pandemic. *TechCrunch*. 2020.
 24. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, Elliott V, Fernandez M, O'neal L, Mcleod L, Delacqua G, Delacqua F, Kirby J, Duda SN. The REDCap consortium: Building an international community of software platform partners. *J Biomed Inform* 2019;95:10328. doi: 10.1016/j.jbi.2019.103208
 25. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data capture (REDCap)-A metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. *J Biomed Inform* 2008;42:377–381. doi:

- 10.1016/j.jbi.2008.08.010
26. Ng MM, Firth J, Minen M, Torous J. User engagement in mental health apps: A review of measurement, reporting, and validity. *Psychiatr Serv American Psychiatric Association*; 2019 Mar 27;70(7):538–544. PMID:30914003
 27. Baumel A, Muench F, Edan S, Kane JM. Objective User Engagement With Mental Health Apps: Systematic Search and Panel-Based Usage Analysis. *J Med Internet Res Department of Community Mental Health, University of HaifaHaifa, Israel: NLM (Medline)*; 2019;21(9):e14567. doi: 10.2196/14567
 28. Khanna G. Mental Health App Development in 2023. *Appwrk IT Solut.* 2023.
 29. Kaveladze BT, Wasil AR, Bunyi JB, Ramirez V, Schueller SM. User Experience, Engagement, and Popularity in Mental Health Apps: Secondary Analysis of App Analytics and Expert App Reviews. *JMIR Hum Factors. JMIR Human Factors*; 2022. p. e30766. doi: 10.2196/30766
 30. Kessler RC, Andrews G, Colpe LJ, Hiripi E, Mroczek DK, Normand SLT, Walters EE, Zaslavsky AM. Short screening scales to monitor population prevalences and trends in non-specific psychological distress. *Psychol Med Psychol Med*; 2002 Aug;32(6):959–976. PMID:12214795
 31. Andrews G, Slade T. Interpreting scores on the Kessler Psychological Distress Scale (K10). *Aust N Z J Public Health Public Health Association of Australia Inc.*; 2001;25(6):494–497. PMID:11824981
 32. Brugnera A, Zarbo C, Scalabrini A, Compare A, Mucci C, Carrara S, Tasca GA, Hewitt P, Greco A, Poletti B, Esposito R, Cattafi F, Zullo C, Lo Coco G. Attachment anxiety, reflective functioning and well-being as predictors of burn-out and psychological distress among psychotherapists: A longitudinal study. *Clin Psychol Psychother* 2023;30(3):587–598. doi: 10.1002/cpp.2823
 33. Heerde JA, Merrin GJ, Le VT, Toumbourou JW, Bailey JA. Health of Young Adults Experiencing Social Marginalization and Vulnerability: A Cross-National Longitudinal Study. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2023;20(3). PMID:36767076
 34. Hughes ME, Waite LJ, Hawkey LC, Cacioppo JT. A Short Scale for Measuring Loneliness in Large Surveys: Results From Two Population-Based Studies. *Res Aging Res Aging*; 2004 Nov;26(6):655–672. PMID:18504506
 35. Russell D, Peplau LA, Ferguson ML. Developing a measure of loneliness. *J Pers Assess J Pers Assess*; 1978 Jun 1;42(3):290–294. PMID:660402
 36. Steptoe A, Shankar A, Demakakos P, Wardle J. Social isolation, loneliness, and all-cause mortality in older men and women. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A National Academy of Sciences*; 2013. p. 5797–5801. PMID:23530191
 37. Ritsher JB, Otilingam PG, Grajales M. Internalized stigma of mental illness: psychometric properties of a new measure. *Psychiatry Res Elsevier*; 2003 Nov 1;121(1):31–49. PMID:14572622
 38. Griffiths KM, Christensen H, Jorm AF, Evans K, Groves C. Effect of web-based depression literacy and cognitive-behavioural therapy interventions on stigmatising attitudes to depression: Randomised controlled trial. *Br J Psychiatry* 2004;185:342–349. PMID:15458995
 39. Corrigan PW, Daniel Giffort P, Rashid F, Matthew Leary B. Recovery as a Psychological Construct. *Community Ment Health J* 1999;35(3).
 40. Sorkin DH, Mukamel DB, Eikey E V., Mark G, Schueller SM, Schneider M, Stadnick NA, Zheng K, Borghouts J, Davis K, Leon C De, Macias D, Mathew AB, Palomares K, Myrick KJ. Conceptualizing and Measuring Mental Health Stigma. 2020.
 41. Survey CHI. CHIS 2020 Adult Public Use Files. *UCLA Cent Heal Policy Res.* 2020.
 42. Venkatesh V, Thong JYL, Xu X. Consumer Acceptance and Use of Information Technology: Extending the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology. *MIS Q* 2012;36(1):157–178.

43. Odewumi MO, Yusuf O, Oputa GO. UTAUT Model: Intention to use social media for learning interactive effect of postgraduate gender in South-West Nigeria. *Int J Educ Dev using Inf Commun Technol* 2018;14:239–251.
44. Borghouts J, Eikey E V., Mark G, De Leon C, Schueller SM, Schneider M, Stadnick N, Zheng K, Mukamel DB, Sorkin DH. Barriers to and facilitators of user engagement with digital mental health interventions: Systematic review. *J Med Internet Res* 2021;23(3). PMID:33759801
45. O'Connor M, Casey L. The Mental Health Literacy Scale (MHLS): A new scale-based measure of mental health literacy. *Psychiatry Res Elsevier*; 2015 Sep 30;229(1–2):511–516. PMID:26228163
46. Bureau UC. QuickFacts. 2023. Available from: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/>
47. Team RC. : A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2022. Available from: <https://www.r-project.org/>
48. Huberty J, Vranceanu A-M, Carney C, Breus M, Gordon MS, Puzia ME. Characteristics and Usage Patterns in a Convenience Sample of Paid Subscribers to Calm Meditation App: Cross-Sectional Survey. *JMIR MHEALTH UHEALTH* 2019 Nov;7(11). doi: 10.2196/15648
49. Militello L, Sobolev M, Okeke F, Adler DA, Nahum-Shani I. Digital Prompts to Increase Engagement With the Headspace App and for Stress Regulation Among Parents: Feasibility Study. *JMIR Form Res* 2022;6(3)e30606 <https://formative.jmir.org/2022/3/e30606> *JMIR Formative Research*; 2022 Mar 21;6(3):e30606. doi: 10.2196/30606
50. Crisp DA, Griffiths KM. Participating in online mental health interventions: Who is most likely to sign up and why? *Depress Res Treat Centre for Mental Health Research, Australian National University, Canberra, ACT 0200, Australia: Hindawi Publishing Corporation*; 2014;2014. doi: 10.1155/2014/790457
51. Upchurch DM, Johnson PJ. Gender differences in prevalence, patterns, purposes, and perceived benefits of meditation practices in the United States. *J Women's Heal* 2019;28(2):135–142. PMID:30543475
52. Borghouts J, Eikey E V, De Leon C, Stephen M; Schueller M, Schneider ; Margaret, Stadnick NA, Zheng K, Wilson L, Caro D, Dana M; Mukamel B, Sorkin DH. Understanding the Role of Support in Digital Mental Health Programs With Older Adults: Users' Perspective and Mixed Methods Study. *JMIR Form Res* 2022;6(12):e43192. doi: 10.2196/43192
53. Kannisto KA, Korhonen J, Adams CE, Koivunen MH, Vahlberg T, Välimäki MA. Factors associated with dropout during recruitment and follow-up periods of a mHealth-based randomized controlled trial for mobile.net to encourage treatment adherence for people with serious mental health problems. *J Med Internet Res Department of Nursing Science, University of Turku, Joukahaisenkatu 3-5, Turku, FI-20014, Finland: Journal of Medical Internet Research*; 2017;19(2). doi: 10.2196/jmir.6417
54. Lattie EG, Stiles-Shields C, Graham AK. An overview of and recommendations for more accessible digital mental health services. *Nat Rev Psychol Springer US*; 2022;1(2):87–100. doi: 10.1038/s44159-021-00003-1
55. Israel B, Perret S, Bs A, Myrick K, Thompson K, Li S, Sharma K, Torous J, Torous J, Perret S, Alon N, Carpenter-Song E, Myrick K, Thompson K, Li S, Sharma K. Standardising the role of a digital navigator in behavioural health: a systematic review. *Lancet Digit Heal* 2023;5:e925–e932. doi: 10.1016/S2589-7500(23)00152-8
56. Jaso-Yim B, Eyllon M, Sah P, Pennine M, Welch G, Schuler K, Orth L, O'Dea H, Rogers E, Murillo LH, Barnes J Ben, Hoyler G, Peloquin G, Jarama K, Nordberg SS, Youn SJ. Evaluation of the impact of a digital care navigator on increasing patient registration with digital mental health interventions in routine care. *Internet Interv Elsevier*; 2024 Dec 1;38:100777. doi: 10.1016/J.INVENT.2024.100777
57. Pruitt LD, Vuletic S, Smolenski DJ, Wagner A, Luxton DD, Gahm GA. Predicting post

- treatment client satisfaction between behavioural activation for depression delivered either in-person or via home-based telehealth. *J Telemed Telecare* 2019;25(8):460–467. PMID:29976097
58. Toscos T, Coupe A, Flanagan M, Drouin M, Carpenter M, Reining L, Roebuck A, Mirro MJ. Teens using screens for help: Impact of suicidal ideation, anxiety, and depression levels on youth preferences for telemental health resources. *J Med Internet Res Department of Psychology, Purdue University, Fort Wayne, IN, United States: Journal of Medical Internet Research*; 2019;21(6). doi: 10.2196/13230
 59. Gál É, Ștefan S, Cristea IA. The efficacy of mindfulness meditation apps in enhancing users' well-being and mental health related outcomes: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *J Affect Disord Elsevier B.V.*; 2021;279(March 2020):131–142. PMID:33049431
 60. Laurie J, Blandford A. Making time for mindfulness. *Int J Med Inform Elsevier Ireland Ltd*; 2016 Dec 1;96:38–50. doi: 10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2016.02.010
 61. Perez S. Nearly 1 in 4 people abandon mobile apps after only one use. *TechCrunch*. 2016. Available from: <https://techcrunch.com/2016/05/31/nearly-1-in-4-people-abandon-mobile-apps-after-only-one-use/>
 62. Burgess ER, Zhang R, Kiranmai Ernala S, Feuston JL, De Choudhury M, Czerwinski M, Aguilera A, Schueller SM, Reddy M. Technology Ecosystems: Rethinking Resources for Mental Health. *Interactions* 2021;66–71.
 63. Graham AK, Greene CJ, Kwasny MJ, Kaiser SM, Lieponis P, Powell T, Mohr DC. Coached Mobile App Platform for the Treatment of Depression and Anxiety among Primary Care Patients: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Psychiatry* 2020;60611:1–9. PMID:32432695
 64. Allan S, Bradstreet S, Mcleod H, Farhall J, Lambrou M, Gleeson J, Clark A, Gumley A. Developing a Hypothetical Implementation Framework of Expectations for Monitoring Early Signs of Psychosis Relapse Using a Mobile App: Qualitative Study. *J Med Internet Res* 2019;21(10):e14366. doi: 10.2196/14366
 65. Berry N, Lobban F, Bucci S. A qualitative exploration of service user views about using digital health interventions for self-management in severe mental health problems. *BMC Psychiatry England*; 2019 Jan;19(1):35. PMID:30665384
 66. Gunn J, Cameron J, Densley K, Davidson S, Fletcher S, Palmer V, Chondros P, Dowrick C, Pirkis J. Uptake of mental health websites in primary care: Insights from an Australian longitudinal cohort study of depression. *Patient Educ Couns Elsevier Ireland Ltd*; 2018;101(1):105–112. doi: 10.1016/j.pec.2017.07.008
 67. Hernandez-Ramos R, Schueller SM, Borghouts J, Palomares K, Eikey E, Schneider M, Stadnick NA, Zheng K, Mukamel DB, Sorkin DH. Evaluation of a pilot implementation of a digital cognitive behavioral therapy platform for isolated older adults in county mental health services. *Implement Res Pract* 2024;5. doi: 10.1177/26334895241288571

Supplementary Files

Figures

One of the art pieces created by community members to include in recruitment emails.



Multimedia Appendixes

The survey instrument.

URL: <http://asset.jmir.pub/assets/9398ade0b869ad3c17533133f53ab49b.docx>

The survey measures as defined in the analyses.

URL: <http://asset.jmir.pub/assets/be948cbe9363368a104a7f1aba33ec40.docx>

Logistic regression tables showing odds ratios and 95% CIs for all measures.

URL: <http://asset.jmir.pub/assets/9b44486969299c960d9605a80406ddc6.docx>

