

Keep It Real

A Schema-Level Deferral Channel for Concise LLM Dialogue

Noam Y. Tenne*
Independent Researcher
noam@skyvalley.ac

July 24, 2026

Abstract

Large language model chat assistants monologue: asked one question, they return several paragraphs. We test whether this is downstream of *statelessness* where nothing the model defers survives the turn, so it says everything now, rather than of any inability to be brief. We introduce *kir*, a schema-level **park** channel: alongside the visible reply, the model emits one-line notes for threads it is holding for later. Across 450 simulated conversations on **claude-sonnet-5**, **gpt-5.6-sol**, and **glm-5.2**, the park’s mere presence reduces per-turn verbosity by 30–54% (words) and 30–54% (tokens) with no length cap applied, on two of the three models; the effect fails to replicate on **glm-5.2**. A *placebo park*, whose contents are silently discarded while the prompt still claims they persist, reproduces the full reduction in 5/5 scenarios and is statistically indistinguishable from the real park in 4/5. The mechanism is *framing*, not storage. Eventual content delivery is statistically indistinguishable from capped and uncapped baselines. In a pre-registered blinded study, 46 Prolific raters (US/UK, $\geq 95\%$ approval; median completion 20m39s, 0 attention-check failures) named the verbose baseline as the one that “dumped too much on you” in 86% of single-assistant answers (95% CI [0.79, 0.92]), and did *not* judge the concise variant to lose the conversational thread. The general preference was a coin-flip (0.515, CI [0.44, 0.59]) that splits sharply by genre: concise was preferred for practical advice (0.70) and verbose for emotional support (0.36) and deep explanation (0.40). We argue the channel’s value is removing the *felt* experience of being dumped on, and we release all code, prompts, transcripts, and pre-registered predictions at <https://github.com/noamt/kir>.

1 Introduction

Ask a modern chat assistant a simple question and it will often answer at length: caveats, alternatives, background, and a summary, where a person would offer one or two sentences and wait. This over-informativeness is well documented (15, 5) and is usually attributed to the length bias of the reward-model acquired during RLHF (12) or to the hedging of the model under uncertainty (15). The standard remedies act on the symptom: instruct the model to “be concise,” penalize length during training, or truncate the output after the fact.

We test a different hypothesis about the *cause*. A chat model generates each turn as if it were the last: nothing it chooses not to say is guaranteed to survive into the next turn, and RLHF rewards per-turn completeness. Under that pressure, saying everything now is a rational move. If this is right, the intervention is not a long instruction, but **persistence**: give the unsaid thing

*Code, data, and pre-registered protocols: <https://github.com/noamt/kir>

a guaranteed place to live, and brevity becomes safe. We summarize the hypothesis as *brevity is downstream of persistence*, and as the results will force us to restate it, ultimately as *brevity is downstream of permission*.

We instantiate the idea as a minimal mechanism, *kir*. Every response is structured output with two channels: a **say** field, the reply the user sees, and a **park** list of one-line pointers to threads the model is holding but not saying this turn. Parked threads persist in a small store, are re-injected into the prompt each turn, and may be resurfaced when relevant. Nothing edits the output post hoc; the split happens at generation time, by the author, via the output schema.

Our contributions are as follows.

1. **The addition of a park channel** with no length cap reduces the per-turn verbosity 30–54% on two of three model families, in both words and tokens, while the eventual content delivery is statistically indistinguishable from the capped and uncapped baselines (§4.1, §4.2).
2. **A placebo dissociation**; a park whose contents are silently discarded reproduces the full reduction, and a model that never populates the park at all still shows the effect. The mechanism operates through the model’s *belief* that a deferral channel exists, not through stored content (§4.3, §5.1).
3. **A blinded human study**. Raters judge the verbose baseline as “dumping” 86% of the time, do not see the concise variant as losing the thread, and split their preference by genre in an interpretable way (§4.5), yielding an *act-vs-be-heard* axis as the study’s forward hypothesis (§5.4).

We size every claim to its evidence and report a negative result (one model on which the effect does not replicate) and a null (overall human preference) as prominently as the positive findings.

2 Related Work and Background

2.1 Deferral and Proactivity in Conversational Agents

The closest system is *Inner Thoughts* (6), which gives a conversational agent a covert stream of generated thoughts, retains unexpressed ones across turns, and selects when to contribute them. Its goal is the inverse of ours, deciding when an agent should speak *more*, at the right moment, in multi-party chat and it does not measure per-turn verbosity. Its design also assumes that agent-initiated resurfacing works; our data provide an empirical counterpoint (§4.2). Work on when-to-speak (10) and turn-taking takes care of all turns rather than shortening them, and stores nothing for later.

2.2 Memory as an Affordance

MemGPT (9) and its descendants provide self-managed side-channel storage to agents, but for *recall* and remembering more, rather than saying less. Notably, MemGPT’s own evaluation reports that its memory-augmented responses trended *more* verbose. A memory affordance therefore does not obviously shorten replies, which makes our result that a *deferral* affordance is non-obvious rather than expected.

2.3 Verbosity and Length Control

The phenomenon is well characterized (15, 5) and its RLHF origins are documented (12). Existing reductions act at training time (length-regularized objectives), at instruction time (“be concise”),

or by truncation, and are precisely the baselines we compare against. Instruction-free reductions exist via internal-representation steering, but require model access. We reduce verbosity with prompt-level affordance and no enforcement of any kind.

2.4 Format and Framing Effects

The output format shapes the generation independently of any behavioral instruction: structured-output constraints change reasoning (13). Separately, functionally empty affordances change behavior: a no-op “think” tool improves agentic performance (1), content-free filler tokens can carry a chain-of-thought effect (11), and a system-prompt fiction with no functional backing drives large behavioral shifts (4). These two literatures meet in our placebo arm.

2.5 Human Preference for Length

Blinded transcript raters exhibit a robust pro-length bias: longer answers win more often, and length is the dominant predictor of pairwise votes (7, 2). The Length-controlled evaluation (3) debiases this statistically. Qualitative UX work still recommends the deferral pattern with essentials first, and more content on request (8).

2.6 Current Limitations of Prior Work

Three gaps motivate this study. First, every documented verbosity reduction requires either training access, an explicit length instruction, or post-hoc truncation; none uses an inference-time affordance. Second, all documented schema effects concern fields the model *uses*, measured on task accuracy; none distinguish the effect of a field’s *presence* from its *use*. Third, the literature on human-preference establishes that raters prefer length and that users complain about it, but there is no blinded quantitative test of the deferral pattern recommended by the UX guidance. We address all three.

3 Methods

3.1 The kir Mechanism

The mechanism is deliberately minimal: it changes the *shape of the output contract* and nothing else. No model is fine-tuned, no output is edited after generation, and no length instruction is given in the critical arm.

Two-channel output. In each turn, the model returns structured JSON with three fields:

- **say** — the reply the user sees and the only channel the user ever sees.
- **park** — a list of `{summary, origin}` objects. Each **summary** is one line (≤ 140 characters) naming a thread the model judged worth saying, but chose not to say this turn; **origin** $\in \{\text{user, agent}\}$ records whether the user raised it or the model thought about it.
- **resurface_id** — the identifier of at most one previously parked thread being taken up in **say** this turn, or null.

Why a schema field rather than an instruction. A brevity *instruction* is a request that competes directly with the length-rewarding gradients acquired in RLHF, and loses (12). A schema field is not a request: it is part of the output contract the model must satisfy. This lets us impose *scarcity* structurally while delegating *triage* to the model, which decides *what* earns the scarce tokens but never *whether* to honour the contract. The design principle is that the wrapper is authoritative in format, where errors are cheap, and advisory in content, where errors are expensive.

Why deferral rather than truncation. Editing a long answer down after generation creates *state divergence*: the model’s context records that it explained four things while the user heard one, and it will never re-raise the other three because it believes they were said. Splitting at generation time, by the author, keeps the transcript a shared ground truth between speaker and listener. This is why the park is written by the model in the same forward pass as the reply, rather than extracted afterwards.

Cap setter. For the arms that use a cap, a small dialogue-act regex maps each incoming user turn to a sentence budget: a short question ending in “?” $\rightarrow$ 2 sentences; a request containing an explanation cue (*explain, walk me through, why, how does*) $\rightarrow$ 8; default $\rightarrow$ 4. Budgets are kept tight and act-dependent because caps become targets, models fill whatever box they are given, and actual-versus-cap length is logged to detect this box-filling. Format compliance is checked deterministically: an over-budget reply triggers one regeneration by the author, and only a second violation is truncated at a sentence boundary and flagged.

Persistence, decay, and resurfacing. Parked threads are written to a small store and re-injected into the system prompt on every subsequent turn, each with its identifier and origin. A thread not taken up within N turns decay into **stale** and stops being injected, so the list stays an index of live threads rather than an accumulating diary. The model may set **resurface_id** when the topic returns or the conversation lulls; threads raised by the user receive a brief spoken receipt (“I’ll come back to your hosting question”) so that concise is not mistaken for dismissive, while threads of the model’s own are held silently.

How this differs from the alternatives. Unlike a memory system (9), the store holds what was *almost said* instead of what was said or learned, and its purpose is to permit the omission rather than to improve recall. Unlike proactive-agent architectures (6), there is no separate scoring or triggering apparatus: the same forward pass that writes the reply writes the deferral list. Unlike length control, nothing enforces brevity in the critical arm and the model is simply told that a place exists to put what it does not say.

3.2 Arms and Baseline

A single shared persona yields four arms plus a placebo, differing *only* in mechanism (Table 1). The **plain** baseline is the same persona under identical conditions — same scenarios, same simulated users, same models, same seeds, same number of turns, same decoding settings — differing solely in the absence of the park field and the cap. Every comparison in this paper is therefore within-scenario and within-model, with the mechanism as the only manipulated variable.

Arm	Cap	Park	Role
plain	—	—	uncapped baseline
cap_only	✓	—	enforcement without deferral
park_only	—	✓	deferral without enforcement (critical arm)
kir	✓	✓	the full mechanism
placebo	—	✓*	*park contents silently discarded

Table 1: Ablation arms. **park_only** is critical: if a park with no enforcement anywhere reduces verbosity, the reduction is voluntary.

3.3 Study 1: Machine Ablation

3.3.1 Simulated Users

Volume comes from a second LLM playing the user, a standard methodology for multi-turn evaluation (5). Each scenario fixes the opening message verbatim and gives the simulated user a persona brief instructing it to react substantively, stay on topic, and not wrap up early. The simulated user is identical across arms, so any difference in assistant behaviour is attributable to the mechanism.

3.3.2 Scenarios

Five scenarios span four genres. They were chosen to vary two things: the *amount of latent content* a model could plausibly say and *what the user wants from the exchange*, that is, to act, to understand, or to be heard.

- **first-dog** (advice). Opener: *“im thinking about getting a dog for the first time. what should i know?”* A maximally open advice request: time, cost, breed, training, and vet care are all plausibly relevant, so the model has a lot to say. Highest latent content.
- **first-camera** (advice). Opener: *“whats a good first camera for someone getting into photography? something not too expensive”* A constrained purchase decision. Like first-dog, it invites enumeration, but the budget constraint gives the model a natural basis for triage.
- **faster-than-light** (understanding). Opener: *“why cant anything go faster than light? like what actually stops it”* A conceptual explanation for a curious layperson. The user wants to understand, not to make a decision, and the content is a single explanatory thread rather than a list.
- **merge-vs-rebase** (technical). Opener: *“whats the actual difference between git merge and git rebase? and when should i use which”* A technical comparison posed in prose by a working developer. Deliberately prose-shaped: we exclude write-me-code requests because code blocks break sentence counting, a limitation we return to in §5.5.
- **quit-my-job** (emotional). Opener: *“been thinking about quitting my job lately. not sure if im being smart or just burnt out”* An affective exchange where the user wants to be heard rather than advised. The simulated user gradually shares feelings and sometimes vents without asking a question.

The genres are the analysis axis for C5 and, as it turns out, the axis on which human preference divides (§4.5).

3.3.3 Models

The primary organism is `claude-sonnet-5`, run in all four arms plus the placebo. Two secondary organisms run the critical pair (`plain` versus `park_only`): `gpt-5.6-sol` (a second vendor’s flagship, to test whether the effect is vendor-specific) and `glm-5.2` (an open-weights model, to test whether it is closed-model-specific). Secondary models were selected before run by a structured-output smoke test of five-cases, with the selection rule and results committed in advance. The simulated user, the point extractor, and the coverage judge are frozen in `claude-sonnet-5` throughout and never rotate, since a moving judge would make cells incomparable.

3.3.4 Measures and Statistical Tests

Verbosity is the mean number of words in the `say` field per assistant turn, computed per run and then averaged across runs within a cell. Because word count can diverge from generation cost, we additionally report mean *tokens* per turn under a single fixed tokenizer (`cl100k_base`) applied uniformly across all three model families; the tokenizer is a consistent proxy rather than each vendor’s native tokenizer, and we report it only for comparability.

Coverage measures eventual delivery. The `plain` arm’s first-turn reply, the model’s own uncapped “blast”, is decomposed by an extractor into a reference list of substantive points for that cell. Every arm’s full transcript is then judged for the earliest assistant turn at which each point’s substance actually appears. Acknowledgements and promises (“I’ll come back to that”) count for nothing; only delivery counts.

Statistical tests. All confidence intervals are 95% percentile bootstrap intervals over 10,000 resamples (resampling runs in Study 1, and clustering by rater in Study 2). Pairwise comparisons use the Mann–Whitney U test, with Cliff’s delta as a non-parametric effect size; reported p -values are two-sided Mann–Whitney U values. A comparison is called *supported* only when it meets its pre-registered threshold *and* its bootstrap CI excludes the null.

3.3.5 Volume and Pre-registration

Ten seeds per cell at ten turns per conversation give 200 primary-active + 80 primary-nodding + 120 secondary = 400 conversations ($\approx 8,500$ API calls), plus 50 placebo conversations, for 450 in total. Total API spend was $\approx$ US\$52. The complete protocol with the model matrix, scenarios, seeds, operational rules, and the five confirmatory comparisons C1–C5, was frozen before any data was collected, with numerical predictions filed after a pilot but before the full run. Every subsequent deviation is recorded as a dated amendment in the released repository.

3.4 Study 2: Blinded Human Study

3.4.1 Participants

Forty-six raters were recruited in Prolific. Eligibility required residence in the United States or the United Kingdom, fluent English and a platform approval rating of at least 95%; the task was restricted to the desktop and tablet because the instrument presents two transcripts side by side. Raters were paid £4.50 for a task estimated at 20 minutes (£13.50/hour, above the platform’s recommended rate). Median completion time was 20m39s and no rater failed either attention check.

3.4.2 Materials and Pair Selection

Each rater saw five pairs, one per scenario. A pair presents the same opening message answered by two assistants — the **plain** and **park_only** arms of Study 1 — labelled only “Assistant A” and “Assistant B”. To avoid cherry-picking, the run shown for each scenario was selected mechanically: the seed minimising the joint standardised distance of both arms from their cell means, i.e. the *median-typical* pair. The selection code and its output were committed before recruitment. Each transcript was trimmed to its first five exchanges.

3.4.3 Procedure and Questions

Which arm appeared as A versus B, and the order of the five pairs, were counterbalanced per rater by a pseudorandom design seeded from the participant’s identifier, making each rater’s layout deterministic and auditable. The mechanism was never mentioned; the study was described only as comparing two chat assistants. Per pair, raters answered: (Q1) “Imagine you were the person in these conversations. Which assistant would you rather be talking to?”; (Q2) “Did either assistant dump too much on you at once?”; (Q3) “Did either seem to lose track of you or the conversation?”; and (Q4, free text) “Why?” Two instructed-response attention checks at fixed positions required different answers, defeating a constant-response strategy.

3.4.4 Countermeasures Against Length Bias

Because transcript raters are known to favour longer answers (2, 7), four countermeasures were pre-registered: first-person framing (“imagine you were the person”), to reinstate the interaction cost a reader does not otherwise pay; a pre-registered length-adjusted analysis reported alongside raw preference (3); content-parity checks on the selected pairs; and per-genre reporting rather than a single pooled number.

3.4.5 Analysis

Confirmatory tests were fixed before launch: H1, preference for the park arm against 0.5; H2, among answers that named exactly one assistant, the share naming **plain** dumper; H3, the same computation for thread-loss; and H4, a logistic regression of preference on the standardised length gap, reporting the implied preference at zero gap. The sample size was fixed in advance with no post-hoc addition of raters. Exclusion was pre-specified as attention-check failure only.

4 Results

4.1 Verbosity

claude-sonnet-5. The reduction is supported in all five scenarios, ranging from 41.1% (quit-my-job) to 54.1% (first-dog), with every bootstrap CI excluding zero (all $p \leq 0.0003$). The ordering is orderly: the scenarios with the most latent content to enumerate (first-dog, first-camera) show the largest cuts, and the most constrained (quit-my-job) the smallest.

gpt-5.6-sol. The reduction is supported in all three scenarios run, from 31.0% (faster-than-light, $p = 0.028$) to 41.7% (first-dog, $p = 0.0003$). The effect is therefore not an artefact of one vendor’s post-training.




Figure 1: Words per turn, **plain** versus **park_only**, with no length cap in either arm. Each row is one model–scenario cell; the bar spans the two arms’ means. Magnitudes in bold met the pre-registered support threshold ($\geq 25\%$ reduction with a bootstrap CI excluding 0); those marked (n.s.) did not. The park’s presence alone shifts every **claude-sonnet-5** and **gpt-5.6-sol** cell left, while **glm-5.2** barely moves.

glm-5.2. The reduction is supported in only one of three scenarios (quit-my-job, 30.5%, $p = 0.0025$). first-dog shows a 19.9% reduction that does not reach significance ($p = 0.082$), and faster-than-light shows no reduction at all (-3.9% , $p = 0.94$). The pre-registered claim is not met for this model.

Synthesis. The pre-registered claim, as supported in $\geq 4/5$ primary and $\geq 2/3$ secondary scenarios, is **met on claude-sonnet-5 (5/5) and gpt-5.6-sol (3/3), and not met on glm-5.2 (1/3)**. Token counts track word counts within roughly one percentage point in every cell, so the effect is not an artefact of counting words rather than generation cost. The effect is thus robust across two model families and absent in a third, which we discuss in §5.1.

4.2 Content Delivery

Adding the cap on top of the park does not cost coverage: the coverage of **kir** versus **park_only** is statistically indistinguishable in all five scenarios (C2; every CI spans zero, $0.53 \leq p \leq 1.0$). Neither park arm beats **cap_only** in coverage at this horizon (C4; all CIs span zero). In verbosity,

Model	Scenario	Words/turn			Tokens/turn	
		plain	park	cut	plain	cut
claude-sonnet-5	first-dog	137.1	62.9	54.1%	167.0	53.7%
claude-sonnet-5	first-camera	110.7	52.9	52.2%	140.5	52.8%
claude-sonnet-5	faster-than-light	132.5	65.8	50.3%	164.6	51.0%
claude-sonnet-5	merge-vs-rebase	109.1	63.5	41.8%	137.0	42.4%
claude-sonnet-5	quit-my-job	81.8	48.2	41.1%	100.9	42.3%
gpt-5.6-sol	first-dog	112.6	65.7	41.7%	144.0	41.8%
gpt-5.6-sol	quit-my-job	85.1	51.3	39.8%	106.3	40.0%
gpt-5.6-sol	faster-than-light	75.3	52.0	31.0%	103.5	36.5%
glm-5.2	quit-my-job	96.2	66.8	30.5%	116.0	30.3%
glm-5.2	first-dog	108.5	86.9	19.9% [†]	133.7	20.4%
glm-5.2	faster-than-light	94.2	97.9	−3.9% [†]	116.3	−3.8%

Table 2: C1: verbosity, `plain` versus `park_only`. Bold = supported ($\geq 25\%$ reduction with a bootstrap CI excluding 0). [†] not significant. Token counts use a single fixed tokenizer across all models (§3.3.4) and track the word counts closely.

`cap_only` sits below `park_only` in four of five scenarios but within roughly $1.3\times$ (C3): explicit enforcement buys some additional brevity, but the unenforced park reaches most of the way there on its own.

Two facts about the store are worth recording because they constrain the interpretation. Parked content is largely *write-only*: across the primary model’s `park_only` runs, 77% of parked threads were never delivered in any later turn. And agent-initiated resurfacing almost never fires without the user first re-raising the topic. At a ten-turn horizon, conversational history alone unravels as well as the park.

4.3 The Placebo Arm

The placebo is identical to `park_only` in prompt and schema and it still tells the model the list persists, except that parked content is silently discarded and the injected list is therefore always empty.

- **PL1 (does the reduction survive?)** The placebo cuts 38–53% relative to `plain`, with CIs excluding zero, in **5/5 scenarios** and the same range as the real park.
- **PL2 (does the store contribute?)** The verbosity of placebo versus `park_only` is statistically indistinguishable in **4/5 scenarios**; in the single scenario that becomes significant, the *placebo* is the terser arm.

Two observations from the main run point in the same way. `gpt-5.6-sol` emitted an empty park on every turn of every run and never used the channel at all, yet it still cut 31–42%. `glm-5.2`, by contrast, populated the park the most heavily of any model (2.7 threads per run) and cut the least.

4.4 Genre

Aggregated by genre, the mean `plain`-versus-`park` reduction is largest for advice (42.0%) and technical (41.8%), middling for emotional (37.1%), and smallest for understanding (25.8%). Models

are already comparatively terse when explaining a single concept, leaving the park less to remove.

4.5 Human Study

Test	Estimate	95% CI	Reading
H1 preference (park vs plain)	0.515	[0.44, 0.59]	coin-flip; no overall winner
H2 “which dumped on you?” → plain	0.861	[0.79, 0.92]	verbose named the dumper
H3 “which lost the thread?” → park	0.328	[0.18, 0.51]	deferral <i>not</i> seen as dropping
H4 length-adjusted preference	0.506		length barely predicts preference

Table 3: Study 2 confirmatory results ($n = 46$ raters, 235 pair-judgments).

The general preference is a coin-flip. The dumping attribution is not: among answers naming a single assistant, 86% named the verbose baseline, with a CI comfortably excluding 0.5. Thread-loss ran opposite to our prediction and among raters naming one assistant, 67% named the *verbose* arm, so brevity did not read as being scattered. Inter-rater agreement on preference is near zero (Fleiss $\kappa = 0.04$): raters simply do not agree on which assistant they would rather talk to.




Figure 2: Per-scenario share of pair-judgments preferring the concise (**park_only**) assistant, with bootstrap 95% CIs clustered by rater ($n = 46$). Points above the dashed 0.5 line favour the concise arm, below it the verbose arm. The pooled figure is a coin-flip (0.515) because two opposite effects average out: advice scenarios favour concision, while the explanatory and emotional scenarios favour length.

The pooled null conceals a systematic split. Preference for the park arm was 0.70 for first-dog (CI excluding 0.5) and 0.60 for first-camera, both advice, but 0.40 for faster-than-light and 0.36 for quit-my-job, with merge-vs-rebase at 0.51. Concise was preferred where the user wanted to *act*; verbose where the user wanted to *understand* or to be *heard*.

5 Discussion

5.1 Permission, Not Persistence

The placebo result changes what the mechanism can be said to be. If the reduction were produced by the store and by threads being safely held and later retrieved, then discarding the store should degrade it. It does not: the sham reproduces the full effect and is statistically indistinguishable from the real thing in four of five scenarios. What the model responds to is the *claim* that a place exists to put the unsaid, not the existence of the place. Our opening hypothesis, *brevity is downstream of persistence*, is therefore wrong as stated, and the corrected form is that *brevity is downstream of permission*.

This locates conversational verbosity in the same family as other framing-driven behaviours in LLMs: no-op tools that nonetheless improve performance (1), content-free tokens that carry a reasoning effect (11), and system-prompt fictions with no functional backing that shift behaviour substantially (4). Our contribution to that literature is the controlled comparison that these studies lack, that is, real affordance versus sham affordance versus none, on a continuous output measure. It also explains why the memory literature did not find this effect: MemGPT’s storage is real and used, and its replies grew *longer* (9). Storage is not the operative variable.

5.2 Why a Model That Never Parks Still Shortens

`gpt-5.6-sol` presents the cleanest case: it emitted an empty park on every single turn, and still shortened its replies by 31–42%. On the storage account this is incoherent. On the permission account it is exactly what should happen and the model reorganises what it says once the contract implies that saying everything now is not required, whether or not it ever writes anything down. Inspection of its replies is consistent with this: it produced complete but compact answers in dialogue register rather than truncated ones, and its sentences were already the tersest on average of the three models in the baseline.

The same account explains the negative model. `glm-5.2` populated the park more heavily and cut the least, treating the field as a notebook to fill rather than as permission to withhold: 87% of what it parked was never delivered and its replies stayed long. The variable that predicts the effect is not whether a model uses the channel but whether it accepts what the channel implies. We do not know what makes a model accept it, and we regard this as the most important open question the study raises.

5.3 What Humans Actually Value

The human study relocates the reward. The park does not win preference overall, and we report that null as plainly as anything else. What it does reliably is remove the *felt* experience of being dumped on: 86% of single-assistant answers named the verbose baseline as the one that dumped, while machine judges found delivered content equivalent across arms (§4.2). The defensible claim is therefore narrower than “users prefer it”: *the deferral channel removes the dumping feeling without costing content and wins preference where users want to act*.

This partially corroborates and partially complicates the prior literature. It corroborates the qualitative UX guidance that recommends essentials-first delivery (8), and it is consistent with users complaining about verbosity in situ. But it complicates the pairwise-preference literature: documented pro-length bias (2, 7) predicted that our concise arm should lose, and our length-adjusted analysis found length to be a weak predictor of preference in this sample (0.506 adjusted versus 0.515 raw). Either the first-person framing suppressed the bias, or the bias is weaker when

the length difference is embedded in a multi-turn transcript rather than a single answer pair. We cannot distinguish these with the present design.

5.4 The Act-versus-Be-Heard Axis

The genre split is the study’s most actionable finding and was not anticipated. Brevity was preferred where the exchange was focused on the goal (practical advice) and avoided where it was affective (an employment dilemma) or explanatory (a physics question). A plausible reading is that deferral is welcome when the user is trying to reach a decision and unwelcome when the user is trying to be understood or to understand. In the latter cases, length is doing relational or pedagogical work rather than simply conveying information. A deployed system might therefore route cap tightness by dialogue act rather than applying a single budget everywhere. We offer this as a hypothesis for the next study, not a finding of this one: our genre comparison was pre-registered as reporting, not as a confirmatory test, and each genre rests on one or two scenarios.

5.5 Limitations and Further Research

Simulated users. Study 1’s conversations are generated by an LLM playing the user, which tends to wrap up earlier than a human would (around turn five), so the effective horizon is shorter than ten turns and the later turns are largely closings. The verbosity effect is concentrated in, and larger within, the early substantive turns.

Judges from the model under test. The coverage judge, point extractor, and simulated user are all `claude-sonnet-5`, which also serves as the primary organism. A delivery-only rubric and identical treatment across arms mitigate but do not eliminate this confound.

Human study scope. Forty-six raters from a US/UK Prolific pool are not representative of chat-assistant users generally, and reading transcripts is not using an assistant: a reader pays none of the waiting and scrolling costs that make verbosity expensive in live use, which is one reason live-chat satisfaction may behave differently.

Unexplained negative result. We do not know what distinguishes models that accept the framing from those that do not, and with one negative model we cannot say whether the boundary is scale, post-training, or instruction-following style.

Instrument scope. The cap setter is a regex over dialogue acts rather than a learned classifier; the primary model is closed-weight; the horizon is ten turns; and topics are restricted to prose-shaped chat, since code blocks break sentence counting.

The store is unjustified at this horizon. Parked content is largely write-only and agent-initiated resurfacing rarely fires without user pull. The persistence machinery proves nothing measurable in these experiments, and the impression is that only the framing is effective. Whether persistence pays off over longer horizons, or under explicit pickup probes of the kind proposed in prospective-memory benchmarks (14), is untested and is the natural next study, alongside a placebo-controlled test of *which* framings models accept, and a live-interaction study in which users bear the real cost of length.

6 Conclusion and Further Research

Giving a language model a schema-level place to defer what it will not say cuts per-turn verbosity by 30–54% in words and tokens, with no enforcement of any kind, on two of three model families, while leaving eventual content delivery statistically indistinguishable from capped and uncapped baselines. A placebo park that silently discards everything reproduces the effect in full, and a model that never writes to the park at all still shows it: the operative variable is the model’s acceptance of the framing, not the storage. Human raters confirm that the verbose baseline is the one that feels like dumping, and do not experience the concise variant as losing the thread, though which assistant they would rather talk to depends on whether they want to act, to understand, or to be heard. Brevity is downstream of permission. The open questions we consider most valuable are what determines whether a model accepts such a framing, and whether persistence, which earned nothing here, earns its place at longer horizons.

Reproducibility and Data Availability

All code, prompts, cap tables, the frozen protocols with their dated amendments, every session’s raw logs, model versions and dates, per-run token usage, and the complete pre-registered prediction ledger (13 entries, each scored against outcome) are in the accompanying repository at <https://github.com/noamt/kir>. Machine-study transcripts and aggregate human-study results are released; raw human responses are withheld because they carry participant identifiers.

Acknowledgments

In the spirit of the title, we disclose plainly how this work was done. Two large language models, **Claude Fable 5** and **Claude Opus 4.8** (Anthropic), implemented the *kir* mechanism and the experimental harness, executed and analysed the ablation and placebo studies, built and end-to-end-validated the human-study instrument, and drafted this manuscript, all under the direction of the author, who conceived the hypothesis, made every design decision, pre-registered the predictions, and is solely responsible for the claims. Members of the same model family also served as the primary organism under test and as the frozen simulated user, points extractor, and coverage judge in Study 1; this dual role is a disclosed limitation (§5.5). We thank Jules Talbourdet for a detailed structural review of an earlier draft, and the 46 Prolific participants.

References

- [1] Anthropic. The "think" tool: Enabling Claude to stop and think in complex tool use situations. Anthropic Engineering Blog, 2025. <https://www.anthropic.com/engineering/claude-think-tool>.
- [2] Guiming Hardy Chen, Shunian Chen, Ziche Liu, Feng Jiang, and Benyou Wang. Humans or LLMs as the judge? a study on judgement biases. In *Proceedings of EMNLP*, 2024. arXiv:2402.10669.
- [3] Yann Dubois, Balázs Galambosi, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. Length-controlled AlpacaEval: A simple way to debias automatic evaluators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.04475*, 2024.

- [4] Ryan Greenblatt, Carson Denison, Benjamin Wright, Fabien Roger, Monte MacDiarmid, Sam Marks, Johannes Treutlein, et al. Alignment faking in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.14093*, 2024.
- [5] Philippe Laban, Hiroaki Hayashi, Yingbo Zhou, and Jennifer Neville. LLMs get lost in multi-turn conversation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.06120*, 2025.
- [6] Xingyu Bruce Liu, Shitao Fang, Weiyang Shi, Chien-Sheng Wu, Takeo Igarashi, and Xiang Anthony Chen. Proactive conversational agents with inner thoughts. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI)*, 2025. arXiv:2501.00383.
- [7] LMSYS Org. Does style matter? disentangling style and substance in chatbot arena. LMSYS Blog, 2024. <https://lmsys.org/blog/2024-08-28-style-control/>.
- [8] Nielsen Norman Group. Less chat, more answer: Chatbot usability findings. NN/g Article, 2026. <https://www.nngroup.com/articles/less-chat-more-answer/>.
- [9] Charles Packer, Sarah Wooders, Kevin Lin, Vivian Fang, Shishir G. Patil, Ion Stoica, and Joseph E. Gonzalez. MemGPT: Towards LLMs as operating systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.08560*, 2023.
- [10] Deep Anil Patel, Iain Melvin, Christopher Malon, and Martin Renqiang Min. DiscussLLM: Teaching large language models when to speak. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.18167*, 2025.
- [11] Jacob Pfau, William Merrill, and Samuel R. Bowman. Let’s think dot by dot: Hidden computation in transformer language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.15758*, 2024.
- [12] Prasann Singhal, Tanya Goyal, Jiacheng Xu, and Greg Durrett. A long way to go: Investigating length correlations in RLHF. In *Conference on Language Modeling (COLM)*, 2024. arXiv:2310.03716.
- [13] Zhi Rui Tam, Cheng-Kuang Wu, Yi-Lin Tsai, Chieh-Yen Lin, Hung-yi Lee, and Yun-Nung Chen. Let me speak freely? a study on the impact of format restrictions on performance of large language models. In *Proceedings of EMNLP: Industry Track*, 2024. arXiv:2408.02442.
- [14] Tianhua Zhang, Xinjiang Wang, Qianxi Zhang, Qi Chen, Kun Li, Yaoqi Chen, Dingdong Wang, Helen Meng, and Yan Lu. TriggerBench: Investigating prospective memory for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.23459*, 2026.
- [15] Yusen Zhang, Sarkar Snigdha Sarathi Das, and Rui Zhang. Verbosity $\neq$ veracity: Demystify verbosity compensation behavior of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.07858*, 2024.