

# **No Warranty, No Rollback: Critical AI Literacy After Black-Box Automation**

**Jooyeol Kim**

Independent Researcher

**Accepted to the 4S 2026 Conference:** TechnoPower • Technoscientific Futures, Toronto, Canada, 7-10 October 2026.

**Submission ID:** 1895

**Submission Type:** Traditional submission (academic paper presentation)

**Primary Research Area:** Advocacy, Equity, and Justice

**Additional Research Area:** Information, Computing and Media Technology

**Open Panel Preference:** TRACKLESS

**Second Open Panel Preference:** Who Owns Intelligence? Co-Intelligence, Epistemic Capture, and TechnoPower

**Delivery Method:** intended to be on Zoom, if available

## **Abstract**

In Korea's AI Labor Law Consultation service, a worker seeking unpaid-wage guidance can receive an answer through a government-branded counseling interface, while the terms define the service as non-binding information and direct matters to expert channels. The issue is not only accuracy. Consultation-like reliance is invited at the interface while legal effect, verification, and responsibility are displaced into a lower-salience terms layer.

Existing STS work on critical AI literacy and AI power has demystified bias, opacity, and sociotechnical control. This paper focuses on output-reliance situations: moments when AI-generated answers, recommendations, evaluations, code, or actions are treated as usable work before warranty, verification, reversal, and responsibility are visible.

Methodologically, the paper reads terms, interface boundary statements, automation controversies, and incident accounts. The main case is Korea's AI labor-law advice interface; AI-mediated customer service automation provides the service and labor context; PocketOS/Cursor serves as a contrast case showing how reliance on advice can extend toward reliance on execution.

I propose output-warranty literacy as a diagnostic extension of critical AI literacy. It asks who warrants an output, who verifies it, how harm can be reversed or compensated, and who remains accountable after failure. Its practical stake is to turn vague dissatisfaction with automation into contestable claims about verification failure, escalation blockage, repair burden, compensation absence, and responsibility displacement.

The STS contribution is to shift analysis from model capability to output-reliance chains, showing how black-box automation redistributes verification, repair, and responsibility and where workers, service users, unions, and public-interest intermediaries can contest that redistribution.

**Note:** This is an accepted conference abstract record, not a full paper.