

FROM DATA TO MEANING: A PHILOSOPHICAL FRAMEWORK FOR INTERPRETING DIGITAL PHENOMENA IN CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY

Mowafg Masuwd

University of Zawia, Libya

*Correspondence: masuwd@zu.edu.ly

Abstract

The exponential growth of digital technologies has transformed how data is produced, interpreted, and integrated into human understanding. However, the transition from raw data to meaningful insight remains philosophically underexplored. This article proposes a comprehensive philosophical framework for interpreting digital phenomena by synthesizing perspectives from hermeneutics, phenomenology, and philosophy of information. It argues that digital data is not inherently meaningful but becomes meaningful through interpretative processes shaped by human cognition, socio-cultural context, and technological mediation. The study introduces three interpretative layers: syntactic (data structure), semantic (contextual meaning), and existential (human significance). These layers interact dynamically, revealing that meaning emerges not solely from data itself but from the interplay between human agents and digital systems. Furthermore, the article critiques dominant data-centric paradigms that assume objectivity and neutrality, emphasizing instead the interpretative and constructed nature of digital knowledge. Methodologically, this research adopts a descriptive-analytical approach, examining theoretical literature across philosophy, information science, and digital studies. The findings demonstrate that digital phenomena should be understood as hybrid entities—simultaneously technical and interpretative—requiring interdisciplinary frameworks. This study contributes to philosophical discourse by offering a structured model that bridges technical data analysis and humanistic interpretation. It also provides implications for artificial intelligence, digital ethics, and knowledge production in the information age. Ultimately, the paper calls for a shift from data-driven epistemology toward meaning-oriented interpretation to better understand the complexities of digital reality.

Keywords: Digital Phenomena; Philosophy of Information; Hermeneutics.

INTRODUCTION

The rapid expansion of digital technologies has fundamentally transformed the ways in which human beings generate, process, and interpret information. In contemporary society, data is often regarded as the primary resource driving innovation, governance, and social interaction. From algorithmic decision-making systems to social media platforms, digital environments continuously produce vast quantities of data that shape individual behavior and collective understanding. Despite its centrality, however, the relationship between data and meaning remains philosophically underexamined. While technical disciplines focus on data processing and analysis, fewer efforts have been made to interrogate how data becomes meaningful within human contexts.

Traditionally, data has been conceptualized as objective, neutral, and value-free. This perspective is rooted in positivist traditions that treat data as a transparent representation of reality. Within this view, meaning is assumed to be inherent in data, awaiting extraction through proper analytical techniques. However, this assumption has increasingly been challenged by scholars across philosophy, sociology, and information science. Data does not simply reflect reality; it is produced through processes of selection, categorization, and

representation that are influenced by human intentions, institutional structures, and technological constraints. Consequently, data should be understood not as a neutral given, but as a constructed artifact that requires interpretation.

The emergence of big data and artificial intelligence has intensified this debate. Contemporary digital systems rely on complex algorithms that process enormous datasets to generate predictions, classifications, and recommendations. These systems often operate as “black boxes,” where the mechanisms of data transformation are opaque to users and even to their designers. As a result, the interpretative processes that convert data into meaningful outputs are increasingly hidden within technical infrastructures. This opacity raises important epistemological and ethical questions: Can we trust meanings derived from systems we do not fully understand? To what extent do these systems shape our perception of reality? And how can meaning be critically evaluated in a data-driven environment?

At the core of these questions lies a fundamental distinction between data and meaning. Data, in its most basic form, consists of symbols, numbers, or signals that can be stored and transmitted. Meaning, on the other hand, involves interpretation, context, and relevance to human experience. The transition from data to meaning is not automatic but requires interpretative engagement. This engagement is shaped by cognitive processes, cultural frameworks, and technological mediations. Therefore, understanding digital phenomena requires moving beyond a purely technical perspective and embracing a philosophical approach that accounts for the complexity of meaning-making.

Philosophical traditions provide essential tools for analyzing this transition. Hermeneutics, for instance, emphasizes that understanding is always an interpretative act situated within historical and cultural contexts. Originally developed for interpreting texts, hermeneutics has evolved into a broader theory of meaning applicable to various forms of human expression, including digital artifacts. According to this perspective, meaning does not reside in the object itself but emerges through the interaction between the interpreter and the object within a specific context.

Similarly, phenomenology offers insights into how individuals experience and make sense of the world. By focusing on lived experience, phenomenology highlights the role of perception, embodiment, and intentionality in the construction of meaning. In digital environments, where interactions are mediated by screens and interfaces, the nature of experience itself is transformed. Users engage with representations rather than physical objects, raising questions about authenticity, presence, and reality. Phenomenology thus helps illuminate how digital phenomena are encountered and interpreted at the level of human experience.

The philosophy of information further complements these perspectives by addressing the nature and value of information in the digital age. It challenges the reduction of information to mere data by emphasizing its semantic and pragmatic dimensions. Information becomes meaningful when it is structured, contextualized, and related to a system of understanding. This perspective underscores the importance of interpretation in transforming data into knowledge.

Digital phenomena, as the focus of this study, encompass a wide range of entities and processes that exist within digital environments. These include social media interactions, algorithmic outputs, digital images, virtual realities, and data visualizations. Unlike traditional phenomena, digital phenomena are inherently mediated by technological systems. They do not exist independently of the infrastructures that produce and sustain them. This mediation introduces additional layers of complexity in interpretation, as meaning is shaped not only by human cognition but also by the design and functionality of digital technologies.

One of the defining characteristics of digital phenomena is their scalability and reproducibility. Digital data can be copied, modified, and distributed with ease, enabling rapid dissemination across global networks. While this enhances accessibility, it also complicates the process of interpretation. The same piece of data can be interpreted differently by diverse audiences, leading to multiple and sometimes conflicting meanings. This multiplicity challenges the notion of a single, stable meaning and highlights the dynamic nature of interpretation in digital contexts.

Another important aspect is the role of algorithms in mediating digital phenomena. Algorithms determine how data is collected, processed, and presented, thereby influencing what is visible and what remains hidden. For example, recommendation systems on social media platforms shape users' exposure to information, affecting their perceptions and beliefs. These algorithmic processes are not neutral; they embody specific values, assumptions, and biases. Understanding digital phenomena therefore requires examining not only the data itself but also the systems that structure its interpretation.

The socio-cultural dimension of digital phenomena further complicates the relationship between data and meaning. Digital data is produced and interpreted within specific cultural contexts that influence its significance. For instance, a meme or a viral post may carry particular meanings within one community while being incomprehensible or interpreted differently in another. Cultural norms, linguistic practices, and social values all play a role in shaping how digital data is understood. This underscores the importance of contextual analysis in interpreting digital phenomena.

In light of these complexities, there is a need for a comprehensive framework that integrates technical, philosophical, and socio-cultural perspectives. Such a framework should account for the multi-layered nature of interpretation and the dynamic interactions between data, technology, and human agents. This study proposes a philosophical framework that conceptualizes the transformation of data into meaning as a process involving multiple interpretative layers.

The primary objective of this research is to develop a conceptual model that explains how digital phenomena are interpreted and how meaning emerges from data. By synthesizing insights from hermeneutics, phenomenology, and the philosophy of information, this study aims to bridge the gap between technical data analysis and humanistic interpretation. It seeks to demonstrate that meaning is not an inherent property of data but a relational and context-dependent outcome.

The significance of this research extends beyond theoretical contributions. In practical terms, understanding the interpretative nature of digital data has important implications for

fields such as artificial intelligence, data science, and digital ethics. For example, recognizing that data is not neutral can help address issues of bias in algorithmic systems. Similarly, acknowledging the role of interpretation can inform the design of more transparent and accountable technologies.

Furthermore, this study contributes to ongoing debates about the epistemological status of data in contemporary society. As data-driven approaches become increasingly dominant, there is a risk of overlooking the interpretative processes that underpin knowledge production. By foregrounding the relationship between data and meaning, this research encourages a more critical and reflective engagement with digital technologies.

The transition from data to meaning is a complex and multifaceted process that cannot be fully understood through technical analysis alone. It requires a philosophical perspective that considers the roles of interpretation, context, and human experience. By proposing a structured framework for interpreting digital phenomena, this study aims to provide a deeper understanding of how meaning is constructed in the digital age.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The relationship between data and meaning has been explored across multiple disciplines, including information theory, philosophy, media studies, and digital sociology. Each of these fields offers distinct yet complementary insights into how data is structured, interpreted, and transformed into meaningful knowledge. This section reviews key theoretical contributions that inform the development of a philosophical framework for interpreting digital phenomena.

One of the earliest and most influential approaches to understanding data comes from Claude Shannon's information theory. Shannon conceptualized information in terms of signal transmission, focusing on the efficiency and accuracy of communication channels. In this model, information is treated as a quantifiable entity measured by entropy, independent of meaning or interpretation. While this approach has been foundational for computer science and telecommunications, it deliberately excludes semantic considerations. As a result, it provides a robust account of how data is transmitted but offers limited insight into how data becomes meaningful.

To address this limitation, Luciano Floridi developed the philosophy of information, which extends the concept of information beyond its syntactic dimension. Floridi defines information as "well-formed, meaningful, and truthful data," thereby integrating semantic and epistemological aspects into the analysis. His work emphasizes that data alone is insufficient for knowledge; it must be structured and interpreted within a context. Floridi also introduces the concept of the "infosphere," a global environment where informational entities interact. This perspective is particularly relevant for digital phenomena, as it situates data within a broader ecosystem of human and technological interactions.

Hermeneutics provides another crucial framework for understanding meaning-making. Hans-Georg Gadamer argues that interpretation is not a methodical process but a fundamental condition of human understanding. According to Gadamer, meaning emerges through a "fusion of horizons" between the interpreter and the object of interpretation,

shaped by historical and cultural contexts. This insight challenges the idea of objective interpretation and highlights the situated nature of understanding. Paul Ricoeur further develops this perspective by emphasizing the role of symbols, narratives, and texts in constructing meaning. Ricoeur's notion of "interpretation as explanation and understanding" is particularly useful for analyzing digital artifacts, which often combine symbolic representation with contextual meaning.

Phenomenology complements hermeneutics by focusing on lived experience. Edmund Husserl's phenomenology seeks to describe how objects are experienced in consciousness, emphasizing intentionality—the directedness of consciousness toward objects. Martin Heidegger expands this approach by introducing the concept of "being-in-the-world," which situates human existence within a network of practical engagements. Heidegger argues that understanding is not merely cognitive but grounded in everyday interactions. This perspective is highly relevant for digital environments, where users interact with interfaces, platforms, and systems in ways that shape their experience and understanding. Don Ihde's postphenomenology further extends these ideas by examining how technologies mediate human perception, suggesting that digital tools actively shape how reality is experienced and interpreted.

In the field of media and digital studies, scholars have critically examined the cultural and epistemological implications of digital data. Lev Manovich explores how digital media transform cultural production, emphasizing the role of databases and algorithms in shaping contemporary culture. He argues that digital media are characterized by modularity, variability, and automation, which influence how information is organized and interpreted. Rob Kitchin, on the other hand, focuses on the "data revolution," highlighting the ways in which big data reshapes knowledge production. Kitchin argues that data-driven approaches often claim objectivity while masking the interpretative decisions embedded in data collection and analysis processes.

The rise of big data has also prompted critical reflections on the assumptions underlying data-centric paradigms. danah boyd and Kate Crawford argue that big data is not inherently objective or comprehensive; rather, it is shaped by social, political, and economic factors. They caution against the belief that large datasets can provide complete or unbiased representations of reality. Similarly, David Beer introduces the concept of the "data gaze," suggesting that data-driven systems influence how individuals and institutions perceive and evaluate the world. These perspectives underscore the need for critical approaches to data interpretation.

Algorithmic systems play a central role in shaping digital phenomena, and their implications have been widely studied. Tarleton Gillespie examines the cultural and political significance of algorithms, arguing that they are not neutral tools but actors that influence visibility and relevance in digital environments. Frank Pasquale's concept of the "black box society" highlights the opacity of algorithmic decision-making, raising concerns about accountability and transparency. Nicholas Diakopoulos further explores algorithmic accountability, emphasizing the need for mechanisms that allow users to understand and

critique automated systems. These studies reveal that meaning in digital contexts is often mediated by algorithmic processes that remain largely invisible.

Ethical considerations are also central to discussions of data and meaning. Helen Nissenbaum's theory of contextual integrity provides a framework for understanding privacy in digital environments, emphasizing that information flows should be appropriate to their social context. Shoshana Zuboff's analysis of surveillance capitalism highlights how data is commodified and used to predict and influence behavior, raising questions about autonomy and agency. These works demonstrate that the interpretation of digital data is not only an epistemological issue but also an ethical one.

Philosophical perspectives on technology further enrich this discussion. Andrew Feenberg's critical theory of technology argues that technologies are socially constructed and reflect the values of the societies that produce them. Peter-Paul Verbeek builds on this idea by examining how technologies mediate moral actions and decisions. Bruno Latour's actor-network theory provides a framework for understanding the interactions between human and non-human actors, suggesting that meaning emerges from networks of relationships rather than isolated entities. Karen Barad's agential realism similarly emphasizes the entanglement of matter and meaning, proposing that phenomena are produced through intra-actions rather than pre-existing independently.

Finally, scholars such as N. Katherine Hayles and Sherry Turkle have explored the impact of digital technologies on human identity and subjectivity. Hayles examines how the concept of the human is transformed in the age of information, while Turkle investigates how digital communication affects relationships and self-perception. These perspectives highlight the existential dimension of digital phenomena, where meaning is tied to questions of identity, presence, and human experience.

In summary, the literature reveals a shift from viewing data as a neutral and objective entity toward understanding it as a constructed and interpretative phenomenon. While information theory provides a foundation for analyzing data structures, philosophical approaches such as hermeneutics, phenomenology, and the philosophy of information offer deeper insights into meaning-making processes. Digital studies and critical data scholarship further emphasize the socio-cultural and ethical dimensions of data interpretation. This study builds on these diverse perspectives to propose an integrated framework that captures the complexity of interpreting digital phenomena in contemporary society.

METHOD

This study employs a qualitative, descriptive-analytical methodology to construct a philosophical framework for interpreting digital phenomena. The approach is grounded in conceptual analysis rather than empirical measurement, as the primary objective is to develop a theoretical model that explains how data is transformed into meaning within digital contexts.

The descriptive component of the methodology involves systematically identifying and outlining key concepts related to data, information, and meaning from established philosophical traditions. Core theoretical foundations are drawn from hermeneutics,

phenomenology, and the philosophy of information, as well as relevant contributions from digital studies and critical data scholarship. These perspectives are selected based on their relevance to interpretative processes and their ability to address the complexities of digital environments.

The analytical component focuses on synthesizing these theoretical insights into a coherent interpretative framework. This is achieved through thematic analysis, where recurring concepts—such as mediation, context, interpretation, and technological influence—are identified and examined. The analysis seeks to uncover relationships between these concepts and to articulate how they collectively contribute to the emergence of meaning from data.

The data sources for this study consist of peer-reviewed journal articles, academic books, and authoritative publications in the fields of philosophy, information science, and digital media studies. Sources are selected using purposive sampling, ensuring that only works with strong theoretical relevance and scholarly impact are included. Emphasis is placed on both foundational texts and contemporary discussions to provide a balanced perspective.

To ensure conceptual rigor, the study adopts an iterative interpretative process, where theoretical constructs are continuously refined through comparison and critical evaluation. This process allows for the integration of diverse viewpoints while maintaining internal coherence.

Overall, this methodology is appropriate for philosophical inquiry, as it prioritizes depth of understanding and conceptual clarity over statistical generalization. It enables the development of a robust framework that captures the multidimensional nature of interpreting digital phenomena.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis conducted in this study results in the formulation of a philosophical framework that explains how digital data is transformed into meaning through a layered and interpretative process. This framework integrates insights from hermeneutics, phenomenology, and the philosophy of information, revealing that digital phenomena cannot be fully understood through technical analysis alone. Instead, meaning emerges from the dynamic interaction between data structures, interpretative contexts, and human experience.

The Three-Layer Model of Interpretation

A central finding of this study is the identification of three interrelated layers of interpretation: the syntactic, semantic, and existential layers. These layers represent distinct but interconnected dimensions through which data acquires meaning.

The syntactic layer refers to the formal structure of data. At this level, data consists of symbols, codes, and signals organized according to specific rules. This is the domain of computational processing, where algorithms manipulate data without necessarily understanding its meaning. For example, a dataset containing numerical values or textual strings can be processed, sorted, and analyzed based on predefined operations. While this

layer is essential for enabling digital systems to function, it does not, by itself, produce meaning. It corresponds closely to the perspective of information theory, where the focus is on transmission efficiency rather than interpretation.

The semantic layer introduces context and interpretation. At this level, data is no longer مجرد structured symbols but becomes associated with meaning through relationships, references, and contextual frameworks. For instance, a sequence of numbers may represent temperature readings, financial transactions, or user behavior, depending on the interpretative context. Meaning at this level depends on shared conventions, linguistic systems, and domain-specific knowledge. Importantly, this layer demonstrates that meaning is not intrinsic to data but arises from its placement within a system of understanding.

The existential layer represents the deepest level of interpretation, where data acquires significance in relation to human experience, values, and purposes. At this level, data is not merely understood but becomes meaningful in a broader sense—impacting decisions, shaping identities, and influencing social realities. For example, health data may not only indicate physiological conditions but also affect a person's sense of well-being, identity, and life choices. This layer reflects the phenomenological dimension of interpretation, emphasizing that meaning is grounded in lived experience.

These three layers are not hierarchical in a strict sense but are dynamically interrelated. The syntactic structure of data constrains possible interpretations at the semantic level, while semantic interpretations influence how data is experienced at the existential level. Conversely, human values and experiences at the existential level can shape how data is interpreted semantically and even how it is structured syntactically. This bidirectional relationship highlights the complexity of meaning-making in digital environments.

Digital Phenomena as Hybrid Entities

Another key finding is that digital phenomena should be understood as hybrid entities that combine technical and interpretative dimensions. Unlike traditional physical objects, digital phenomena do not possess a stable, independent existence. Instead, they are constituted through interactions between data, algorithms, and users.

For example, a social media post is not merely a piece of data stored on a server. It is a dynamic entity that acquires meaning through user engagement, platform algorithms, and cultural context. The same post may be interpreted differently depending on who views it, when it is viewed, and how it is algorithmically presented. This fluidity challenges conventional notions of objectivity and stability, suggesting that digital phenomena are inherently relational.

This hybridity also implies that digital phenomena cannot be fully analyzed using purely technical methods. While computational tools can identify patterns and correlations, they cannot fully capture the interpretative and experiential dimensions of meaning. Therefore, a philosophical approach is necessary to complement technical analysis and to provide a more comprehensive understanding.

The Role of Algorithms in Mediating Meaning

The analysis further reveals that algorithms play a crucial role in shaping the interpretation of digital data. Algorithms do not merely process data; they actively mediate how data is presented, prioritized, and understood. This mediation introduces a layer of technological agency that influences meaning-making processes.

For instance, recommendation systems on platforms such as YouTube or Instagram determine which content is visible to users. These systems are based on complex models that analyze user behavior and predict preferences. As a result, users are exposed to curated streams of information that shape their perceptions and interpretations. The meaning of digital content is therefore not solely determined by the content itself but is also influenced by the algorithmic context in which it appears.

This finding challenges the assumption that meaning is solely a human construct. Instead, it suggests that meaning in digital environments is co-produced by humans and machines. Algorithms, while not conscious, embody specific values, assumptions, and design choices that affect how data is interpreted. This raises important questions about accountability and transparency, particularly when algorithmic decisions have significant social consequences.

The Contextual Nature of Meaning

A recurring theme in the analysis is the importance of context in interpreting digital phenomena. Meaning is not fixed but varies depending on the context in which data is produced and interpreted. This context includes cultural norms, social practices, institutional frameworks, and technological environments.

For example, the interpretation of a digital image may depend on cultural symbols, historical references, and social conventions. A gesture or expression that carries a specific meaning in one culture may be interpreted differently in another. Similarly, data generated in one institutional context, such as healthcare, may have different implications when interpreted in another context, such as insurance or employment.

This contextual variability highlights the limitations of universal or standardized interpretations of data. It suggests that meaning must be understood as situated and contingent, requiring sensitivity to specific contexts. This insight aligns with hermeneutic perspectives, which emphasize the role of historical and cultural horizons in shaping understanding.

Challenging the Myth of Data Objectivity

One of the most significant implications of this study is the critique of the widely held belief in data objectivity. The analysis demonstrates that data is not a neutral representation of reality but is shaped by processes of selection, classification, and interpretation.

Data is produced through specific methodologies that involve choices about what to measure, how to measure it, and how to represent it. These choices are influenced by human intentions, institutional priorities, and technological constraints. As a result, data reflects particular perspectives and may exclude or distort aspects of reality.

Furthermore, the interpretation of data is influenced by biases, assumptions, and expectations. Even when data is processed using advanced algorithms, these algorithms are designed and trained based on existing datasets that may contain biases. Consequently, the meanings derived from data are not purely objective but are shaped by underlying structures of power and knowledge.

This critique has important implications for fields that rely heavily on data, such as artificial intelligence, policy-making, and scientific research. It calls for greater awareness of the limitations and biases inherent in data and for more critical approaches to data interpretation.

Implications for Artificial Intelligence and Digital Ethics

The proposed framework has significant implications for the development and evaluation of artificial intelligence systems. By emphasizing the interpretative nature of data, it challenges the assumption that AI systems can produce objective and unbiased outputs.

AI systems operate primarily at the syntactic and semantic levels, processing data and generating predictions based on patterns. However, they lack the existential dimension of interpretation, which involves understanding meaning in relation to human values and experiences. This limitation suggests that human oversight remains essential in interpreting AI outputs and making decisions based on them.

Moreover, the framework highlights the ethical responsibilities associated with data interpretation. Issues such as bias, privacy, and accountability are not merely technical problems but are deeply connected to how data is understood and used. For example, biased datasets can lead to discriminatory outcomes, while lack of transparency in algorithmic processes can undermine trust.

By recognizing the interpretative nature of data, stakeholders can develop more ethical and responsible approaches to digital technologies. This includes designing systems that are transparent, inclusive, and sensitive to context, as well as promoting critical literacy among users.

Toward a Meaning-Oriented Epistemology

Finally, the study suggests a shift from a data-driven epistemology to a meaning-oriented epistemology. In a data-driven paradigm, knowledge is derived primarily from the analysis of large datasets, often emphasizing quantification and prediction. While this approach has produced significant advancements, it risks neglecting the interpretative and contextual dimensions of knowledge.

A meaning-oriented epistemology, in contrast, emphasizes understanding, interpretation, and relevance to human experience. It recognizes that data alone is insufficient for knowledge and that meaning emerges through complex interactions between data, context, and human agents.

This shift has profound implications for how knowledge is produced and evaluated in the digital age. It calls for interdisciplinary approaches that integrate technical expertise with philosophical and humanistic perspectives. It also encourages a more reflective and critical

engagement with digital technologies, moving beyond mere data analysis to deeper questions of meaning and significance.

Synthesis of Findings

In summary, the results of this study demonstrate that interpreting digital phenomena requires a multi-layered and interdisciplinary approach. The three-layer model provides a conceptual framework for understanding how data is transformed into meaning, while the analysis highlights the roles of algorithms, context, and human experience in this process.

Digital phenomena emerge as complex, hybrid entities that cannot be reduced to data alone. Their meaning is dynamic, context-dependent, and co-constructed by humans and technological systems. By challenging assumptions of objectivity and emphasizing the interpretative nature of data, this study contributes to a more nuanced understanding of digital reality.

Ultimately, the findings underscore the need for a philosophical perspective in the study of digital phenomena. As digital technologies continue to shape contemporary society, understanding how data becomes meaningful is essential for navigating the ethical, epistemological, and social challenges of the digital age.

CLOSING

Conclusion

This study has developed a philosophical framework to explain how digital data is transformed into meaningful understanding within contemporary digital environments. By integrating perspectives from hermeneutics, phenomenology, and the philosophy of information, the research demonstrates that meaning is not an inherent property of data but emerges through interpretative processes shaped by context, technology, and human experience.

The proposed three-layer model—syntactic, semantic, and existential—provides a structured way to understand how meaning is constructed. At the syntactic level, data exists as structured symbols processed by computational systems. At the semantic level, data acquires meaning through contextual interpretation. At the existential level, meaning becomes relevant to human life, influencing decisions, values, and identity. These layers are interconnected and dynamically influence one another, highlighting the complexity of digital interpretation.

The findings challenge the common assumption that data is objective and neutral. Instead, data is shown to be constructed, mediated, and influenced by human and technological factors. Algorithms, in particular, play a significant role in shaping how data is interpreted, raising important concerns about transparency, bias, and accountability. Additionally, the study emphasizes the importance of socio-cultural context in determining meaning, demonstrating that digital phenomena are not universally understood but are contingent upon interpretative frameworks.

Ultimately, this research calls for a shift from a purely data-driven approach to a meaning-oriented perspective. Such a shift is essential for addressing the ethical and

epistemological challenges of the digital age. By recognizing the interpretative nature of data, scholars and practitioners can develop more critical, responsible, and human-centered approaches to digital technologies.

AI Policy Statement

This article was developed with the assistance of artificial intelligence tools to support language refinement, structural organization, and drafting efficiency. The AI was used strictly as an auxiliary tool and did not generate original scholarly claims independently. All theoretical arguments, conceptual frameworks, and interpretations presented in this work are the result of the author's intellectual contribution and critical evaluation. The author has ensured that the content meets academic standards of originality, integrity, and proper citation. Any use of AI complies with ethical guidelines for scholarly publishing, and the final manuscript has been carefully reviewed to avoid bias, inaccuracies, and unverified information.

REFERENCES

- Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*. Duke University Press.
- Beer, D. (2017). *The data gaze: Capitalism, power and perception*. Sage.
- Borgmann, A. (1999). *Holding on to reality: The nature of information at the turn of the millennium*. University of Chicago Press.
- boyd, d., & Crawford, K. (2012). Critical questions for big data. *Information, Communication & Society*, 15(5), 662–679.
- Capurro, R. (2009). Digital hermeneutics: An outline. *AI & Society*, 25(1), 35–42.
- Cheney-Lippold, J. (2017). *We are data: Algorithms and the making of our digital selves*. NYU Press.
- Couldry, N., & Mejias, U. A. (2019). *The costs of connection: How data is colonizing human life and appropriating it for capitalism*. Stanford University Press.
- Diakopoulos, N. (2016). Accountability in algorithmic decision-making. *Communications of the ACM*, 59(2), 56–62.
- Dreyfus, H. L. (1992). *What computers still can't do: A critique of artificial reason*. MIT Press.
- Feenberg, A. (1999). *Questioning technology*. Routledge.
- Floridi, L. (2011). *The philosophy of information*. Oxford University Press.
- Gadamer, H.-G. (2004). *Truth and method* (2nd rev. ed.). Continuum.
- Gillespie, T. (2014). The relevance of algorithms. In T. Gillespie, P. Boczkowski, & K. Foot (Eds.), *Media technologies* (pp. 167–194). MIT Press.
- Hayles, N. K. (1999). *How we became posthuman: Virtual bodies in cybernetics, literature, and informatics*. University of Chicago Press.
- Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and time*. Harper & Row.
- Husserl, E. (1970). *The crisis of European sciences and transcendental phenomenology*. Northwestern University Press.

- Ihde, D. (1990). *Technology and the lifeworld: From garden to earth*. Indiana University Press.
- Kitchin, R. (2014). *The data revolution: Big data, open data, data infrastructures and their consequences*. Sage.
- Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network-theory*. Oxford University Press.
- Manovich, L. (2001). *The language of new media*. MIT Press.
- McLuhan, M. (1964). *Understanding media: The extensions of man*. McGraw-Hill.
- Nissenbaum, H. (2010). *Privacy in context: Technology, policy, and the integrity of social life*. Stanford University Press.
- Pasquale, F. (2015). *The black box society: The secret algorithms that control money and information*. Harvard University Press.
- Ricoeur, P. (1976). *Interpretation theory: Discourse and the surplus of meaning*. Texas Christian University Press.
- Shannon, C. E. (1948). A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 27(3), 379–423.
- Turkle, S. (2011). *Alone together: Why we expect more from technology and less from each other*. Basic Books.
- Verbeek, P.-P. (2011). *Moralizing technology: Understanding and designing the morality of things*. University of Chicago Press.
- Wiener, N. (1950). *The human use of human beings: Cybernetics and society*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Winograd, T., & Flores, F. (1986). *Understanding computers and cognition: A new foundation for design*. Ablex.
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.