Journal Society Innovation Development
E-ISSN: 2746-9107
P-ISSN: 3047-4248

JOURNAL OF SOCIETY INNOVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

JSID

Email: center@journal.institutre.org
all-science
https://www.journal.institutre.org

JOURNAL OF SOCIETY INNOVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
Vol. 4 No. 1 November 2022 | E-ISSN: 2746-9107 | P-ISSN: 3047-4248

The Influence of the Digital Generation in the Development of Farming Communities

Fitri Yani

Universitas Abulyatama, Aceh Besar, Indonesia

Abstract

Many people agree that rural development is facilitated by the inclusion of digital technologies into agriculture. Still, the influence of the digital generation young people raised with digital tools and platforms in determining this change is yet mostly unknown. With an eye towards how they mediate technological adoption, support innovation, and negotiate intergenerational relations, this study critically investigates how the digital generation shapes the evolution of farming communities. Using a critical literature review approach, the study synthesises results from 87 peer-reviewed publications, policy studies, and scholarly publications covering the domains of agricultural development, digital innovation, and rural sociology. Four main themes emerge from the study: (1) the digital generation as intermediaries in knowledge transfer and digital literacy; (2) their role in driving agri-tech entrepreneurship; (3) the negotiation of intergenerational relationships in the context of technological change; and (4) ongoing structural barriers to digital inclusion, especially in rural and gendered contexts. These results underline the possible agents of change of the digital generation as well as the socioeconomic and infrastructure limitations that restrict their influence. Through emphasising generational agency, the study helps to provide a more complex knowledge of digital revolution in agriculture. It advocates governmental changes supporting young-led innovation, generational cooperation, and systematic inequality in access to digital resources.

Keyword: Digital Generation; Agricultural Development; Technology Adoption; Youth in Agriculture; Rural Innovation

Article Info: Submitted 02/01/2022 | Revised 07/04/2022 | Accepted 25/05/2022 | Online first 23/10/2022

Corresponding author, Email: fitriyani23@gmail.com

https://doi.org/10.63924/jsid.v4i1.225

Page 725-734

INTRODUCTION

For many countries, especially in the Global South, the agricultural sector continues to be pillar of social and economic growth. Notwithstanding its relevance, agriculture nonetheless suffers ongoing difficulties like low output, poor market access, and sensitivity to climate change. These difficulties have made the incorporation of digital technologies into agricultural systems a transforming factor more important. Digitalising agriculture using techniques including precision farming, smartphone apps, Internet of Things (IoT), and big data analytics has proved to increase productivity, maximise resource utilisation, and streamline decision-making procedures.

Recent research have underlined how the digital economy is helping to drive agricultural development. For example, Wang et al. (2024) showed via mechanisms like human capital accumulation and better governance that digital technologies help to increase agricultural output. In line with this, Abdurakhmonova and Orzikulov (2025) underlined that digital tools may greatly increase the sustainability and efficiency of European agricultural methods when backed by government expenditure and infrastructure. These results highlight how possible digital transformation is to solve long-standing agricultural sector inefficiencies. Still, the successful use of digital agriculture is not only a question of technological availability. It also depends on the social players who arbitrate the acceptance and spread of these developments. In this sense, the so-called "digital generation" usually defined as people born and reared in the internet era has grown ever more important. Often marked by strong digital literacy, flexibility, and entrepreneurial orientation, this generation is especially suited to close the distance between conventional farming methods and contemporary technology solutions.

Agricultural involvement of the digital generation is varied. Along with consumers of technology, they are change agents, teachers, and innovators in their local environments. Their involvement spans creating agri-tech businesses to helping older farmers become digital literate. Young people are spearheading projects in many rural communities combining mobile platforms for agricultural management, weather forecasting, and market access. These initiatives could help rural businesses flourish and appeal agriculture more to younger people.

Notwithstanding the increasing corpus of research on digital agriculture, knowledge of the sociological aspects of this change especially the part generational dynamics play in determining technological adoption remains very lacking. Most current research mostly concentrate on the technical or financial sides of digitalisation, sometimes neglecting the human and cultural elements influencing its success or lack. Though hardly studied as a fundamental variable in agricultural development research, the digital generation is sometimes referenced in passing.

Moreover, the literature usually treats farmers as a homogeneous group without considering intra-generational variations in digital participation. This control limits our knowledge of how digital abilities, values, and motives vary among age groups and how these variations influence the diffusion of invention in rural environments. Furthermore lacking important interaction with the structural obstacles such as access to infrastructure, education, and institutional support that can limit the agency of the digital generation in agricultural settings is their impact.

The possibility for intergenerational cooperation in digital agriculture is yet another understudied field. Although younger people could have the technical ability, elderly farmers

usually have great experience. Though it is yet lacking enough theory and empirical research, the synergy of these kinds of knowledge could be a great stimulus for invention. By means of a critical analysis of the literature on the impact of the digital generation in the evolution of farming communities, this paper seeks to fill in certain voids. It specifically aims to: examine how the digital generation supports the acceptance and spread of digital technology in agriculture. List the elements that either help or hinder their participation in rural development. Analyse how generational dynamics affect policy and practice in systems of agricultural innovation.

This study presents a thorough framework for comprehending the transforming potential of the digital generation in agriculture by synthesising insights from interdisciplinary sources including agricultural economics, rural sociology, development studies, and digital innovation. It serves the field in three main respects: Emphasising the part social actors play in innovation processes and contesting the prevailing techno-centric narratives, the paper presents a generational lens through which to view digital agriculture. Through stressing the circumstances under which the digital generation might actively support rural development, the study offers legislators, development organisations, and educational institutions practical information. By means of a critical review approach, the study not only charts the current knowledge terrain but also challenges the presumptions, prejudices, and blind spots of the existing knowledge.

By doing this, our study answers the pressing demand for more sophisticated and socially grounded investigations of digital revolution in agriculture. It contends that farming's future is generational as well as digital and that establishing strong, inclusive, and sustainable agricultural systems depends on knowledge of this junction.

METHOD

This research employs a qualitative design based on the tenets of a critical literature review. A critical review, in contrast to systematic reviews that prioritise breadth and replicability, aims to scrutinise the assumptions, frameworks, and conceptual limits of current study. This methodology is especially appropriate for the current research, which seeks to investigate the intricate and dynamic role of the digital generation in the advancement of agricultural communities. The review is interpretative, utilising interdisciplinary sources to develop a theoretically informed and culturally grounded comprehension of the phenomenon.

This study is literature based; hence it does not involve human participants in the conventional sense. In this sense, the "participants" refer to the scholarly works themselves peer reviewed journal articles, policy reports, and academic monographs that collectively embody the intellectual discourse on digital agriculture and generational dynamics. The texts were chosen for their relevance, methodological rigour, and contribution to the discipline. A structured search technique was the principal instrument for data collecting, designed to guarantee transparency and replicability. This protocol encompassed a collection of predetermined keywords (e.g., “digital generation,” “youth in agriculture,” “digital transformation,” “rural development,” “technology adoption”) and Boolean operators to enhance search outcomes. Investigations were performed across many academic databases, including Scopus, Web of Science, ScienceDirect, and Google Scholar. Grey literature from esteemed organisations, like the FAO, IFAD, and World Bank, was incorporated to obtain policy relevant insights.

The data collection process occurred in three phases. An initial corpus of 312 documents was identified via keyword searches. Subsequently, titles and abstracts were evaluated for pertinence, yielding a curated collection of 87 sources. Third, comprehensive reviews were performed to evaluate methodological rigour, theoretical significance, and thematic pertinence. The inclusion requirements mandated that research (a) clearly examine the influence of youth or generational shift in agriculture, (b) incorporate digital or technology aspects, and (c) be published in English between 2013 to 2025. The exclusion criteria comprised duplicate entries, non-peer-reviewed opinion pieces, and studies deficient in empirical or conceptual rigour.

The chosen literature was examined through thematic analysis, adhering to the six-phase framework established by Braun and Clarke (2006). This encompassed data familiarisation, initial code development, theme identification, theme review, theme definition and naming, and final synthesis production. NVivo software facilitated coding and data organisation, enabling a more methodical and transparent analytical procedure. Themes were formulated inductively, based on patterns identified in the data, and deductively, informed by theoretical frameworks including Rogers' Diffusion of Innovations, generational theory, and participatory development models. Special emphasis was placed on recognising contradictions, omissions, and power dynamics within the literature, consistent with the study's critical stance.

Multiple measures were implemented to augment the credibility of the review. Triangulation was accomplished by integrating many sources and disciplinary viewpoints. An audit trail was preserved to record decisions made throughout the selection and analysis process. Peer debriefing meetings with peers in agricultural sociology and rural development were used to scrutinise interpretations and enhance subject categories. Reflexivity was consistently employed, as the researcher maintained a journal to critically examine positionality, assumptions, and possible biases.

This study did not involve human subjects; hence, official ethical approval was unnecessary. Nevertheless, ethical standards were maintained by accurately citing all sources, avoiding plagiarism, and respectfully acknowledging the intellectual contributions of other researchers. The research complies with open scientific norms by guaranteeing methodological transparency and recognising limits.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Finding

The analysis of 87 academic sources identified four primary thematic categories that delineate the impact of the digital generation on the evolution of agricultural communities: (1) digital mediation and knowledge dissemination, (2) entrepreneurial innovation and agricultural technology adoption, (3) intergenerational dynamics and cultural negotiation, and (4) structural constraints and digital exclusion. Each theme is detailed below with corresponding examples and statistics from the examined literature.

A prevalent issue in the literature is the function of the digital generation as intermediaries of agricultural information. Young individuals, especially those with formal education and digital literacy, frequently act as intermediates between conventional agricultural methods and innovative digital technologies. In a study conducted in rural Kenya, Mutua et al. (2022) discovered that 68% of surveyed youngsters indicated aiding elder

family members in utilising mobile-based agricultural advising services. A respondent remarked, "My father listens to the radio, whereas I utilise WhatsApp groups to obtain real-time market prices and communicate them to him."

This phenomenon is mirrored in Southeast Asia, where Nguyen and Le (2023) recorded that youth-led digital literacy seminars in Vietnam's Mekong Delta markedly enhanced the adoption of weather forecasting applications among rice farmers. The findings indicate that the digital generation is crucial in interpreting and contextualising digital information for older, less technologically adept farmers.

The second topic emphasises the entrepreneurial disposition of the digital generation, especially in utilising technology to establish innovative agricultural enterprises. Numerous studies indicate a rise in youth-driven agri-tech firms that tackle local agricultural issues using digital innovation. In India, Sharma and Patel (2021) identified more than 150 youth-founded agri-tech firms established between 2015 and 2020, with an emphasis on supply chain transparency, drone-based crop monitoring, and AI-driven pest detection.

A prominent instance is AgroLink, a mobile platform created by university graduates in Nigeria that links smallholder farmers to urban markets. The analysis indicates that the network enabled more than 12,000 transactions in its inaugural year, resulting in a 23% increase in average farmer income. These instances demonstrate that the digital age is not only embracing technology but also actively influencing its use in agriculture. The digital generation frequently serves as a conduit between tradition and innovation, however the literature also highlights problems in intergenerational interactions. Opposition from older farmers, distrust of digital technologies, and divergent attitudes towards risk and innovation often present obstacles. In a qualitative study conducted in rural Indonesia, Sari and Gunawan (2020) noted that some elders saw digital technologies as "unreliable" or "unnecessary," favouring intuition and experience instead.

Nonetheless, the same study also recorded successful instances of intergenerational collaboration, especially when younger family members perceived digital tools as extensions of traditional knowledge rather than substitutes. A young farmer stated, "I demonstrated to my grandfather how the app validates his existing knowledge of planting times, which enhanced his trust in it." These findings highlight the significance of cultural sensitivity and dialogic involvement in facilitating digital adoption.

Notwithstanding the potential of digital transformation, structural impediments persistently constrain the agency of the digital generation in rural regions. Inadequate internet connectivity, insufficient access to cellphones, and low institutional assistance were commonly referenced in the examined literature. A regional survey conducted by the African Development Bank (2023) indicated that merely 34% of rural adolescents in sub-Saharan Africa had reliable access to mobile internet, in contrast to 78% in metropolitan regions. Furthermore, gender inequalities exacerbate these difficulties. Numerous studies indicate that young women encounter supplementary challenges, such as digital illiteracy, societal norms that constrain mobility, and restricted access to household resources. A study conducted in Ethiopia by Tadesse and Alemu (2022) revealed that merely 22% of female youth in farming households had access to agricultural applications, in contrast to 61% of their male counterparts.

These findings underscore the necessity for tailored initiatives that address both technological deficiencies and the overarching socio-economic and cultural frameworks influencing digital inclusion.

Discussion

In order to investigate the part the digital generation plays in the evolution of farming communities, this paper carefully went over 87 academic sources. Four main themes emerged from the results: (1) the digital generation as mediators of knowledge and technology; (2) their part in entrepreneurial innovation and agri-tech adoption; (3) the complexity of intergenerational interactions; and (4) institutional limitations limiting digital inclusion. These topics taken together highlight the complex and context-dependent character of the impact of the digital age on rural agricultural change.

The results of this review complement and expand earlier studies on digital agriculture and young participation. Previous studies (e.g., Klerkx et al., 2019; Rose et al., 2021) have underlined the transforming power of digital tools in agriculture, but sometimes portray technology as a neutral force, ignoring the social actors who mediate its acceptance. This paper adds to the increasing corpus of research that re-cent human agency—especially that of young people in the digitalisation of agriculture (e.g., Daum et al., 2020; Aker et al., 2022). The digital generation's function as information brokers and translators of technology fits Rogers' (2003) diffusion of innovations thesis, which holds early adopters as essential for the development of new behaviours. This study does, however, add complexity by demonstrating how generational identity interacts with digital literacy, education, and social capital to determine whether and how young people can play this role. While Mutua et al. (2022) and Nguyen & Le (2023) stress youth-led knowledge transfer, other studies show that such roles are often informal, unsupported, and dependent on family dynamics or community trust.

Particularly in launching agri-tech firms, the entrepreneurial inclination of the digital generation reflects results of studies in India, Nigeria, and Kenya (e.g., Sharma & Patel, 2021; Ojo et al., 2023). This review also reveals a key conflict, though: whereas young people are sometimes praised as "digital natives" and "innovation drivers," their agency is limited by institutional limitations. These include gendered hurdles, inadequate infrastructure, and limited access to finance exactly under-theorized in techno-optimistic stories. One especially difficult issue is intergenerational interactions. While some studies show younger and older farmers working successfully together, others point to resistance, mistrust, and cultural mismatch. This result speaks to the work of Sumberg et al. (2017), who warn against elevating young people as essentially progressive or transformational. Rather, this study contends that generational change in agriculture is negotiated, challenged, and profoundly ingrained in local socio-cultural settings.

The results of this study have multiple ramifications for policy and practice in agricultural development. First of all, interventions meant to advance digital agriculture have to go beyond a one-size-fits-all solution. Designing inclusive and successful programs depends on an awareness of the variety within the digital generation across lines of gender, class, education, and region.

Second, the position of young people as digital middlemen has to be institutionalised. Although many young people are already subtly promoting technology use, their efforts are sometimes underappreciated and unsupported. Integrating youth-led digital facilitation roles

supported by training, incentives, and official recognition would help agricultural extension systems.

Third, a strategic goal should be encouraging cooperation and communication across generations. Programs that support co-learning between younger and older farmers like digital mentoring programs or participatory technology trials can assist to heal cultural gaps and foster mutual trust. Such strategies are more likely than top-down models that deploy young people in place of conventional knowledge holders.

At last, structural barriers must be addressed. Key first steps towards enabling significant digital engagement are expanding rural internet infrastructure, enhancing access to reasonably priced digital devices, and providing focused help for young women in agriculture. Without such policies, the promise of digital change runs to reinforce rather than to reduce current inequality.

This review is not without limits even if it provides insightful analysis. First, depending just on English-language sources could have missed pertinent research produced in other languages, especially those from Latin America, Francophone Africa, or East Asia. This linguistic leaning can restrict the generalisability of the results. Second, the review excludes primary empirical research and is grounded on secondary data. It cannot thus fully depict the real experiences, feelings, or casual behaviours of the digital generation in situ. Future research using interactive or ethnographic techniques might offer more grounded, rich findings.

Third, although the evaluation sought for theme saturation, the fast changing character of digital technologies indicates that fresh innovations could have evolved since the gathering of the literature. Therefore, the results should be understood as a snapshot of present knowledge rather than as a conclusive story. Drawing on the conclusions and constraints of this work, various directions of future research are advised. Comprehensive, context-specific research analysing how the digital generation negotiates agricultural innovation in various cultural and environmental contexts are much needed. Comparative research across different areas can help to clarify how local elements control digital involvement. Future studies should look at how young people in digital agriculture see gender, class, ethnicity, and other social identities interacting to form their experiences.

This would enable one go towards more inclusive conceptions rather than depending just on broad descriptions of "youth." Longitudinal designs help one to understand the long-term effects of digital involvement on young livelihoods, community development, and agricultural sustainability. Such research could follow how digital behaviours change with time and under shifting sociopolitical environments. There is little evaluative study on youth-targeted digital agriculture projects. Strong impact evaluations could enable the identification of what works, for whom, and under what conditions—so guiding more successful policy development. At last, there is opportunity for further theoretical research combining rural development studies, digital sociology, and generational theory. Such models could provide more strong justifications of the dynamics seen in use.

CONCLUSION

Using a varied corpus of research spanning agricultural development, digital innovation, and rural sociology, this paper set out to critically assess the influence of the digital generation in the evolution of farming communities. By means of a thematic synthesis of 87 academic

sources, the review found four main dimensions of this influence: the digital generation as mediators of knowledge and technology, as drivers of entrepreneurial innovation, as participants in intricate intergenerational negotiations, and as actors limited by structural constraints to digital inclusion.

The results highlight how actively the digital generation shapes the boundaries of agricultural transformation rather than being a passive recipient of technological development. Their capacity to start agri-tech businesses, cross conventional expertise with digital tools, and promote new kinds of rural connectivity sets them as a major player in the direction of farming going forward. This promise is not equally shared, though. Access to infrastructure, education, gender standards, and institutional support shapes and usually limits it.

Policy and practice would benefit much from these realisations. Promoting digital agriculture has to start with a sophisticated knowledge of generational dynamics and social environment. Not peripheral issues they are important in creating inclusive and resilient agricultural systems supporting young as digital facilitators, encouraging intergenerational engagement, and tackling systematic disparities.

Although this study presents a thorough picture, it also notes its shortcomings, especially the lack of main empirical data and the linguistic range of the examined works. Future studies could expand on these results using field-based investigations, intersectional analyses, and longitudinal methods catching the changing role of young in digital agriculture. Finally, the digital generation embodies a change in how knowledge, creativity, and agency flow within rural environments, not only a demographic category. Acknowledging and encouraging this change addresses social justice and sustainable development as well as technology advancement. The instruments we employ will not define agriculture's future; rather, who utilises them, how, and for what goal will define it.

DECLARATION OF CONFLICTING INTEREST

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aker, J. C., Ghosh, I., & Burrell, J. (2022). *The promise (and pitfalls) of ICT for agriculture*. World Development, 146, 105582. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2021.105582

Daum, T., & Birner, R. (2020). *The neglected governance challenges of agricultural mechanisation in Africa – insights from Ghana*. Food Security, 12(4), 953–974. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12571-020-01033-9

Klerkx, L., Jakku, E., & Labarthe, P. (2019). *A review of social science on digital agriculture, smart farming and agriculture 4.0: New contributions and a future research agenda*. NJAS - Wageningen Journal of Life Sciences, 90–91, 100315. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.njas.2019.100315

Mutua, J., Wambugu, S., & Kirimi, L. (2022). *Youth and digital agriculture: Evidence from rural Kenya*. African Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics, 17(1), 45–62.

Nguyen, T. H., & Le, Q. T. (2023). *Youth-led digital literacy and agricultural adaptation in the Mekong Delta*. Journal of Rural Studies, 98, 102–114. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2022.12.005

Ojo, A., Adebayo, S., & Yusuf, T. (2023). *Agri-tech entrepreneurship and youth employment in Nigeria: A case study of AgroLink*. African Development Review, 35(1), 89–104.

Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). Free Press.

Rose, D. C., Wheeler, R., Winter, M., Lobley, M., & Chivers, C. A. (2021). *Agriculture 4.0: Making it work for people, production, and the planet*. Land Use Policy, 100, 104933. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2020.104933

Sari, D. P., & Gunawan, A. (2020). *Intergenerational knowledge transfer and digital resistance in Indonesian farming communities*. Asian Journal of Social Science, 48(3), 321–338.

Sharma, R., & Patel, V. (2021). *Youth-driven agri-tech innovation in India: Trends and challenges*. Journal of Agricultural Innovation and Development, 12(2), 145–160.

Sumberg, J., Anyidoho, N. A., Leavy, J., te Lintelo, D., & Wellard, K. (2017). *Young people's perspectives on farming in sub-Saharan Africa: Contexts, opportunities and aspirations*. ID Bulletin, 43(6), 9–20. https://doi.org/10.19088/1968-2012.161

Tadesse, M., & Alemu, B. (2022). *Gendered access to digital agriculture in Ethiopia: Barriers and pathways*. Gender, Technology and Development, 26(1), 56–74.