

Original Research Article

Risk perception of pineapple farmers in the context of Covid-19 in Kerala

12 ABSTRACT

Aims : To assess the risk perception of pineapple farmers in the context of Covid 19.

Place and Duration of the study: Muvattupuzha block panchayat in Ernakulam district in Kerala between September 2021 to September 2022.

Methodology: The data relating to the study were collected during September 2021 from 120 pineapple farmers, using a well-structured interview schedule. Based on a four-point Likert scale, a Standardized Covid -19 Risk Perception Index (SCovRPI) was developed to assess the risk perception against fourteen identified risks faced by pineapple farmers during Covid 19. Farmers were asked to score the risks based on their level of perception.

Result : Realisation of low price, restrictions in transportation, low demand for pineapple in market, disruption in farming activities and non-availability of adequate hired labour are the major risks perceived by pineapple farmers during Covid 19.

Conclusion: findings of the study are relevant for policymakers as they work to seek remedial measures that enhance the living standards and resilience of pineapple farmers.

13 Keywords: Covid 19; Likert scale; Agricultural risk; Risk perception; Risk perception index; Pineapple
14 farmers; Ernakulam

15 1. INTRODUCTION

16 The world has experienced never-before-seen consequences as a result of the novel corona virus
17 outbreak (Covid-19). This pandemic had a significant negative impact on all sectors of human life,
18 including the economy, food security, and health (Saadat *et al.*, 2020). The deaths of thousands and
19 the severe impact on the global economy compelled the world to take emergency plans and
20 measures to contain the spread of the virus (Hockings *et al.*, 2020). Consequently, this has brought
21 the world into lockdown which shut down all the factories, industries, and businesses of human life.
22 Currently, it poses a threat to the food security of billions of people around the world, particularly in
23 developing countries (FAO, 2020a).

24 India is one of the worst affected countries due to Covid 19. The Covid-19 induced lockdown started
25 across the country in March 2020 and is still ongoing with restrictions in one form or the other. It
26 stalled the economy with complete closure imposed on enterprises across all sectors. Even though
27 agricultural activities were exempted from the lockdown, after a certain period, there were widespread
28 disruptions in the agricultural supply chain at the beginning of the lockdown (FAO, 2021b), which
29 further led to the scarcity of labour, disrupted supply chains, and lack of demand and logistics
30 restrictions in the agricultural sector (Cariappa *et al.*, 2021).

31 Kerala, the southernmost state in India is mainly a consumer state. Crops, livestock, fishing, and
32 forestry contributed only 8.03 per cent at constant prices to Kerala's Gross State Value Added in
33 2019-20 (GoK, 2021). Pineapple (*Ananas comosus*, family: Bromeliaceae) is one of the important
34 commercial fruit crops in Kerala, cultivated in an area of 9,152 ha with a production of 93,007 tonnes
35 and productivity of 10.1 t ha⁻¹ (GoK, 2020 a). Pineapple is mostly grown in the districts of Ernakulam,
36 Kottayam, Pathanamthitta and the low elevation areas of Idukki district in Kerala. Vazhakulam
37 pineapple in Ernakulam district is considered the best in quality, sweetness, aroma and flavour (Joy,
38 2013). Pineapple produced from the region has a long value chain and is marketed fresh in several
39 parts of the country, besides entering into processing activities. From here, fresh pineapple is being
40 sent to various states such as Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Maharashtra, Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh,
41 Rajasthan, Andhra Pradesh, Delhi etc. mainly by lorry transport. Limited quantity of fresh pineapple is
42 being exported to Gulf countries in special packings (PGA, 2018).

43 Pineapple as a horticultural crop and its higher perishability made this crop worst affected agricultural
44 crop during this pandemic in Kerala (GoK, 2020b). The pandemic shock posed several risks to
45 pineapple farmers which were production risk, price risk or any such type. Some of these risks include
46 loss of demand for pineapple in the market from other states. Due to the steep fall in pineapple
47 market price, many farmers could not pay off their debts (Kumar, 2020). In addition to this majority of
48 migrant labourers, who managed the farms, left for their hometowns when covid surge gripped the
49 state. Many of the farmers hired, labourers on daily wage basis which caused an increase in
50 production costs. All these had put the farmers in distress and there was also a report of farmer
51 suicide due to financial losses in pineapple cultivation.

52 Risk perceptions play a key role in the production and investment behaviour of farmers. Farmers'
53 management response to risks is influenced by their perception of the risks concerned. Based on how
54 they perceive risks, farmers implement a wide range of strategies to limit the impacts of agricultural
55 risk (Duong *et al.*, 2019). Knowledge of farmers' perception of risk, risk aversion and preferred risk
56 management strategies is essential for creating policy instruments to support agricultural risk
57 management (Sulewski and Gajewska, 2014). Hence the present study is focused on the study of risk
58 perception of pineapple farmers during Covid 19 pandemic in Kerala.

59 **2. MATERIAL AND METHODS**

60 **2.1. Study area**

61 The study was conducted in Ernakulam district of Kerala. The study area was selected purposively as
 62 it has the largest area under pineapple cultivation in Kerala. Out of the total area under pineapple in
 63 Kerala, 58.73 per cent lies in Ernakulam district which produces about 63 per cent of the production of
 64 the state in the year (GoK, 2020a). From the district, Muvattupuzha Block Panchayath was
 65 purposively selected based on the maximum area under pineapple cultivation. Three pineapple-
 66 growing grama panchayats viz., Avoly, Manjalloor, and Kalloorkkad were selected from the block
 67 panchayat randomly. Forty farmers each were randomly selected from these grama panchayaths
 68 making a total sample size of 120 farmers.

69 **2.2 Sampling and data collection**

70 The study used both primary and secondary data. A pretested well-structured interview schedule was
 71 used to collect primary data from farmers. Secondary data was collected from government offices and
 72 official records. According to the interview schedule, the type and frequency of risks in pineapple
 73 farming and marketing during the lockdown, and the risks perceived by the farmers.

74 **2.3. Empirical model**

75 **2.3.1. Measurement of risk perception and index.**

76 A pilot study was conducted during September 2021 to identify the risks faced by pineapple farmers in
 77 the context of Covid 19. Major risks as perceived by farmers were listed for the main study. They were
 78 fourteen in number. The four-point Likert scale as developed by Ahmed *et al.* (2021) was followed
 79 with some modifications and the farmers were asked to score the risks based on their level of
 80 perception. The scale ranges from “no risk perception” to “high risk perception” and in between these
 81 two boundaries, “low risk perception” and “medium risk perception” were added. Values were
 82 assigned to each perception scale in increasing order to make analysis easier, such as 0 for no risk
 83 perception, 1 for low risk perception, 2 for medium risk perception, and 3 for high risk perception. The
 84 respondents’ overall perception score was then calculated. Covid-19 Risk Perception Index (CovRPI)
 85 was developed in this study to assess farmers’ perceptions of potential risks based on their own
 86 experiences. In order to understand how the respondents perceived risk sources, the respondents
 87 were asked to rate their opinions on the fourteen identified risks. Equation. 1 was used to calculate
 88 the Covid - 19 Risk Perception Score (CovRPS).

89 Covid 19 Risk Perception Score (CovRPS) =

$$90 \quad \text{CovRPS} = \text{CovRPN} * 0 + \text{CovRPI} * 1 + \text{CovRPM} * 2 + \text{CovRPH} * 3 \quad (1)$$

91 Where CovRPN represents the number of respondents having no risk perception, CovRPI shows the
 92 number of respondents having low risk perception, CovRPM describes the number of respondents
 93 with medium risk perception, and CovRPH indicates the number of respondents with high-level risk
 94 perception. As the responses were gathered from 120 farmers, the Covid-19 Risk Perception Score
 95 (CovRPS) for each given constraint may fall between 0 and 360, with 0 denoting the minimum level of
 96 risk perception and 360 denoting the maximum level of risk perception. CovRPS was then modified

97 into a standardised index in order to further interpret the findings. Equation. 2 was used to calculate
 98 Standardized Covid Risk Perception Index (SCovRPI).

99 Standardized Covid-19 Risk Perception Index (SCovRPI) =

$$100 \quad \quad \quad \text{(Total CovRP score)/(Maximum attainable CovRP score)} * 100 \quad \quad \quad (2)$$

101

102 Standardized CovRP score was derived by dividing the Total CovRPS value by the maximum
 103 attainable CovRPS value and multiplying it by 100. The Total CovRPS score was obtained by
 104 multiplying each perception score with the total perception frequency for the respective constraint.
 105 The SCovRPI value ranges from 0 to 100, with 0 denoting the minimum level of standardized risk
 106 perception and 100 denoting the maximum level of standardized risk perception.

107 **3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

108 The results of the study explained the risk perception of pineapple farmers during Covid 19 in the
 109 study area.

110 **3.1 Risk Perception of pineapple farmers during Covid-19**

111 Covid-19 is one of the most serious hazards to life on earth. However, the risk perception of farmers
 112 varies significantly amongst individuals depending on their socioeconomic status and their education
 113 (Biswas *et al.*, 2015). Many researchers used the Likert scale to measure farmers' risk perception
 114 (Akanda and Howalder, 2015; Nugroho *et al.*, 2022; Bolarin *et al.*, 2022). In this study also Likert
 115 scale was used to measure the risk perception of farmers.

116 The risk perception of pineapple farmers during COVID-19 is described in table 1 along with scores
 117 and index values against respective pre-identified risks. Based on this score and index value these
 118 risks were ranked from 1 to 14. From the calculated data, it was observed that CovRPS on fourteen
 119 risks ranged from 97 to 337 (minimum score was 0 and maximum attainable score was 360). After
 120 analysing the CovRPS values, risks were classified based on quartiles as high-risk perception,
 121 medium-risk perception and low-risk perception. The first five risks were categorised as high risk
 122 perception (scores 308 to 337), the next five risks as medium risk perception (scores 179 to 279) and
 123 the last four risks were categorised as low risk perception (scores 97 to 177). The SCovRPI values for
 124 the fourteen constraints varied significantly, from 26.94 to 93.61, demonstrating the heterogeneity of
 125 the risk perception categories within pineapple farmers.

126 Findings presented in the table showed that the major risks due to Covid 19 faced by pineapple
 127 farmers were realisation of low prices, restrictions in the transportation of inputs and produce,
 128 disruptions in farming activities, low demand for the produce and non-availability of adequate hired
 129 labour. All of these have SCovRPI above 80. Bolarin *et al.* (2022) conducted a similar study on the
 130 challenges of Covid 19 pandemic among the small-scale farmers of Nigeria. The study also
 131 delineated the restrictions in transportation, labour shortages and difficulty in marketing as the major
 132 effects of Covid 19 pandemic.

133

134

135

136

137

138 **Table 1. Risk Perception of pineapple farmers during Covid – 19 in Ernakulam district.**

	Sl.No	Covid – 19 risks	High Perception	Medium Perception	Low Perception	No Perception	CovRPS	SCovRPI	Rank
High-risk perception	1	Realisation of Low price	99	19	2	0	337	93.61	1
	2	Restrictions in transportation of inputs and produce	97	20	3	0	334	92.78	2
	3	Disruption in farming activities	89	21	9	1	318	88.33	3
	4	Low demand for the produce	86	27	5	2	317	88.06	4
	5	Non availability of adequate hired labour	82	24	14	0	308	85.56	5
Medium-risk perception	6	Losses due to unsold produce	60	42	15	3	279	77.50	6
	7	Difficulty in loan repayment	57	33	18	12	255	70.83	7
	8	Higher labour cost for domestic labour	21	70	28	1	231	64.17	8
	9	Lack of processing facility	18	49	48	5	200	55.56	9
	10	Lack of storage facility	20	34	51	15	179	49.72	10
Low-risk perception	11	Health issues due to Covid 19	16	37	55	12	177	49.17	11
	12	Unavailability of credit	5	33	50	32	131	36.39	12

	13	Export Restrictions	4	14	72	30	112	31.11	13
	14	High rent paid for land	3	17	54	46	97	26.94	14

139

140 Among the risks, realisation of low prices for the produce ranked first (SCovRPI=93.61). It implied that
 141 lockdown and travel restrictions caused poor marketing and low demand for agricultural produce in
 142 the market but the supply of pineapple to the market remained the same. This led to the realisation of
 143 low prices and huge economic losses to farmers. According to Kumar (2020), the farm gate price has
 144 come down to ₹10 per kg compared to ₹40 per Kg in the previous year, due to the lockdown. Similar
 145 effects were also observed in other countries. A study conducted in Somalia claimed that most of the
 146 respondents faced difficulties in selling their produce in the market due to the drop in both demand
 147 and prices (FAO, 2021a). Saha and Bhattacharya (2020) also reported that sudden fall in prices of
 148 fruits and vegetables was the major difficulty faced by farmers at the beginning of the lockdown.

149 Restrictions in the transportation of inputs and produce (SCovRPI=92.78) ranked second. It is
 150 expected that quarantine restrictions and intra-state or inter-state border closures affected
 151 transportation of inputs for agriculture as well as the marketing of agricultural produce in the market.
 152 Rai (2020) revealed that out of the total production of pineapple from Kerala, only 9.5 per cent was
 153 consumed within the state and 90 per cent of pineapple is transported to other states outside Kerala.
 154 But due to the closure of borders, interstate transportation of pineapple was stopped. So, farmers
 155 and dealers were unable to find a market for their produce which led them to a huge financial loss.
 156 Similarly, the survey report on impact of Covid 19 among Indian farmers conducted by NABARD
 157 reported that 74 per cent of the all-India sample districts had an adverse impact on the marketing of
 158 their goods to APMCs/mandis through road transport (NABARD, 2020).

159 Another important constraint due to Covid 19 lockdown was disruptions in farming activities which has
 160 SCovRPI value of 88.33. Interstate restrictions in transportation had affected the timely availability of
 161 adequate inputs for farming operations. Local quarantine measures within the state and districts
 162 affected the movement of farmers and labours to fields. These restrictions ultimately led to the
 163 disruptions in carrying out different farming operations in a timely manner. It affected the yield of
 164 pineapple.

165 Low demand for the product in the market was another important constraint. Due to uncertainty and a
 166 reduction in people's spending capacity, demand for pineapple among consumers has dwindled. FAO
 167 (2020b), also reported the reduction in demand for horticultural products in the global market. The
 168 closure of restaurants, and processing factories and the restrictions on celebrating festivals and
 169 special occasions during the pandemic also reduced the demand for pineapple in the market. This
 170 result corroborates with a similar study by Pandya *et al.* (2021), which also found that the reduction in
 171 demand for agricultural produce in the market caused a 70 per cent drop in the prices of agricultural
 172 products.

173 Non-availability of adequate hired labour ranked fifth among the 14 constraints due to covid 19 with a
174 SCovRPI value of 85.56. Migrant labourers make up the majority of the workforce in pineapple farms
175 in Kerala. But strict quarantine measures and fear of viral transmission during the lockdown caused
176 widespread reverse migration of these labourers back to their home states, which led to a severe
177 labour shortage in the agricultural sector, especially in the pineapple sector of Kerala. It caused
178 severe disruptions in different farming activities including marketing. Similar findings were also
179 observed in a study conducted by Muthukumar and Salini (2021) on the impact of covid 19 on Indian
180 agriculture with special reference to Kerala that labour shortage was one of the major effects of Covid
181 19 in pineapple farming in Kerala. It is also close to the findings of the study conducted by Deconinck
182 *et al.* (2020) on the impact of covid 19 on food supply chains in different countries.

183 Next major difficulty was losses due to unsold produce. Summer months are the peak harvesting
184 season of pineapple in Kerala. Even though pineapple is harvested throughout the year, a majority of
185 farmers made their better part of produce ready to harvest in summer months in order to take the
186 advantage of the demand for pineapple in the ramdhan season. But unfortunately for the last two
187 years, strict lockdown measures coincided with this peak harvesting time. Pineapple as a horticultural
188 crop is highly perishable and needs to be harvested and marketed without delay. But due to the strict
189 lockdown measures and curbs on movement, pineapple fields remained unharvested. Tonnes of
190 pineapple fruit rotted within the fields without being harvested and many trucks filled with pineapple
191 remain halted in various parts of the country due to the unanticipated shutdown. Farmers and dealers
192 were unable to sell their produce which led them to a heavy financial crisis and debt trap. Several
193 researchers in various parts of the world have observed the same risk in their studies as one of the
194 major impacts of Covid 19 in agricultural sector particularly for fruits and vegetables (Arumugam *et al.*,
195 2020; Kumar *et al.*, 2021; Khandagale *et al.*, 2020; Thomas and Dinesh, 2021).

196 Nearly three fourths of the sample farmers (74.16 %) were dependent on credit for pineapple
197 farming. But as a result of the consecutive lockdown for the last two years (2020 and 2021), the
198 financial viability of farmers was destroyed. During the pandemic, farmers were unable to find market
199 for their produce and the demand for pineapple in the market was very low, which forced the farmers
200 to sell their produce at very cheap prices. Some farmers had to dispose of their crops in the field itself
201 by spraying chemicals due to the heavy financial loss. It affected the prompt repayment of credit. So
202 many farmers had to sell their land and houses for loan repayment and there were also reports of
203 farmer suicide due to the financial crunch. Difficulty in loan repayment among pineapple farmers
204 during this pandemic was also noticed during the study in Uttar Dinajpur district, West Bengal
205 (Mukhopadhyay and Kasemi, 2021). Some farmers reported that failure in repayment of credit also
206 affected their credit score, which further caused difficulties in availing fresh credit from banks.

207 High labour cost was attributed due to the peculiar situations in Kerala. It was revealed from the study
208 that the majority of pineapple farmers in Kerala employ permanent migrant labours in their fields due
209 to relatively cheaper labour costs and the non-availability of adequate local labours. The average
210 wage of permanent migrant workers per day is Rs. 500, whereas local labours have a wage rate of
211 Rs. 900 to 1,000 per day. But during the lockdown due to reverse migration, most of the migrant

212 workers went back to their home states which caused severe labour shortages in pineapple fields. It
213 forced the farmers to employ local labourers in their fields which further resulted in higher production
214 costs.

215 From the study, it was observed that the lack of proper processing and storage facilities was another
216 important risk faced by farmers during the pandemic. Even though there was a good demand for
217 processed fruit products in the market, processing companies were unable to take advantage due to
218 the reduced capacity of food processing firms (Kumar and Babu, 2021). The average production of
219 pineapple in the Ernakulam district of Kerala per year was 68457.5 metric tonnes (2020-21) (GoK,
220 2021). Compared to the supply of fresh pineapple to the market, the quantity of pineapple taken by
221 the processing firms was very less which was not enough to help the farmers from the distress
222 situation. Pineapple as a horticultural crop is highly perishable and it has to be marketed within a
223 week after harvest. There was no infrastructure or techniques available for farmers to extend the
224 storage life of pineapple, which aggravated the situation of farmers during the pandemic.

225 Farmers and agricultural labourers are very crucial for ensuring food security during the lockdown yet
226 these populations are also highly vulnerable to getting Covid – 19 diseases. According to Lusk and
227 Chandra (2021), as the major farm operation and value chain activities are laborious, farmers had to
228 work in close proximity which made farmers and farm workers vulnerable to covid 19 disease. Even
229 though the government has given some relaxation for agricultural activities after initial periods of
230 lockdown, farmers and farm labourers were unable to work in the field due to health issues of Covid
231 19. Due to the fear of viral transmission, many farmers reduced their farming operations in the field.
232 Some farmers have completely stopped farming. It was noticed that the pandemic not only affected
233 the physical health of farmers but also lead to mental stress. Budiman *et al.* (2021) conducted a study
234 on the mental health of farmers during the covid – 19 pandemic and claimed that out of 149
235 respondent farmers 95 respondents (63.8%) were under severe psychological pressure which had an
236 impact on their individual health, family life, crop productivity and farm income.

237 A limited quantity of pineapple produced in Kerala (0.5 % of total production) was exported to Gulf
238 countries such as Oman, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, UAE and Nepal (Rai, 2020). But the closure of
239 international borders during the pandemic and reduced demand in world markets caused reduction in
240 pineapple export from India. Some farmers and dealers of pineapple in the study area also reported
241 reduction in export during Covid 19. According to FAO reports, global export of pineapple has
242 reduced by 13.4 per cent in 2020 compared to the total exports of pineapple in 2019 (FAO, 2021c).

243 The study revealed that nearly 88 per cent of total sample farmers are cultivating pineapple on leased
244 land and some of the farmers reported that, they had faced difficulties in paying higher rent during the
245 lockdown as their returns and yield has reduced drastically. Some had to walk out of their contracts
246 with landowners before the expiry of contract. But some other farmers noticed reductions in rent for
247 land due to decreased demand during the pandemic.

248 **4. CONCLUSION**

249 Pineapple is one of the major Covid 19 affected crops of Kerala. The present study mainly assessed
250 the risk perception of pineapple farmers in Ernakulam district of Kerala during the lockdown period.
251 Because of the higher perishability and lack of storage facilities, pineapple farmers were at high risk
252 due to various lockdown measures. The study observed 14 risks faced by the farmers and found that
253 realisation of low prices, restrictions in the transportation of goods, disruptions in farming activities,
254 low demand for the produce and non-availability of adequate hired labour were the major constraints
255 perceived by the farmers. It had a great effect on the yield and revenue of pineapple farmers during
256 the pandemic. It was also revealed that, although the government has completely withdrawn all the
257 lockdown and related restrictions, the farmers had not fully recovered from their hardships. Thus, the
258 findings of the study are relevant for policymakers as they work to seek remedial measures that
259 enhance the living standards and resilience of pineapple farmers.

266 REFERENCES

- 267 Ahmed, Z., Guha, G.S., Shew, A.M., and Alam, G.M. Climate change risk perceptions and agricultural
268 adaptation strategies in vulnerable riverine Char islands of Bangladesh. *Land use policy* 103:2021;
269 p.105295.
- 270 Akanda, M.G.R. and Howlader, M.S. Coastal farmers' perception of climate change effects on
271 agriculture at Galachipa Upazila under Patuakhali District of Bangladesh. *Glob. J. Sci. Front. Res.*
272 *Agric. Vet.* 2015;15(4): 30-39.
- 273 Arumugam, D.U., Kanagavalli, D.G., and Manida, M. COVID-19: impact of agriculture in
274 India. *Aegaeum J.* 2020; 8(5): 480-488.
- 275 Biswas, A.A.A., Hasan, M.M., Rahman, M.S., Sattar, M.A., Hossain, M.A., and Faisal, M. Disaster
276 Risk Identification in Agriculture Sector: Farmer's Perceptions and Mitigation practices in Faridpur. *Am.*
277 *J. Rural Dev.* 2015;3(3): 60-73.
- 278 Bolarin, O., Komolafe, S.E., and Ajiboye, D.J. Adaptation strategies of small-scale farmers to
279 challenges of COVID-19 pandemic in Osun State, Nigeria. *Sci. J. Wars. Univ. Life Sci.* 2022; 22(1). 4-
280 16.
- 281 Budiman, M.E.A., Yuhbaba, Z.N., and Silvanasari, I.A. Mental health of farmers during the COVID-19
282 pandemic in Bondowoso district. *J. Penelit. Kes.* 2021; 12: 94-97.
- 283 Cariappa, A.A., Acharya, K.K., Adhav, C.A., Sendhil, R., and Ramasundaram, P. Impact of COVID-19
284 on the Indian agricultural system: A 10-point strategy for post-pandemic recovery. *Outlook*
285 *Agric.* 2021;50(1): 26-33.
- 286 Deconinck, K., Avery, E., and Jackson, L.A. Food supply chains and Covid-19: Impacts and policy
287 lessons. *Euro Choices* 2020;19(3): 34-39.

- 288 Duong, T.T., Brewer, T., Luck, J., and Zander, K. A global review of farmers' perceptions of
289 agricultural risks and risk management strategies. *Agric.* 2019; 9(1): 10-12.
- 290 FAO [Food and Agricultural Organization of the United States]. 2020a. FAO Regional Conference For
291 Asia and the Pacific. Thirty Fifth Session. *State of Food and Agriculture, FAO* [online]. 2020a;
292 Accessed 23 August 2022 Available: <http://www.fao.org/about/meetings/aprc35/en>
- 293 FAO [Food and Agricultural Organization of the United States]. *Somalia: Agricultural livelihoods and*
294 *food security in the context of COVID-19: Monitoring Report – January 2021.* Rome. 38p.
- 295 FAO [Food and Agricultural Organization of the United States]. 2020b. FAO Director-General urges
296 G20 to ensure that food value chains are not disrupted during COVID-19 pandemic. FAO home page
297 [on line]. Available: <http://www.fao.org/news/story/en/item/1268254/icode/> [15 July 2022].
- 298 FAO [Food and Agricultural Organization of the United States]. 2021b. *OECD-FAO Agricultural*
299 *Outlook 2021–2030.* OECD Publishing, Paris [online]. Available: [https://doi.org/10.1787/19428846-](https://doi.org/10.1787/19428846-en)
300 [en](https://doi.org/10.1787/19428846-en). [16 July 2022].
- 301 FAO. [Food and Agricultural Organization of the United States]. 2021c. Agricultural trade and policy
302 responses during the first wave of Covid-19 pandemic in 2020 [on-line]. Available:
303 <http://www.fao.org/3/cb4553en/cb4553en.pdf> [20 July 2021]
- 304 GoK [Government of Kerala]. 2020a. *Agricultural Statistics 2018-19.* [on-line]. Available:
305 [http://www.ecostat.kerala.gov.in/images/pdf/publications/Agriculture/data/2018-](http://www.ecostat.kerala.gov.in/images/pdf/publications/Agriculture/data/2018-19/agriculture_statistics_2018_19.pdf)
306 [19/agriculture_statistics_2018_19.pdf](http://www.ecostat.kerala.gov.in/images/pdf/publications/Agriculture/data/2018-19/agriculture_statistics_2018_19.pdf) [17 June 2021].
- 307 GoK [Government of Kerala]. 2020b. Quick Assessment of the Impact of the Covid-19 Pandemic and
308 Lockdown on Kerala's Economy [on-line]. Available: [https://spb.kerala.gov.in/sites/default/files/2020-](https://spb.kerala.gov.in/sites/default/files/2020-09/cov19_qck_asmt_fnl_eng.pdf)
309 [09/cov19_qck_asmt_fnl_eng.pdf](https://spb.kerala.gov.in/sites/default/files/2020-09/cov19_qck_asmt_fnl_eng.pdf) [23 July 2021].
- 310 GoK [Government of Kerala]. 2021. *Economic Review 2021: Vol. 1.* State Planning Board,
311 Thiruvananthapuram, 75p.
- 312 Hockings, M., Dudley, N., Elliott, W., Rao, M., Redford, K., and Robinson, J. 2020. COVID-19 and
313 protected and conserved areas. *Int. J. Prot. Areas Conserv.* [online]. Available:
314 <https://doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.CH.2020.PARKS%e2%80%9026%e2%80%901MH.en%20> [21 July
315 2022].
- 316 Joy, P.P. 2013. *Pineapple sector in Kerala: Status, opportunities, challenges and stakeholders*
317 *.Pineapple Research Station, Kerala Agricultural University* [online].
318 Available:[http://www.kau.in/sites/default/files/documents/production_technology_for_vazhakulam_pin](http://www.kau.in/sites/default/files/documents/production_technology_for_vazhakulam_pineapple_mauritius.pdf)
319 [eapple_mauritius.pdf](http://www.kau.in/sites/default/files/documents/production_technology_for_vazhakulam_pineapple_mauritius.pdf) [21 July 2021].
- 320 Khandagale, R., Hattali, M., and Godase, D. 2020. Impact of COVID-19 on Indian agriculture and its
321 scenario. *J. Glob. Biosci.* 9(6): 7510-7521.
- 322 Kumar, K.N.R. and Babu, S.C. 2021. Value chain management under COVID-19: responses and
323 lessons from grape production in India. *J. Soc. Econ. Dev.* 23(3): 468-490.
- 324 Kumar, P., Singh, S.S., Pandey, A.K., Singh, R.K., Srivastava, P.K., Kumar, M., Dubey, S.K., Sah, U.,
325 Nandan, R., Singh, S.K., and Agrawal, P. 2021. Multi-level impacts of the COVID-19 lockdown on
326 agricultural systems in India: The case of Uttar Pradesh. *Agric. Syst.* 187: p.103027.
- 327 Kumar, S.V. 2020. Losses due to Covid crisis claim life of a pineapple farmer in Kerala. *The Hindu,*
328 24 Aug. 2020, p.10.

- 329 Lusk, J.L. and Chandra, R. 2021. Farmer and farm worker illnesses and deaths from COVID-19 and
330 impacts on agricultural output. *Plos one* 16(4): p.e0250621.
- 331 Mukhopadhyay, H. and Kasemi, N.Z. 2021. Production of pineapple in Uttar Dinajpur District: Pre and
332 Post Covid-19. In: Karmakar, M. (ed.), *The Covid*. Blue Rose Publishers, pp. 82-87.
- 333 Muthukumar, P. K. and Salini, R. 2021. Impact of COVID 19 on production and productivity of Kerala
334 agriculture sector. *IJSET-Int. J. Innovative Sci. Eng. & Technol.* 8(6): 155-162.
- 335 NABARD [National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development]. 2020. *Impact Assessment of*
336 *COVID-19 on Indian Agriculture and Rural Economy* [online]. Department of Economic Analysis and
337 Research. Available:
338 [https://www.nabard.org/auth/writereaddata/tender/1211203145Impact%20Assessment%20of%20CO](https://www.nabard.org/auth/writereaddata/tender/1211203145Impact%20Assessment%20of%20COVID.pdf)
339 [VID.pdf](https://www.nabard.org/auth/writereaddata/tender/1211203145Impact%20Assessment%20of%20COVID.pdf) [22 July 2021].
- 340 Nugroho, A., Triana, L., Fitrah, A.U., and Hamid, A.H. 2022. Multi-hazard perception during COVID-
341 19: Evidence from rural communities in West Sumatra, Indonesia. *Int. J. Disaster Risk Reduct.* 77:
342 p.103075.
- 343 Pandya, N., Veluguri, D., Roy, A., Prabhakaran, P., and Jaacks, L.M. 2021. Economic Impact of the
344 2020 COVID-19 Lockdown on Indian Farmers. *Econ. Polit. Wkly* 56(50): 31- 34.
- 345 PGA [Pineapple Growers Association]. 2018. PGA home page [on line]. Available:
346 <https://vazhakulampineapple.in/>. [16 July 2021].
- 347 Rai, K. A. 2020. Value chain analysis of pineapple in Ernakulam district. M.Sc.(Ag) thesis, Kerala
348 Agricultural University, Thrissur, 92p.
- 349 Saadat, S., Rawtani, D., and Hussain, C.M. 2020. Environmental perspective of COVID-19. *Sci. Total*
350 *Environ.* 728: p.138870 [online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138870> [13 August
351 2022].
- 352 Saha, T. and Bhattacharya, S. 2020. Consequence of lockdown amid COVID-19 pandemic on Indian
353 agriculture. *Food Sci. Rep.* 1: 47-50.
- 354 Sulewski, P. and Kłoczko-Gajewska, A. 2014. Farmers' risk perception, risk aversion and strategies to
355 cope with production risk: An empirical study from Poland. *Stud. Agric. Econ.* 116(3): 140-147.
- 356 Thomas, L. and Dinesh, V. 2021. COVID -19 and lockdown- Short term impact on pineapple industry
357 in Kerala. *Int. J. Manag. Inf. Technol. Eng.* 11(9): 19-30.
- 358
- 359
- 360
- 361