

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

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.

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

1. INTRODUCTION

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

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

Kerala, the southernmost state in India is mainly a consumer state. Crops, livestock, fishing, and forestry contributed only 8.03 per cent at constant prices to Kerala's Gross State Value Added in

25 2019-20 (GoK, 2021). Pineapple (*Ananascomosus*, family: Bromeliaceae) is one of the important
26 commercial fruit crops in Kerala, cultivated in an area of 9,152 ha with a production of 93,007 tonnes
27 and productivity of 10.1 t ha⁻¹ (GoK, 2020 a). Pineapple is mostly grown in the districts of Ernakulam,
28 Kottayam, Pathanamthitta and the low elevation areas of Idukki district in Kerala. Vazhakulam
29 pineapple in Ernakulam district is considered the best in quality, sweetness, aroma and flavour (Joy,
30 2013). Pineapple produced from the region has a long value chain and is marketed fresh in several
31 parts of the country, besides entering into processing activities. From here, fresh pineapple is being
32 sent to various states such as Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Maharashtra, Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh,
33 Rajasthan, Andhra Pradesh, Delhi etc. mainly by lorry transport. Limited quantity of fresh pineapple is
34 being exported to Gulf countries in special packings (PGA, 2018).

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

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

51

52

53

54 **2. MATERIAL AND METHODS**

55 **2.1. Study area**

56 The study was conducted in Ernakulam district of Kerala. The study area was selected purposively as
57 it has the largest area under pineapple cultivation in Kerala. Out of the total area under pineapple in
58 Kerala, 58.73 per cent lies in Ernakulam district which produces about 63 per cent of the production of
59 the state in the year (GoK, 2020a). From the district, Muvattupuzha Block Panchayath was
60 purposively selected based on the maximum area under pineapple cultivation. Three pineapple-
61 growing grama panchayats *viz.*, Avoly, Manjalloor, and Kalloorkkad were selected from the block

62 panchayat randomly. Forty farmers each were randomly selected from these grama panchayaths
63 making a total sample size of 120 farmers.

64 **2.2 Sampling and data collection**

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

69 **2.3. Empirical model**

70 **2.3.1. Measurement of risk perception and index.**

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

84 Covid 19 Risk Perception Score (CovRPS) =

$$85 \quad \text{CovRPN} \times 0 + \text{CovRPI} \times 1 + \text{CovRPM} \times 2 + \text{CovRPh} \times 3 \quad (1)$$

86 Where CovRPN represents the number of respondents having no risk perception, CovRPI shows the
87 number of respondents having low risk perception, CovRPM describes the number of respondents
88 with medium risk perception, and CovRPh indicates the number of respondents with high-level risk
89 perception. As the responses were gathered from 120 farmers, the Covid-19 Risk Perception Score
90 (CovRPS) for each given constraint may fall between 0 and 360, with 0 denoting the minimum level of
91 risk perception and 360 denoting the maximum level of risk perception. CovRPS was then modified
92 into a standardised index in order to further interpret the findings. Equation. 2 was used to calculate
93 Standardized Covid Risk Perception Index (SCovRPI).

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

$$95 \quad (\text{Total CovRP score}) / (\text{Maximum attainable CovRP score}) * 100 \quad (2)$$

96

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

102 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

103 The results of the study are presented in two segments: the first segment discusses the socio-
 104 economic characteristics of pineapple farmers in the Ernakulam district of Kerala and the second
 105 segment explains the risk perception of pineapple farmers during covid 19 pandemic.

106

107 3.1 Risk Perception of pineapple farmers during Covid-19

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

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

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

130 **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

131

132 Among the risks, realisation of low prices for the produce ranked first (SCovRPI=93.61). It implied that
133 lockdown and travel restrictions caused poor marketing and low demand for agricultural produce in
134 the market but the supply of pineapple to the market remained the same. This led to the realisation of
135 low prices and huge economic losses to farmers. According to Kumar (2020), the farm gate price has
136 come down to ₹10 per kg compared to ₹40 per Kg in the previous year, due to the lockdown. Similar

137 effects were also observed in other countries. A study conducted in Somalia claimed that most of the
138 respondents faced difficulties in selling their produce in the market due to the drop in both demand
139 and prices (FAO, 2021a). Saha and Bhattacharya (2020) also reported that sudden fall in prices of
140 fruits and vegetables was the major difficulty faced by farmers at the beginning of the lockdown.

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

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

157 Low demand for the product in the market was another important constraint. Due to uncertainty and a
158 reduction in people's spending capacity, demand for pineapple among consumers has dwindled. FAO
159 (2020b), also reported the reduction in demand for horticultural products in the global market. The
160 closure of restaurants, and processing factories and the restrictions on celebrating festivals and
161 special occasions during the pandemic also reduced the demand for pineapple in the market. This
162 result corroborates with a similar study by Pandya *et al.* (2021), which also found that the reduction in
163 demand for agricultural produce in the market caused a 70 per cent drop in the prices of agricultural
164 products.

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

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

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

199 High labour cost was attributed due to the peculiar situations in Kerala. It was revealed from the study
200 that the majority of pineapple farmers in Kerala employ permanent migrant labours in their fields due
201 to relatively cheaper labour costs and the non-availability of adequate local labours. The average
202 wage of permanent migrant workers per day is Rs. 500, whereas local labours have a wage rate of
203 Rs. 900 to 1,000 per day. But during the lockdown due to reverse migration, most of the migrant
204 workers went back to their home states which caused severe labour shortages in pineapple fields. It
205 forced the farmers to employ local labourers in their fields which further resulted in higher production
206 costs.

207 From the study, it was observed that the lack of proper processing and storage facilities was another
208 important risk faced by farmers during the pandemic. Even though there was a good demand for
209 processed fruit products in the market, processing companies were unable to take advantage due to
210 the reduced capacity of food processing firms (Kumar and Babu, 2021). The average production of
211 pineapple in the Ernakulam district of Kerala per year was 68457.5 metric tonnes (2020-21) (GoK,
212 2021). Compared to the supply of fresh pineapple to the market, the quantity of pineapple taken by
213 the processing firms was very less which was not enough to help the farmers from the distress

214 situation. Pineapple as a horticultural crop is highly perishable and it has to be marketed within a
215 week after harvest. There was no infrastructure or techniques available for farmers to extend the
216 storage life of pineapple, which aggravated the situation of farmers during the pandemic.

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

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

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

240 **4. CONCLUSION**

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

252 there was low demand and price for pineapple in the market. Hence the procurement of fruits by
253 HortiCorp (Kerala State Horticultural Products Development Corporation) and other agencies may be
254 ensured especially during the periods of low demand. Also, the average cost of production was
255 estimated as ₹ 17.33 per kg from the study. Base price fixed by the Government of Kerala for
256 pineapple is ₹ 15 per kg. So, the base price fixed by the government may be revised to at least ₹ 20-
257 22 per kg in order to make pineapple farming more profitable.

258 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

259 The authors express their sincere thanks to Dr. Thasnimol, F., Assistant Professor, Department of
260 Agricultural Economics, College of Agriculture, Vellayanifor his enormous help in formulating the
261 methodological framework of the study.

262 REFERENCES

- 263 Ahmed, Z., Guha, G.S., Shew, A.M., and Alam, G.M. Climate change risk perceptions and agricultural
264 adaptation strategies in vulnerable riverine Char islands of Bangladesh. *Land use policy* 103:2021;
265 p.105295.
- 266 Akanda, M.G.R. and Howlader, M.S. Coastal farmers' perception of climate change effects on
267 agriculture at GalachipaUpazila under Patuakhali District of Bangladesh. *Glob. J. Sci. Front. Res.*
268 *Agric. Vet.* 2015;15(4): 30-39.
- 269 Arumugam, D.U., Kanagavalli, D.G., and Manida, M. COVID-19: impact of agriculture in
270 India. *Aegaeum J.* 2020; 8(5): 480-488.
- 271 Biswas, A.A.A., Hasan, M.M., Rahman, M.S., Sattar, M.A., Hossain, M.A., and Faisal, M. Disaster
272 Risk Identification in Agriculture Sector: Farmer's Perceptions and Mitigation practices in Faridpur. *Am.*
273 *J. Rural Dev.* 2015;3(3): 60-73.
- 274 Bolarin, O., Komolafe, S.E., and Ajiboye, D.J. Adaptation strategies of small-scale farmers to
275 challenges of COVID-19 pandemic in Osun State, Nigeria. *Sci. J. Wars. Univ. Life Sci.* 2022; 22(1):4-
276 16.
- 277 Budiman, M.E.A., Yuhbaba, Z.N., and Silvanasari, I.A. Mental health of farmers during the COVID-19
278 pandemic in Bondowoso district. *J. Penelit. Kes.* 2021; 12: 94-97.
- 279 Cariappa, A.A., Acharya, K.K., Adhav, C.A., Sendhil, R., and Ramasundaram, P. Impact of COVID-19
280 on the Indian agricultural system: A 10-point strategy for post-pandemic recovery. *Outlook*
281 *Agric.* 2021;50(1): 26-33.
- 282 Deconinck, K., Avery, E., and Jackson, L.A. Food supply chains and Covid-19: Impacts and policy
283 lessons. *Euro Choices* 2020;19(3): 34-39.
- 284 Duong, T.T., Brewer, T., Luck, J., and Zander, K.A global review of farmers' perceptions of
285 agricultural risks and risk management strategies. *Agric.* 2019; 9(1): 10-12.
- 286 FAO [Food and Agricultural Organization of the United States]. 2020a. FAO Regional Conference For
287 Asia and the Pacific. Thirty Fifth Session. *State of Food and Agriculture, FAO* [online]. 2020a;
288 Accessed 23 August 2022 Available: <http://www.fao.org/about/meetings/aprc35/en>
- 289 FAO [Food and Agricultural Organization of the United States]. *Somalia: Agricultural livelihoods and*
290 *food security in the context of COVID-19: Monitoring Report – January 2021.* Rome. 38p.

291 FAO [Food and Agricultural Organization of the United States]. 2020b. FAO Director-General urges
292 G20 to ensure that food value chains are not disrupted during COVID-19 pandemic. FAO home page
293 [on line]. Available: <http://www.fao.org/news/story/en/item/1268254/icode/> [15 July 2022].

294 FAO [Food and Agricultural Organization of the United States]. 2021b. *OECD-FAO Agricultural*
295 *Outlook 2021–2030*. OECD Publishing, Paris [online]. Available: [https://doi.org/10.1787/19428846-](https://doi.org/10.1787/19428846-en)
296 *en*. [16 July 2022].

297 FAO.[Food and Agricultural Organization of the United States]. 2021c. Agricultural trade and policy
298 responses during the first wave of Covid-19 pandemic in 2020 [on-line]. Available:
299 <http://www.fao.org/3/cb4553en/cb4553en.pdf> [20 July 2021]

300 GoK [Government of Kerala]. 2020a. *Agricultural Statistics 2018-19*. [on-line]. Available:
301 [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)
302 *19/agriculture_statistics_2018_19.pdf* [17 June 2021].

303 GoK [Government of Kerala]. 2020b. Quick Assessment of the Impact of the Covid-19 Pandemic and
304 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)
305 *09/cov19_qck_asmt_fnl_eng.pdf* [23 July 2021].

306 GoK [Government of Kerala]. 2021. *Economic Review 2021: Vol. 1*. State Planning Board,
307 Thiruvananthapuram, 75p.

308 Hockings, M., Dudley, N., Elliott, W., Rao, M., Redford, K., and Robinson, J. 2020.COVID-19 and
309 protected and conserved areas.*Int. J. Prot. Areas Conserv.* [online]. Available:
310 <https://doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.CH.2020.PARKS%e2%80%9026%e2%80%901MH.en%20> [21 July
311 2022].

312 Joy, P.P. 2013. *Pineapple sector in Kerala: Status, opportunities, challenges and stakeholders*
313 *.Pineapple Research Station, Kerala Agricultural University* [online].
314 Available:http://www.kau.in/sites/default/files/documents/production_technology_for_vazhakulam_pineapple_mauritius.pdf [21 July 2021].

316 Khandagale, R., Hattali, M., and Godase, D. 2020.Impact of COVID-19 on Indian agriculture and its
317 scenario. *J. Glob. Biosci.* 9(6): 7510-7521.

318 Kumar, K.N.R. and Babu, S.C. 2021. Value chain management under COVID-19: responses and
319 lessons from grape production in India. *J. Soc. Econ. Dev.* 23(3): 468-490.

320 Kumar, P., Singh, S.S., Pandey, A.K., Singh, R.K., Srivastava, P.K., Kumar, M., Dubey, S.K., Sah, U.,
321 Nandan, R., Singh, S.K., and Agrawal, P. 2021. Multi-level impacts of the COVID-19 lockdown on
322 agricultural systems in India: The case of Uttar Pradesh. *Agric. Syst.* 187: p.103027.

323 Kumar, S.V. 2020. Losses due to Covid crisis claim life of a pineapple farmer in Kerala. *The Hindu*,
324 24 Aug. 2020, p.10.

325 Lusk, J.L. and Chandra, R. 2021. Farmer and farm worker illnesses and deaths from COVID-19 and
326 impacts on agricultural output.*Plos one* 16(4): p.e0250621.

327 Mukhopadhyay, H. and Kasemi, N.Z. 2021. Production of pineapple in Uttar Dinajpur District: Pre and
328 Post Covid-19. In: Karmakar, M. (ed.), *The Covid*. Blue Rose Publishers, pp. 82-87.

329 Muthukumar, P. K. and Salini, R. 2021.Impact of COVID 19 on production and productivity of Kerala
330 agriculture sector.*IJISSET-Int. J. Innovative Sci. Eng. & Technol.* 8(6): 155-162.

331 NABARD [National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development]. 2020. *Impact Assessment of*
332 *COVID-19 on Indian Agriculture and Rural Economy* [online]. Department of Economic Analysis and
333 Research. Available:
334 [https://www.nabard.org/auth/writereaddata/tender/1211203145Impact%20Assessment%20of%20CO](https://www.nabard.org/auth/writereaddata/tender/1211203145Impact%20Assessment%20of%20COVID.pdf)
335 [VID.pdf](https://www.nabard.org/auth/writereaddata/tender/1211203145Impact%20Assessment%20of%20COVID.pdf) [22 July 2021].

336 Nugroho, A., Triana, L., Fitrah, A.U., and Hamid, A.H. 2022. Multi-hazard perception during COVID-
337 19: Evidence from rural communities in West Sumatra, Indonesia. *Int. J. Disaster Risk Reduct.* 77:
338 p.103075.

339 Pandya, N., Veluguri, D., Roy, A., Prabhakaran, P., and Jaacks, L.M. 2021. Economic Impact of the
340 2020 COVID-19 Lockdown on Indian Farmers. *Econ. Polit. Wkly* 56(50): 31- 34.

341 PGA [Pineapple Growers Association]. 2018. PGA home page [on line]. Available:
342 <https://vazhakulampineapple.in/>. [16 July 2021].

343 Rai, K. A. 2020. Value chain analysis of pineapple in Ernakulam district. M.Sc.(Ag) thesis, Kerala
344 Agricultural University, Thrissur, 92p.

345 Saadat, S., Rawtani, D., and Hussain, C.M. 2020. Environmental perspective of COVID-19. *Sci. Total*
346 *Environ.* 728: p.138870 [online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138870> [13 August
347 2022].

348 Saha, T. and Bhattacharya, S. 2020. Consequence of lockdown amid COVID-19 pandemic on Indian
349 agriculture. *Food Sci. Rep.* 1: 47-50.

350 Sulewski, P. and Kłoczko-Gajewska, A. 2014. Farmers' risk perception, risk aversion and strategies to
351 cope with production risk: An empirical study from Poland. *Stud. Agric. Econ.* 116(3): 140-147.

352 Thomas, L. and Dinesh, V. 2021. COVID -19 and lockdown- Short term impact on pineapple industry
353 in Kerala. *Int. J. Manag. Inf. Technol. Eng.* 11(9): 19-30.

354

355

356

357