1	
2	Original Research Article
3	
4	CONSUMERS' AWARENESS REGARDING THE EFFECT OF
5	ANTIBIOTIC USED IN ANIMAL FEED ON HUMAN HEALTH
6	
7	
8	ABSTRACT
9	The main aim of the study were to determine the consumers' awareness regarding the effect of
10	antibiotic used in animal feed on human health and to explore relationship between the selected
11	characteristics of the respondent consumers and their awareness. The study was conducted at
12	Mohammad Nagar residential area under Batiaghata upazila of Khulna district and Nirala
13	residential area of Khulna City Corporation, Khulna, Bangladesh following descriptive and
14	diagnostic type of research design. Forty respondents from each of the residential areas were
15	interviewed as the sample of the study and data were collected through personal interview

of d at a d ·e interviewed as the sample of the study and data were collected through personal interview 15 16 method using an interview schedule by the researcher herself during January–February, 2019. Most (80%) of the respondents were highly aware while only one fifth (20%) of the respondents 17 18 had medium awareness about the effect of antibiotic used in animal feed on human health. Consumers were highly aware about that resistance is grown in pathogenic organisms causing 19 20 diseases in human body against antibiotics which are used in patient treatment resulting in 21 treatment failure. But consumers were less aware about allergic reaction and painful rash which 22 are possible with many antibiotics. The mean awareness score of the consumers resided at Nirala was higher than that of Mohammad Nagar residential area but it did not differ significantly. This 23 24 might be due to proximity of the two residential areas. Among ten selected characteristics of the respondents; education, family education, annual family income, exposure to communication 25 media, nutritional knowledge, animal protein consumption behavior and attitude showed positive 26 27 significant relationship with their awareness regarding the effect of antibiotic used in animal feed 28 on human health. Consumers in the study area are concerned about the effect of antibiotic used in animal feed on human health. 29

30

31 Key Words: Consumers' awareness, antibiotic, animal feed, human health.

32

33 **1. INTRODUCTION**

Human health is directly related to the environment and in particular the nature and quality of food. Quality of food from animal products is widely concerning public health agencies around the world since antibiotic and veterinary drugs have played an important role in the field of animal husbandry and agro-industry. At present, the occurrences of residues in increasing form

38 and resistance have become burning issues [1].

Antibiotics and veterinary medicinal products (VMPs) are crucial to meet the challenges of supplying sufficient quantity of food for the vast and fast growing world population as drugs 41 improve the rate of weight gain, improve feed efficiency, prevent and treat diseases in food

- 42 producing animals [2]. The safe and effective use of antibiotic in animal production has received 43 considerable attention in most of the countries in the world [3]. Human health can either be
- 43 considerable attention in most of the countries in the world [3]. Human health can either be 44 affected by the residues of drugs in food of animal origin, which may cause direct side effects or
- 44 affected by the residues of drugs in food of animal origin, which may cause direct side effects of 45 indirectly through selection of antibiotic resistance bacteria that may spread to human [4, 5, 6].
- 46 Resistant microorganism can get access to human, either by direct contact or indirectly through
- 47 milk, meat, and egg. It is documented that drug resistant bacteria such as Salmonella,
- 48 Campylobacter and Staphylococcus from food of animal origin were developed by human beings
- 49 [5, 6].
- 50 In general, harmful effects of antibiotics and drugs residues on health, which may be mutagenic,
- 51 carcinogenic, reduction in reproductive performance, drug allergy and acute toxicity or
- 52 poisoning in human [1, 7, 8]. Drug low-level contamination generally may not generate a
- violation problem on human health. However, extensive use of drugs may increase the risk of an
- adverse effect of residues on the consumer including the occurrence of antibiotic resistance. In this study an attempt has been made to find out the effects of antibiotics used in animal feed on
- this study an attempt has been made to find out the effects of antibiotics used in animal feed on human health and how far the consumers are aware of this issue in the selected areas of Khulna
- 57 district.

58 The study was conducted to fulfill the following objectives:

- 59 i. To analyze the selected characteristics of the consumers.
- ii. To determine consumers' awareness regarding the effect of antibiotic used in animal feed
 on human health.
- iii. To explore relationships between the selected characteristics of the consumers and their
 extent of awareness regarding the effect of antibiotic used in animal feed on human
 health.

65 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

66 2.1 Design and Locale of the Study

The present study was a descriptive and diagnostic type of research. It was designed to study consumers' awareness regarding the effect of antibiotic used in animal feed on human health. The study was based on collection of data by door to door interviewing of the respondents. The study was conducted at Mohammad Nagar residential area under Batiaghata upazila of Khulna district and Nirala residential area of Khulna City Corporation, Khulna, Bangladesh.

72 2.2 Population and Sampling

All the household heads of Mohammed Nagar and Nirala residential areas of Khulna were
 considered as the population of the study. Forty family heads from each of the residential areas
 were interviewed as the sample of the study. Thus the sample size stood 80.

76 **2.3 Data Collection and Processing**

The primary data were collected by the researcher herself through face to face interview using interview schedule during January–February, 2019. Reviewing related studies, the researcher considered some of the selected characters of the respondents as independent variables for the study. The characteristics were age, educational qualification, family size, family education, annual income, exposure to communication media, nutritional knowledge, animal protein

- consumption behavior, training exposure and attitude towards antibiotic used in animal feed. 82 83 Consumers' awareness regarding the effect of antibiotic used in animal feed on human health
- was considered as dependent variable in this study. 84

All qualitative data were converted into quantitative form by means of applying some 85 appropriate scoring technique. In several instances, indices and scales were constructed through 86

- the simple accumulation of score assigned to individual or pattern of attributes. 87
- 88

89 **2.3.1Measurement of Selected Characteristics (Independent Variables)**

- The measurement of selected characteristics (independent variables) is shown in Table 1. 90
- Table 1. Measurement of selected characteristics (independent variables)
 91
- 92

Selected characteristics (independent variables)	Measuring Unit
Age	Actual year
Educational qualification	Years of schooling
Family size	Number
Family education	Years of schooling
Annual income	*000'BDT
Exposure to communication media	Score
Nutritional knowledge	Score
Animal protein consumption behavior	Score
Training exposure	Score
Attitude	Score (following Likert scale)

93

2.3.2 Measurement of Consumers' Awareness (Dependent Variable) 94

To determine consumers' awareness, five (5) statements related to the effects of antibiotic used 95 in animal feed on human health were incorporated in the interview schedule. To determine the 96 awareness score of the respondents a five point rating scale such as strongly agree, agree, 97 undecided, disagree and strongly disagree were employed against the five (5) statements and a 98 score of 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 was employed against the scales respectively. The awareness score of a 99 respondent could range from 5 to 25, where '5' indicate low awareness and '25' indicate high 100 awareness. Based on awareness score, the respondents were categorized into three groups as low 101 awareness (≤ 8), medium awareness (9-16) and high awareness (>16). To compare among 102 statements, an awareness index (AI) was calculated using following formula: 103

104
$$AI = N_{sag} \times 5 + N_{ag} \times 4 + N_{ud} \times 3 + N_{da} \times 2 + N_{sda} \times 1$$

Where, 105

106	AI = Awareness	Index

- N_{sag} = Number of respondents rated the impact as strongly agree 107
- N_{ag} = Number of respondents rated the impact as agree 108
- N_{ud} = Number of respondents rated the impact as undecided 109
- N_{da}= Number of respondents rated the impact as disagree 110
- N_{sda}= Number of respondents rated the impact as strongly disagree 111

- 112 The awareness index (AI) score could range from 80-400 where 80 indicates low awareness and
- 400 indicates high awareness on a particular statement regarding the effect of antibiotic used in
- animal feed on human health.

For better understanding of the relative position of the statement the AI score was converted to percentage using following formula:

 $- \times 100$

110 percentage using ione 117 Ot

Highest Possible AI Score

120 **2.4 Data Analysis**

Data were compiled, tabulated and analyzed based on the objectives of the study. Different statistical treatments such as number, mean, standard deviation, range, minimum, maximum, rank order and percentage were used to describe the variables. To explore relationship between any two variables, Pearson Product Correlation Coefficient (for interval and ratio type of data) and in some cases Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient (for ordinal type of data) were used. Data analysis was done using the concerned software Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) 20.

128 **3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

3.1 Facts on the Selected Characteristics of the Consumers (Respondents)

130 Data presented in Table 2 indicate that majority (51.3%) of the respondents was young aged and highest proportion (41.3%) of the respondents had secondary level of education. Highest 131 proportion (45%) of the respondents' family had secondary level of education followed by 132 higher secondary (27.5%) and graduate (25%). Majority (70%) of the respondents had small 133 sized family, belonged to high income group(57.5%), had medium exposure to communication 134 media(72.5%), had medium nutritional knowledge(61.3%) and consumed high amount of animal 135 136 protein(62.5%). Most (90%) of the respondents did not receive any training on human health especially the effects of antibiotics used in animal feed on human health and had moderately 137 favorable attitude(80%). 138

Table 2. Distribution of the respondents according to their selected characteristics (N=80)

Selected	Categories	Score	Respond	ents (N=80)	Mean	SD	Ra	nge
Characteristics			Number	Percentage			Min.	Max.
C.C.	Young aged	≤ 35	41	51.3				
Age	Middle aged	36-50	24	30	38.08 12.85	12.85	16	70
(Years)	Old aged	> 50	15	18.8				
	Illiterate	0	0	0				
	Primary	1-5	3	3.8	12.34	3.61	1	17
	Secondary	6-10	33	41.3	12.34 5.01	1	17	
Education (Years of	Higher Secondary	11-12	10	12.5				
schooling)	Graduate	13-16	18	22.5				
	Post graduate	>16	16	20				
Family size	Small	1-4	56	70				

Family1-322.5FamilySecondary $6-10$ 36 45 (Years of schooling)Higher secondary $11-12$ 22 27.5 Graduate $13-16$ 20 25 Post graduate >16 -10 3.8									
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	(No. of	Medium	5-6	22	27.5	4.2	0.97	2	7
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	members)	Large	≥ 7	2	2.5				
Family Findary 1-3 2 2.3 Family Secondary 6-10 36 45 (Years of schooling) Higher secondary 11-12 22 27.5 Graduate 13-16 20 25 Post graduate >16 20 25 Annual family income Low income ≤200 3 3.8 Medium income 201-350 31 38.8 422.93 185.07 180 960 (BDT "000") High income >350 46 57.5 14.63 3.94 6 23 Communication media (score) No Exposure 0 0 0 25 8.84 3.05 2.5 16 Nutritional knowledge (score) No knowledge 0 0 0 25 8.84 3.05 2.5 16 Medium nowledge 7-12 49 61.3 2.07 4 14 Animal protein consumption behavior (score) Low consumption 1-5 2 2.5 2.07 4 14 High consumption 1		Illiterate	0	0	0				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	F 1	Primary	1-5	2	2.5	10.21	2.69	3	15.5
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	•	Secondary	6-10	36	45				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Higher secondary	11-12	22	27.5				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	schooling)	Graduate	13-16	20	25				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Post graduate	>16						
	Annual family	Low income	≤200	3	3.8				
High income>3504657.5Exposure to communication media (score)No Exposure000Low exposure1-91012.514.633.94623Medium exposure10-185872.514.633.94623Medium exposure10-185872.514.633.94623No knowledge000000Nutritional knowledge (score)No knowledgeUp to 620258.843.052.516Medium knowledge (score)7-124961.31113.8113.8114Animal protein consumption behavior (score)Low consumption1-522.510.612.07414Medium consumption high consumption5105062.5510.612.07414Training exposure No7290729072907290Attitude (score)Less favorable Moderately favorable51011.31028		Medium income	201-350	31	38.8	422.93	185.07	180	960
$ \begin{array}{c} \mbox{Exposure to}\\ \mbox{communication}\\ \mbox{media (score)} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \mbox{Low exposure}\\ \mbox{Medium exposure}\\ \mbox{High exposure}\\ \mbox{High exposure}\\ \mbox{Signal} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \mbox{1-9}\\ \mbox{10-18}\\ \mbox{58}\\ \mbox{72.5}\\ \mbox{58}\\ \mbox{72.5}\\ \mbox{72}\\ \mbox{58}\\ \mbox{72.5}\\ \mbox{72}\\ \mbox{72}\\ \mbox{72}\\ \mbox{90}\\ \mbox{72}\\ \mbox{90}\\ \mbox{72}\\ \mbox{90}\\ \mbox{72}\\ \mbox{90}\\ \mbox{72}\\ \mbox{90}\\ \mbox{71.7}\\ \mbox{3.31}\\ \mbox{72}\\ \mbox{72}\\ \mbox{72}\\ \mbox{90}\\ \mbox{71.7}\\ \mbox{73.31}\\ \mbox{10}\\ \mbox{72}\\ \m$	(BD1 ~000~)	High income	>350	46	57.5				
$\begin{array}{c} \text{communication}\\ \text{media (score)} & \text{Medium exposure} & 10 & 12.5 \\ \text{Medium exposure} & 10 & 18 & 58 & 72.5 \\ \text{High exposure} & >18 & 12 & 15 \\ \text{No knowledge} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \text{Poor knowledge} & Up to 6 & 20 & 25 & 8.84 & 3.05 & 2.5 & 16 \\ \text{Medium knowledge} & 7 & 12 & 49 & 61.3 \\ \text{Medium knowledge} & 13 & 11 & 13.8 \\ \text{Animal protein} & Low consumption & 1 & 5 & 2 & 2.5 \\ \text{Medium consumption} & 1 & 5 & 2 & 2.5 \\ \text{Medium consumption} & 6 & -10 & 28 & 35 & 10.61 & 2.07 & 4 & 14 \\ \text{High consumption} & >10 & 50 & 62.5 \\ \hline \text{Training} & \text{Yes} & 8 & 10 \\ \text{exposure} & \text{No} & 72 & 90 \\ \text{Attitude (score)} & \text{Less favorable} & \leq 10 & 1 & 1.3 \\ \text{Moderately favorable} & 11 & 20 & 64 & 80 & 17.7 & 3.31 & 10 & 28 \\ \end{array}$		No Exposure	0	0	0	A A		2	
media (score)Medium exposure10-185872.5High exposure>181215Nutritional knowledge (score)No knowledge00Poor knowledge (score)Up to 620258.843.052.516Medium knowledge (score)7-124961.31113.81113.816Animal protein consumption behavior (score)Low consumption1-522.510.612.07414High consumption behavior (score)105062.5510.612.07414Training exposure NoYes81011.31028Attitude (score)Less favorable Hoderately favorable ≤ 10 11.31028		Low exposure	1-9	10	12.5	14.63	3.94	6	23
High exposure>181215Nutritional knowledge (score)No knowledge000Poor knowledge (score)Up to 620258.84 3.05 2.5 16Medium knowledge (score)7-124961.31 13.8 1 13.8 1 13.8 1 13.8 Animal protein consumption behavior (score)Low consumption $1-5$ 2 2.5 2.5 10.61 2.07 4 14 Medium consumption behavior (score) 410 50 62.5 10.61 2.07 4 14 Training exposure NoYes 8 10 72 90 72 90 72 90 Attitude (score)Less favorable Moderately favorable $11-20$ 64 80 17.7 3.31 10 28		Medium exposure	10-18	58	72.5				
Nutritional knowledge (score)Poor knowledge Medium knowledge High knowledgeUp to 6 $7-12$ 20 49 25 61.3 8.84 11 3.05 2.5 2.5 16 Animal protein consumption behavior (score)Low consumption Medium consumption High consumption $8-10$ $1-5$ 2 2 2.5 2.5 2.5 10.61 2.07 2.07 4 4 14 Training exposureYes No 8 72 10 90 1 1.3 1.3 10 28 2.5	media (seore)	High exposure	>18	12	15		-		
knowledge (score)How knowledge7-124961.3Medium knowledge13-181113.8Animal protein consumption behavior (score)Low consumption1-522.5Medium consumption high consumption6-10283510.612.07414Training exposureYes81011.311.31028Attitude (score)Less favorable Moderately favorable ≤ 10 11.31028		No knowledge	0	0	0				
$\begin{array}{c cccc} (score) & Medulm knowledge & 7-12 & 49 & 61.3 \\ \hline High knowledge & 13-18 & 11 & 13.8 \\ \hline Animal protein consumption & 1-5 & 2 & 2.5 \\ consumption behavior (score) & Medium consumption & 6-10 & 28 & 35 & 10.61 & 2.07 & 4 & 14 \\ \hline High consumption & >10 & 50 & 62.5 \\ \hline Training & Yes & 8 & 10 \\ exposure & No & 72 & 90 \\ \hline Attitude (score) & Less favorable & \leq 10 & 1 & 1.3 \\ \hline Moderately favorable & 11-20 & 64 & 80 & 17.7 & 3.31 & 10 & 28 \\ \hline \end{array}$		Poor knowledge	Up to 6	20	25	8.84	3.05	2.5	16
High knowledge13-181113.8Animal protein consumption behavior (score)Low consumption Medium consumption High consumption1-522.5Training exposureYes810Moderately favorable 510 648017.73.311028	U	Medium knowledge	7-12	49	61.3				
$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \mbox{consumption} \\ \mbox{behavior (score)} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \mbox{Medium consumption} \\ \mbox{High consumption} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \mbox{6-10} & 28 & 35 \\ \mbox{solution} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \mbox{10.61} & 2.07 & 4 & 14 \\ \mbox{solution} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \mbox{10} & 50 & 62.5 \end{array} & \end{array} \\ \hline \mbox{Training} & \mbox{Yes} & 8 & 10 \\ \mbox{exposure} & \mbox{No} & 72 & 90 \end{array} & \\ \mbox{Attitude (score)} & \mbox{Less favorable} & \mbox{Less favorable} & \mbox{11-20} & 64 & 80 & 17.7 & 3.31 & 10 & 28 \end{array}$	(50010)	High knowledge	13-18	11	13.8				
behavior (score)Medium consumption0-102833High consumption>105062.5Training exposureYes810No7290Attitude (score)Less favorable ≤ 10 1Moderately favorable11-20648017.73.311028		Low consumption	1-5	2	2.5				
High consumption>105062.5Training exposureYes810No7290Attitude (score)Less favorable ≤ 10 11.3Moderately favorable11-20648017.73.311028		Medium consumption	6-10	28	35	10.61	2.07	4	14
exposureNo7290Attitude (score)Less favorable ≤ 10 11.3Moderately favorable11-20648017.73.311028	beliavior (score)	High consumption	>10	50	62.5				
Attitude (score)Less favorable ≤ 10 11.3Moderately favorable11-20648017.73.311028	Training	Yes							
Moderately favorable 11-20 64 80 17.7 3.31 10 28	exposure			72					
	Attitude (score)	Less favorable		1					
High favorable 21-30 15 18.8		·				17.7	3.31	10	28
		High favorable	21-30	15	18.8				

140

141 Table 3. Rank order of sources of animal protein based on animal protein consumption 142 index

Source of animal protein	APCI		Rank order	
	Score	Percentage	_	
Egg	204	85%	2^{nd}	
Milk	195	81.25%	$3^{\rm rd}$	
Chicken	210	87.5%	1^{st}	
Beef	143	59.58%	4^{th}	
Mutton	96	40%	5^{th}	

143 **APCI= Animal protein consumption index

Among the sources of animal protein chicken ranked 1st (APCI= 210, percentage= 87.5%) compared to other sources of animal protein and mutton ranked last (APCI=96, percentage=40%). This might be due to the low and high market price of chicken and mutton respectively.

3.2 Consumers' Awareness regarding the Effect of Antibiotic Used in Animal Feed on 148 149 Human Health

The computed scores of awareness of the respondents ranged from 14 to 24 with mean and 150 151 standard deviation of 18.93 and 2.63 respectively. According to the scores on awareness, the respondents were distributed into three groups as shown in Table 4. 152

- 153
- 154

Table 4. Distribution of the respondents according to their awareness 155

Categories	Score	Respond	ents (N=80)	Mean	Standard	Ra	nge
		Number	Percentag	je	Deviation	Min.	Max.
Low awareness	≤ 8	0	0				
Medium awareness	9-16	16	20.0	18.93	2.63	14	24
High awareness	> 16	64	80.0				

Most (80%) of the respondents were highly aware about the effect of antibiotic used in animal 156 feed on human health. Only one fifth (20%) of the respondents had medium awareness about the 157 effect of antibiotic used in animal feed on human health (Table 4). Therefore, it is clear that, all 158 the respondents were more or less aware about the effect of antibiotic used in animal feed on 159 160 human health. The findings of the present study have harmony with the findings of Mallick and Mondol [9]. They conducted a study on farmers' awareness regarding deforestation at Jalma 161 union of Batiaghata upazila under Khulna district of Bangladesh. 162

Table 5. Rank order of the statements related to antibiotics used in animal feed and their 163 effect on human health based on Awareness Index (AI) 164

165

SI.	Statements		AI*	Rank
No.		Score	Percentage	Order
1.	Resistance grow against the antibiotics which are used in patient treatment	327	81.75%	1^{st}
2.	Some antibiotics can cause stomach upset and other gastrointestinal side effect	286	71.5%	4 th
3.	Allergic reaction and painful rash are possible with many antibiotics	271	67.75%	5^{th}
4.	Some antibiotics may cause cancer.	320	80.00%	2^{nd}
5.	Many antibiotics may adversely affect human fertility	307	76.75%	3^{rd}

166 ****** AI= Awareness Index

Data presented in Table 5 indicate that consumers were highly aware about that the resistance is 167 grown against antibiotics which are used in patient treatment (AI=327, rank= 1st). But consumers 168 were less aware about allergic reaction and painful rash are possible with many antibiotics 169 170 $(AI=271, rank=5^{th}).$

The mean awareness score of the consumers resided at Nirala residential area (x=19.65) was higher than that of the Mohammad Nagar residential area (x=18.2). But it did not differ significantly (t=1.99). This might be due to proximity of the two residential areas.

3.3 Relationship between the Selected Characteristics of the Respondents and Their Awareness Regarding the Effect of Antibiotic Used in Animal Feed on Human Health

176 The purpose of this section is to determine the relationships of the selected characteristics of the respondents with their awareness regarding the effect of antibiotic used in animal feed on human 177 178 health. The selected characteristics of the farmers included: age, educational qualification, family size, family education, exposure to communication media, nutritional knowledge, animal protein 179 consumption behavior and attitude towards antibiotic used in animal feed. Each of the above 180 181 characteristics constituted an independent variable while consumers' awareness regarding the 182 effect of antibiotic used in animal feed on human health was the only dependent variable in this study. Relationships of the nine selected characteristics of the respondents with their awareness 183 184 have been presented in the Table 6.

Independent variable (selected characteristics)	Dependent variable (focus variable)	Correlation coefficient	Remark			
Age		0.055 NS	PPCC			
Education	\mathbf{V}	0.520**	PPCC			
Family size	Consumers' awareness	-0.147 NS	PPCC			
Family education	regarding the	0.419**	PPCC			
Annual family income	effect of antibiotic used in	0.426**	PPCC			
Communication media exposure	animal feed on human health	0.619**	SRCC			
Nutritional knowledge	numan nearth	0.725**	PPCC			
Animal protein consumption behavior		0.310**	SRCC			
Attitude		0.663**	SRCC			

Table 6. Correlation between the selected characteristics of the respondents and their awareness regarding the effect of antibiotic used in animal feed on human health

187 NS= Non-significant, **Correlation highly significant at 1% level of probability and *Correlation highly significant

at 5% level of probability, PPCC = Pearson's Product Moment co-efficient of correlation, SRCC = Spearman Rank
 Correlation Coefficient.

190

Among the selected characteristics of the respondents; education, family education, annual family income, exposure to communication media, nutritional knowledge, animal protein consumption behavior and attitude showed positive significant relationship with their awareness regarding the effect of antibiotic used in animal feed on human health. It means that education, family education, annual family income, exposure to communication media, nutritional knowledge, animal protein consumption behavior and attitude increase awareness of consumers also increases. Similar results were also found bySultana *et al.* [10] regarding age. The findings of the studies conducted by Hasan [11], Shanto [12] and Khatun [13]have harmony with the present study regarding educational qualification. Similar result was described by Hasan [11], Hoque [14] and Mallick and Mondol [9] regarding family size. The findings of the studies conducted by Hasan [11] Shanto [12] and Khatun [13] have similarity with the present study regarding annual family income. Hasan [11] and Shanto [12] observed similar result regarding exposure to communication media. The findings of the studies conducted byHoque [14], Hasan [11] and Jalal [15] have harmony with the present study regarding knowledge.

205

206 4. CONCLUSION

Based on the finding of the study and its' logical interpretation it can be concluded that most of 207 the respondents were highly aware about the effect of antibiotic used in animal feed on human 208 health. Only one fifth of the respondents had medium awareness about the effect of antibiotic 209 used in animal feed on human health. Consumers were highly aware about that resistance is 210 grown in pathogenic organisms causing diseases in human body against antibiotics which are 211 used in patient treatment resulting in treatment failure. But consumers were less aware about 212 allergic reaction and painful rash which are possible with many antibiotics. The mean awareness 213 score of the consumers resided at Nirala residential area was higher than that of the Mohammad 214 Nagar residential area but it did not differ significantly. This might be due to proximity of the 215 two residential areas. Among the selected characteristics of the respondents; education, family 216 education, annual family income, exposure to communication media, nutritional knowledge, 217 218 animal protein consumption behavior and attitude showed positive significant relationship with their awareness regarding the effect of antibiotic used in animal feed on human health. In pursuit 219 of the findings and observations, it is clear that the consumers in the study area are concerned 220 221 about the effect of antibiotic used in animal feed on human health. Government and the producer 222 should develop new strategies for a prudent use of antibiotic in food producing animal to ensure 223 food safety.

224

REFERENCES

- Beyene T. Veterinary drug residues in food-animal products: its risk factors and potential effects on public health. Journal of Veterinary Science & Technology. 2016;7:285.
 DOI:10.4172/2157-7579.1000285.
- Jayalakshmi K, Paramasivam M, Sasikala M, Tamilam TV, Sumithra A. Review on antibiotic residues in animal products and its impact on environments and human health.
 Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies.2017;5(3):1446-1451.
- 3. Swatantra S, Shukla, Tandia N, Nitesh K, Paliwal R. Antibiotic Residues: A global challenge. Pharma Science Monitor. 2014;5(3):184-197.
- 4. Hassali MA, Ho RY, Verma AK, Hussain R, Sivaraman S. Antibiotic use in food animals:
 Malaysia overview. School of Pharmaceutical Sciences, University Sains Malaysia, 11800
 Minden, Penang, Malaysia; 2018.
- 5. Chang Q, Wang W, Regev-Yochay G, Lipsitch M, Hanage W P. Antibiotics in agriculture
 and the risk to human health: how worried should we be? Evolutionary
 Applications.2014;8:240-247.

- 239 6. Landers TF, Cohen B, Wittum TE, Larson EL. A review of antibiotic use in food animals:
 240 perspective, policy, and potential. Public Health Report. 2012;127:4-22.
- Prajwal S, Vasudevan VN, Sathu T, Irshad A, Nayankumar SR, Pame K. Antibiotic residues
 in food animals: Causes and health effects. The Pharma Innovation Journal. 2017;6(12):0104.
- 8. Falowo AB, Akimoladun OF. Veterinary drug residues in meat and meat products:
 occurrence, detection and implications;2019. DOI: org/10.5772/intechopen.83616.
- 9. Mallick A, Mondol S. Farmers' awareness regarding deforestation at Jalma union of
 Batiaghata upazilla under Khulna district of Bangladesh. B.Sc. Ag. (Hons.) Thesis,
 Agrotechnology Discipline, Life Science School, Khulna University, Khulna; 2017.
- 10. Sultana H, Sultana N, Ahmed DMB, Islam MR. Farmers' awareness about Bangladesh
 agricultural research institute (BARI) innovated agricultural machineries: a case study of
 Meherpur district. The journal of rural development.2012;37(2):91-105.
- 11. Hasan MM. Use of organic manure: farmers' awareness and environmental consideration.
 M.S. Thesis, Department of Environmental Science, Bangladesh Agricultural University, Mymensingh; 2008.
- 12. Shanto HH. Awareness of the farmers on environmental pollution due to use of pesticides in vegetable cultivation. M.S. (Ag. Ext. Ed.) Thesis, Department of Agricultural Extension Education, Bangladesh Agricultural University, Mymensingh; 2011.
- 13. Khatun H. Farmers' awareness about the impact of using pesticide on environment at
 Iswaripur union under Shyamnagar upazilla of Satkhira district. B.Sc. Ag. (Hons.) Thesis,
 Agrotechnology Discipline, Life Science School, Khulna University, Khulna; 2017.
- 14. Hoque MK. Environmental awareness and problem confrontation of the FFS farmers in
 practicing IPM. M.S. (Ag. Ext. Ed.) Thesis, Department of Agricultural Extension Education,
 Bangladesh Agricultural University, Mymensingh; 2001.
- I5. Jalal MS. Farmers' awareness of the use of indigenous technical knowledge (ITK) for
 sustainable agricultural development. M.S. (Ag. Ext. Ed.) Thesis, Department of Agricultural
 Extension Education, Bangladesh Agricultural University, Mymensingh; 2009.

and a second