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One of the most frequently given reasons for relinquishing a companion animal to an animal shelter is that the person or family is moving. Telephone interviews conducted with 57 caregivers who relinquished animal companions to a shelter in the midwestern United States covered details of the move, characteristics both of the caregivers and the animals, and efforts to avoid relinquishment. A human–nonhuman animal bonding scale also was administered. Although some participants had additional reasons for relinquishment, the majority had given up their pets solely because they were moving. Most had relatively low income, were moving for employment reasons, and were renting their homes. Landlord restrictions were an important factor in relinquishment. High scores on the bonding scale and spontaneous expressions of discomfort and sorrow suggest that external pressures overrode attachment to the animal and the pain of relinquishment.

Although the numbers are declining, millions of companion animals are brought to U.S. animal shelters each year, and a high proportion subsequently are destroyed (DiGiacomo, Arluke, & Patronek, 1998). One of the most frequently given reasons for relinquishing a companion animal is that the owner is moving. In their study of 130 relinquishers, Miller, Staats, Partlo, and Rada (1996) found moving to be the main reason for relinquishment of cats and the third most common reason for relinquishment of dogs. The National Council on Pet Population Study and Policy’s Regional Shelter Study analyzed data from 12 shelters in four regions of the United States. Of 71 reasons for relinquishment, moving was cited most often for dogs and third most frequently for cats (Salman et al., 1998).
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Analyses of Regional Shelter Study questionnaires completed by relinquishers who were moving (New et al., 1999) provide information on both owner and non-human animal characteristics. Most of the relinquished animals were obtained at no cost, were under 3 years of age, and had lived with their relinquishers less than 2 years. Young adults were overrepresented among relinquishers, and median household income ranged between $20,000 and $34,999. Landlord refusal to allow pets was the most common additional reason given for relinquishment. These results suggest that, when moving, this group of pet owners may find it especially difficult to retain their pets. The primary purpose of this study is to obtain additional information on the circumstances surrounding the decision to move and to give up a pet at that time.

DiGiacomo et al. (1998) pointed out that shelter staff may be intolerant of owners who relinquish their pets, viewing their reasons as “excuses given by an irresponsible public” (p. 42). Their in-depth interviews with 38 individuals or families relinquishing pets indicated that most relinquishers were in difficult or complex situations and had struggled before turning to the shelter. However, they also found that the usually brief reasons given to shelter staff often were not the primary reasons for relinquishment. Another purpose of this study is to determine whether relinquishers told admissions staff they were moving when, in fact, they were not.

Relinquishment obviously is the end of the relationship between human and companion animal, but that relationship might have been weak or strained prior to relinquishment. Patronek, Glickman, Beck, McCabe, and Ecker (1996a, 1996b) used carrying a picture of a pet dog or cat and considering the pet to be a family member as measures of owner–pet attachment. They found that both were reported less frequently among relinquishers as compared with pet-owning households, and constituted risk factors for relinquishment. Scarlett, Salman, New, and Kass (1999) found a high level of movement of animals in and out of the households of people relinquishing for health and personal reasons and suggested that a lack of stability in the human–animal bond may be a factor in relinquishment. Our study used a pet attachment scale to investigate the relationship between bonding and relinquishment for moving.

METHOD

Data for this study were obtained from a humane society in a midwestern U.S. city. The private, not-for-profit agency primarily serves the city and surrounding county, a 1,000-square-mile area with an estimated 2001 population of 455,516 people (U.S. Census Bureau, 2002). A second, open-admissions shelter, operated by the municipal Animal Control department, also serves the community.

During a 3-month period (February 1, 2002 to April 30, 2002), the researchers were given access to the Humane Society’s intake forms. Each form provides basic information on the animal or animals relinquished, the relinquisher, and the reason
given for surrender of the animal. Those indicating that moving was the reason for surrender were included in the study. Researchers telephoned relinquishers and asked them to participate in a university research study “Looking at how dogs and cats, puppies and kittens wind up at animal shelters.” Because one objective of the study was to determine whether people who were not, in fact, moving used moving as a surrender reason, participants were not told that the study was limited to those who had said they were moving.

If moving was given as a reason for surrendering the animal, the participant was asked a series of questions about the move, including the reason for moving. Participants were asked about other pets, specifically whether the other pets had moved with them and why some were retained and others were given up. Those who did not mention moving as the reason for relinquishment were asked follow-up questions related to the reason given. In all cases, information about the relinquished animal was obtained. A human–animal bonding scale, based on scales by Poresky, Hendrix, Mosier, and Samuels (1987) and Eckstein (2000), was administered. Participants also were asked to rate how much trouble the relinquished pet had been. The interview ended with demographic questions.

The researchers tried to record the person’s own words in response to all open-ended questions. Standard procedures for handling such responses were employed (Patton, 1990). Three coders worked independently to categorize and code open-ended questions. Discrepancies were discussed and consensus was obtained for assignment of responses to categories.

RESULTS

During the 3-month data collection period, 98 people (4.4% of admissions) cited moving as the reason for relinquishing canines or felines to the shelter. All were called. In some cases, 10 or more attempts were made before either contacting the person or determining that the person could not be reached \((n = 24)\). Seventy-four relinquishers were reached, 7 of whom declined to participate. The 67 interviews constitute a completion rate of 68.4% of the entire sample and 90.1% of those reached. When asked during the telephone interview what led to relinquishment, 10 respondents did not mention moving as a factor. Unless otherwise indicated, results are based on data obtained from the 57 remaining interviews.

Twenty-nine men and 28 women were interviewed. All but 5 reported their race or ethnicity as White. Three were African American, 1 was Native American, and 1 was of mixed heritage. The largest proportion were in their 20s \((n = 24, 42.1\%)\), 6 were younger than 20 years old, 10 were in their 30s, 12 were in their 40s, and 5 respondents were 50 or older. Most \((77.2\%)\) were employed at the time of the interview, 48.2% had a household income of less than $30,000 per year, and 57.9% lived with a spouse or significant other, children, or both (Table 1).
Reason for Relinquishment

Participants were asked, “Could you tell me what led you to bring the dog/cat/puppy/kitten to the shelter?” Landlord conditions comprised the largest set of reasons (Table 2). In most of these cases (n = 14), pets were forbidden in the apartment complex, apartment, or house. Three relinquishers had dogs who were larger than the landlord allowed. In another three cases, the person or family could not afford the required pet deposit. Some respondents gave reasons that also might reflect landlord requirements, stating that they could not take the animal where they were moving or that they were uncertain about their future living arrangements.

Eight respondents gave up their pets because of involvement in the military. It should be noted that data collection was begun less than 5 months after the events of September 11, 2001, in a city that is home to an Air Force base. One case was clearly related to these events: The relinquisher’s father reported that his son had
rejoined the Army to fight terrorism. Two other pet owners had recently joined the military. One owner had been called to active duty, 2 were being transferred to another location, and 2 were moving to base housing that either prohibited pets (single men’s dormitory) or limited the number allowed.

One category of reasons was labeled “owner chose not to take.” In these cases, there was no evidence of external barriers to retention of the pet, as in the case of landlord and military restrictions. Seven relinquishers in this group had decided that their new homes would not be appropriate for the animal. Most indicated that the new house or yard was too small or not fenced. One woman described the emotionally difficult decision her husband had made, giving up two well-loved hunting dogs because he felt that it would be cruel to keep them in a 6 ft.-by-9 ft. dog run. One man was moving to Florida and felt that the climate would be too hot for his outdoor Chow Chow dogs; the man also had cats and birds who were to move with him. Another man was selling his home and felt that the dog was in the way when showing the house to prospective buyers. Other reasons owners gave for choosing not to take their pets included problem behavior on the part of the animals and the decision to reduce the number of animals in the household.

Reason for Moving

Participants were asked whether there was a “reason that you moved/are moving at this time” (Table 3). Slightly more than 30% of the moves were work related, including moves to take a new job, moves to be closer to work, and moves by members of the military. Housing characteristics were involved in 20 of the moves. Pets were relinquished when owners moved to another type of home, usually a new or different house; when owners were forced to move (landlord selling or remodeling, evicted, asked to leave); and when economic reasons or a bad landlord or neighborhood necessitated moving. Four respondents included in this group reported that their lease was up but did not indicate whether they could have renewed it.

Respondents experienced a variety of life transitions that led to pet relinquishment. Companion animals were brought to the shelter when young adults left home or went to school. Other transitions included divorce or relationship break-ups, retirements, and moves to be closer to family. Health issues were involved in three moves: One couple entered an assisted-living facility; another moved to a house with fewer stairs. A 77-year-old woman gave up her 8-year-old cat when she moved to an apartment on a lower floor. Mentioning her problems carrying bags of litter, the woman said that the cat “needs somebody to take care of her better than I can.” Owner life transitions were involved in 30% of the relinquishments.
In 23 cases (41.4%) the move was the person’s own idea; 21 (37.5%) reported that they had to move. Slightly over 60% ($n = 34$) said that they had been thinking about moving “for a while,” and slightly more than 30% stated that they “suddenly needed to move.” Most (73.6%) had been renting, and 66.7% were renting their new home. One third of participants’ new homes were apartments, and 35.2% were moving into single-family homes.

### Attempts to Avoid Relinquishment

Respondents were asked, “Before bringing the animal to the shelter, did you try anything else—to try to fix the problem, to try to keep the animal with you, or to find another place for it?” The majority of respondents ($n = 47; 83.9\%$) said that they had, with many describing lengthy or multiple efforts. The most commonly reported actions were attempts to find a new home for the animal through personal contacts ($n = 30$), putting up signs and notices or placing ads in newspapers ($n = 7$), trying to locate the previous owner or breeder ($n = 2$), or asking a veterinarian for assistance in finding a home ($n = 2$). Five respondents stated that they “tried to find it a home” without specifying how they did so. Six relinquishers viewed the Humane Society as a preferred option, some stating that the animal would have a better chance of adoption, that they had heard good things about the agency, or that the shelter would screen potential adopters. One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason Given</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work reasons (e.g., new job)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce/relationship breakup</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving to a different type of housing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced move (e.g., landlord selling house)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease is up</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To leave a bad housing situation/landlord</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic (e.g., cheaper apartment)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health (e.g., home with fewer stairs)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be closer to family</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young adult leaving parents’ home</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Total is greater than 100% because of multiple responses.
man, relinquishing a purebred Rottweiler, stated that he chose not to sell the dog because he did not want her used as an attack dog. He felt that the shelter’s screening process would prevent that. One man, bringing a 1-year-old Shih Tzu to the shelter after trying to find someone to adopt her, stated that the “only other thing would have been to put her out and let her run.” Four owners who reported that their pets had behavior problems had tried to correct the problem before relinquishing the animal. Few relinquishers mentioned trying to keep the animal despite moving. One woman had tried to get the landlord to accept her dog. Two respondents mentioned looking for apartments that would accept animals: One reported that they only accept “itty-bitty” dogs, and another said “if they do, they’re dumps.”

Characteristics of the Animals

The 57 respondents brought 80 animals to the shelter: 36 dogs (45%), 11 puppies (13.7%), 25 cats (31.2%), and 8 kittens (10.0%). One respondent was unable to provide information on 2 of the 3 cats he relinquished; the rest of the information therefore is about 78 animals. The average age of the animals was 1.96 years (SD = 2.40, range = 8 weeks to 13 years); 69.2% were less than 2 years old. Slightly more than half of the animals were males (52.6%). Nearly two thirds were intact (intact males, n = 32, 41.0%; intact females, n = 25, 32.1%). Neutered females (n = 12, 15.4%) outnumbered neutered males (n = 9, 11.5%). Of the 23 dog breeds and breed mixes represented, German Shepherds were the most common, followed by Labrador Retrievers and Chow Chows. Thirteen of the dogs were reported to be purebred. All the cats were classified as domestic short (54.8%), medium (38.7%), or longhairs (6.5%).

The mean length of time the relinquisher had owned the relinquished animal was 18 months. Length of ownership ranged from 10 weeks to 10 years, but 47.4% had been in the household less than 1 year. Nearly three quarters (74.4%) were obtained at no cost. Prices paid for the 20 remaining animals ranged from $10 to $400, with 10 of the 20 costing less than $70. Half the animals had been giveaways, gifts, or found through advertisements. Fifteen (19.2%) were born to another animal in the household, 13 (16.7%) had been purchased, and 7 (9.0%) had been strays. Four relinquishers reported having obtained the animal from a shelter.

Respondents were asked whether there were any other reasons the relinquished animal was brought to the shelter. Forty respondents said there were no reasons beyond moving. Some praised the animal (“great dog,” “the perfect dog,” “very well-behaved puppy”) or reported that it was difficult to give the animal up (“hard thing to do,” “I loved them,” “tore me up”). The majority of the reasons given by the other 17 relinquishers (Table 4) had to do with the animal’s behavior.
The two cases in which the owner’s pregnancy led to pet relinquishment (one dog and one cat) were not related to health concerns such as exposure to toxoplasmosis. Although many of the reasons could be called normal animal behavior, only two were labeled as such. In one, after having relinquished two dogs because the new landlord would not permit pets, the owner became so upset that she reclaimed the adult dog. She left the puppy behind, feeling that the “typical puppy things” the animal did would certainly get her in trouble with her landlord. In the other case, the owner reported that her cats’ nighttime wanderings were setting off the motion detector alarm system. There was only one case of aggressive behavior, a 4-month-old Yorkshire Terrier who bit the owner’s father.

Respondents were asked to rate the relinquished animal in terms of how much of a problem the animal was, choosing a rating from 1 (no problem at all) to 10 (nothing but trouble). The mean rating was 3.47 (SD = 1.97), 76.9% received ratings of 4 or less, and only 6.4% were rated 8 or higher (Figure 1).

Twenty-one respondents (36.8%) had other pets at the time of relinquishment, and 14 retained or planned to retain them when they moved. After stating, “it does happen that some pets get to go when folks move, while others don’t,” the interviewers asked how this happened in each case (Table 5). The most common reason was that the retained pet fit the new landlord’s requirements for species, size, or number of pets permitted. Owners kept animals to whom they felt most highly attached and older animals. They also retained animals who were more well-behaved and easier to care for.

When asked to compare the relinquished pet to their other pets, 11 of the 21 respondents reported that the former was more trouble. In a second comparison question, using a scale ranging from 1 to 10, 13 of 17 respondents rated the relinquished pet as more trouble (6 or higher); 4 rated the relinquished pet as less trouble (rating of 4 or lower).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem behavior (barking, digging, destructive behavior)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat spraying</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puppy not responding to attempts to housebreak</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal perceived as needing too much attention</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal perceived as too energetic/hyper</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal knocking down or impeding a young child</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner is pregnant</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too big or outdoor animal</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal animal behavior</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog bit a relative</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment to the Relinquished Animal

The human–animal bonding scale consisted of a set of 10 questions, to be answered, *always, usually, sometimes,* or *never.* Participants were asked to rate the frequency in which:

1. You were responsible for the animal’s care.
2. You cleaned up after the animal.
3. You held, stroked, or petted the animal.
4. The animal slept in your room.
5. The animal was responsive to you.
6. You felt that you had a close relationship with the animal.
7. You traveled with the animal.
8. The animal slept near you.
9. You considered the animal to be a regular member of the family.
10. You played or engaged in activities with the animal.

The first eight questions are a slightly reworded version of the Companion Animal Bonding Scale (Poresky et al., 1987); the last two were adapted from the Pet Relationship Impact Inventory (Eckstein, 2000).

The range of possible total scores was from 10 (low bonding) to 40 points (high bonding). The mean total for the 78 animals was 30.9 \((SD = 5.6)\), 48.1% were in the top third, and only 2 animals were in the bottom third of possible scores. On 7 of the 10 questions, 60% or more of the responses were always. The exceptions were whether the animal slept in the relinquisher’s room (32.1% always, 43.6% never), whether the animal slept near the relinquisher (35.9% always, 35.9% never), and whether the animal traveled with the person (6.4% always, 65.4% never).

There was no significant difference in level of bonding based on species. The difference between relinquishers who had to move \((M = 33.6, SD = 4.2)\) and those whose move was voluntary \((M = 30.2, SD = 5.5)\) was small but statistically significant, \(t(42) = 2.26, p = .03\). Similarly, relinquishers whose household income was less than $30,000 per year were slightly but statistically significantly more bonded \((M = 32.7, SD = 4.6)\) than those whose income was $30,000 or greater \((M = 29.7, SD = 5.5), t(52) = 2.22, p = .03\).

Comments made during the interviews offer additional support for the finding that the respondents were close to their relinquished pets. As mentioned earlier, when asked if there were other reasons for relinquishment, most reported that moving was the only reason, with some emphasizing the positive attributes of the animal and the pain involved in their actions. At least three relinquishers asked the interviewers whether they knew what had happened to their animals. Another visited the shelter’s Web site to see if her cat was among those posted for adoption, this despite the fact that she had described the cat as an unwanted gift and an unfriendly animal and herself as preferring dogs. This woman also was upset at being called for an interview. Another woman sounded distressed and was hesitant about being interviewed, stating “it was only yesterday that I brought him out there,” and a third suggested that we wait longer between relinquishment and calling to interview people. This last respondent was the wife of a man whose two German Shorthaired Pointers had been relinquished because they no longer had a fenced yard and the owner felt it cruel to keep them in a dog run. The woman said she was glad that her husband was not home to take the call, as giving up the dogs had been, and continued to be, very painful for him.
“Heartbroken,” “broken up,” and similar expressions were used to describe a number of relinquishers’ feelings about giving up their pets. Three respondents told the interviewers that they had cried over the action. After having “cried all night” one reclaimed the adult dog (but not the puppy) she had surrendered and was keeping the dog without her landlord’s knowledge. A young man returned to the shelter and found his relinquished puppy available for adoption. He described his plan to readopt her if she remained there. When asked what he would do about his landlord, he said he would try to get the landlord to allow him to keep the pup; if that did not work, he would find another place to live. This man viewed his upset and crying as a “breakdown” that showed him he should not have relinquished the animal. He was concerned that the interviewer understand that he did not “condone” giving up pets, and stated that he would never do this again.

DISCUSSION

Moving is a major reason given for the relinquishment of animals to shelters (Miller et al., 1996; Salman et al., 1998). It also is a reason sometimes met with skepticism on the part of shelter staff, who wonder whether relinquishers use this to avoid questioning or criticism. In this sample, 57 of the 67 respondents told interviewers not employed by the Humane Society that they had relinquished because they were moving. Follow-up questions about the details of the move provided additional evidence that they indeed had moved or that a move was imminent.

In 10 of the 24 cases in which the person could not be reached, the interviewer received a message that the telephone was disconnected or no longer in service. Although no definitive statement can be made about these 10, it is possible that the discontinuance of telephone service was the result of a move. Twice, the interviewer reached a friend or family member who said the person had moved but who could not provide a new number.

There were 10 cases in which the respondent did not tell the interviewer that moving was the reason for relinquishment: In 8 of these “not moving” situations follow-up questioning indicated that moving was somehow relevant. Two involved parents who temporarily had kept a pet their grown children had left behind. Another was told by his landlord to get rid of the dog or move out. Four respondents said that they would be moving in the near future, and a fifth had planned to move and could no longer do so because he had lost his job. He was relinquishing the pet for financial reasons. Thus, it appears that relinquishers do not simply invent moving as a reason for relinquishment. For most of those contacted, it was the real reason. For some, it was at least a factor in the person’s current life situation and, as such, may have been influential in the timing of the relinquishment.
Landlords appear to play a crucial role in the need to relinquish a pet when changing residence. Respondents gave up pets because pets were forbidden, were too large, or because the owners had more pets than were permitted. The combination of relatively low annual household income (48.1% < $30,000) and status as renters (66.7%) suggests that the pet owners may have had relatively few options other than to relinquish the animal. There also may be a lack of “pet-friendly” rentals in the area.

Although landlords’ regulations were a major factor in multiple-pet households as well, in those cases other features also became salient. Scarlett et al. (1999) found that approximately 17% of owners relinquishing for health and personal reasons retained one or more other pets, perhaps selecting the “least favorite animal” (p. 55) to be given up. The same may be true here, as many of the multiple-pet owners reported retaining those to whom they were more attached or had had for a longer period of time. Qualities that made the retained animal easier to care for (size, indoor, less trouble) also played a role.

Twelve of the 57 relinquishers chose not to take the pet when they moved, most stating that the new home would not be appropriate for the animal. Their comments suggest that they may have viewed relinquishment for potential adoption in the best interest of the animal. That clearly seems to have been the motive of the man who gave up his hunting dogs rather than keep them in a pen. In addition, bonding scores for this group did not differ significantly from scores of those who relinquished because of landlord restrictions. Nonetheless, it appears that members of this group may have had a larger range of alternatives than did other relinquishers.

More dogs and puppies were relinquished than were cats and kittens (58.7% versus 41.2%), and some multiple-pet owners reported that their landlords permitted them to keep their cats but not their dogs. In addition, large-breed dogs, usually less welcome in rental units, predominated. The animals were generally young, had not been in the household for long, and had been obtained at low or no cost, characteristics found in other research to place pets at risk for relinquishment (Miller et al., 1996; New et al., 1999; Patronek et al., 1996a, 1996b). More intact than altered animals were in the sample, but this did not appear related to problems found among hormonally influenced animals; in fact, fewer secondary reasons for relinquishment were reported for intact animals (22.8%) than for altered ones (33.3%).

Scores on the bonding scale indicated that the majority of relinquishers in this sample were quite involved with the animal they gave up. Similarly high proportions also viewed their pet as nonproblematic, and 83.9% tried to avoid bringing the animal to the shelter, primarily by attempting to find the pet a new home. The small number of respondents who reported trying to find a place that would accept pets might reflect the local housing market. Alternatively, it may mean that the needs of the family pet were not a high priority when seeking a new residence,
even though giving up the pet would be painful. Research comparing relinquishers to people who moved and kept their pets, using bonding and other factors considered in this study, could provide additional insight into the circumstances surrounding relinquishment when moving.

The methodology used here enabled us to obtain a broader and richer understanding of this group of relinquishers. We encountered few who seemed callous or thoughtless and a number who genuinely grieved their action or missed their pets. As in the study by DiGiacomo et al. (1998) these relinquishers’ decisions did not appear to be “trivial or casual” (p. 50), a fact that might help reduce the stress and anger experienced by shelter admissions staff and improve staff–customer interactions at relinquishment. Shelter adoption counselors might advise renters, particularly younger people who are more likely to move (New et al., 1999), to consider adopting cats or smaller dogs so that later they will not be faced with the painful decision to relinquish a family pet. Finally, efforts to prevent relinquishment might be directed at increasing the numbers of landlords who accept pets, particularly larger dogs.
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