

ICPSR 34871

**Public Opinion About Nuclear  
Energy in the Context of Local  
Public Hearings About the  
Expansion of the V.C. Summer  
Nuclear Station, South Carolina,  
2008-2009**

John Besley  
*University of South Carolina*

Codebook

Inter-university Consortium for  
Political and Social Research  
P.O. Box 1248  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106  
[www.icpsr.umich.edu](http://www.icpsr.umich.edu)

# Terms of Use

The terms of use for this study can be found at:  
<http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/ICPSR/studies/34871/terms>

## Information about Copyrighted Content

Some instruments administered as part of this study may contain in whole or substantially in part contents from copyrighted instruments. Reproductions of the instruments are provided as documentation for the analysis of the data associated with this collection. Restrictions on "fair use" apply to all copyrighted content. More information about the reproduction of copyrighted works by educators and librarians is available from the United States Copyright Office.

### NOTICE WARNING CONCERNING COPYRIGHT RESTRICTIONS

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be "used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research." If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

### **ICPSR PROCESSING NOTES FOR #34871**

*Public Opinion About Nuclear Energy in the Context of Local Public Hearings About the Expansion of the V.C. Summer Nuclear Station, South Carolina, 2008-2009*

- 1) **Weighted Data:** Please note that the original deposited data for this study was weighted. ICPSR standard processing is to turn off all weights prior to release. In order to view the weighted data, use the weight variable **CENSUSWT**.

SURVEY RESEARCH LABORATORY  
SURVEY ON NUCLEAR POWER ATTITUDES  
Revised Training Version - 11/13/08

"Hello, this is \_\_\_\_\_ calling for the University of South Carolina. This month the University is conducting a brief confidential study of public opinion in South Carolina and we'd really appreciate your help and cooperation."

"First, let me make sure I've dialed the correct phone number ... "Is this \_\_\_\_\_?"

"And what county do you live in? RECORD COUNTY \_\_\_\_\_"

"Now, to determine who to interview ... of the people who currently live in your household who are 18 or older - including yourself - we would like to interview the one who will have the next birthday. Would that be you or someone else?"

GENDER. RECORD SEX OF RESPONDENT (ASK IF UNSURE).

[WHEN SELECTED RESPONDENT IS ON THE PHONE]: "As you may have heard, a group of energy producers in South Carolina is asking the state's Public Service Commission for permission to expand the existing nuclear power plant near Jenkinsville, which is about 25 miles north of Columbia.

There will be a week-long public hearing on this issue at the beginning of December. The questions we will ask you are about nuclear power. They are not designed to promote support or opposition to nuclear power, but rather to find out how you feel about this issue.

The first set of questions is on your feelings about nuclear power in the State of South Carolina and the decision-makers who may be involved in the public hearing process.

1. "When it comes to the potential BENEFITS of nuclear power production in South Carolina, do you think people like you will receive a very fair, somewhat fair, somewhat unfair, or very unfair share of the benefits? By fair, we mean whether people like you will get an appropriate share of the benefits."

1. Very fair
2. Somewhat fair
3. Somewhat unfair
4. Very unfair
5. Don't know (PROBE: "In general ...")

2. “When it comes to the potential RISKS of nuclear power production in South Carolina, do you think that the share of the risks for people like you will be very fair, somewhat fair, somewhat unfair, or very unfair? Again, by fair we mean whether people like you will get an appropriate share of the risks.”

1. Very fair
2. Somewhat fair
3. Somewhat unfair
4. Very unfair
5. Don’t know (PROBE: “In general ...”)

3. “What about the EFFECTIVENESS of public hearings ... would you say that the process of public hearings is a very effective, somewhat effective, not too effective, or not at all effective way to hear all sides of the debate about nuclear power in South Carolina?”

1. Very effective
2. Somewhat effective
3. Not too effective
4. Not at all effective
5. Don’t know (PROBE: “In general ...”)

4. “When it comes to the VOICE of citizens at public hearings, would you say that the process of public hearings is a very fair, somewhat fair, somewhat unfair, or very unfair way to give citizens in South Carolina a voice in decision-making about nuclear power?”

1. Very fair
2. Somewhat fair
3. Somewhat unfair
4. Very unfair
5. Don’t know (PROBE: “In general ...”)

5. “How much respect do you think that decision-makers in the process of public hearings about issues such as nuclear power have for the views of the public ... a great deal of respect, some respect, not too much respect, or no respect at all?”

1. A great deal of respect
2. Some respect
3. Not too much respect
4. No respect at all
5. Don’t know (PROBE: “In general ...”)

6. "How would you rate the trustworthiness of decision-makers in the process of public hearings about issues such as nuclear power ... do you feel these decision-makers are very trustworthy, somewhat trustworthy, not too trustworthy, or not at all trustworthy?"
1. Very trustworthy
  2. Somewhat trustworthy
  3. Not too trustworthy
  4. Not at all trustworthy
  5. Don't know (PROBE: "In general ...")
7. "When it comes to knowledge and expertise about nuclear power, do you think that the decision-makers at a public hearing about nuclear power would be very knowledgeable, somewhat knowledgeable, not too knowledgeable, or not at all knowledgeable about nuclear power issues?"
1. Very knowledgeable
  2. Somewhat knowledgeable
  3. Not too knowledgeable
  4. Not at all knowledgeable
  5. Don't know (PROBE: "In general ...")
8. "Overall, how legitimate do you think the public hearing process is for deciding whether to expand nuclear power plants in South Carolina, very legitimate, somewhat legitimate, not too legitimate, or not at all legitimate?"
1. Very legitimate
  2. Somewhat legitimate
  3. Not too legitimate
  4. Not at all legitimate
  5. Don't know (PROBE: "In general ...")

"Now I'd like to ask you a few questions specifically about energy related issues."

9. "How concerned are you about the safety of nuclear power? Would you say you are very concerned, somewhat concerned, not too concerned, or not at all concerned?"
1. Very concerned
  2. Somewhat concerned
  3. Not too concerned
  4. Not at all concerned
  5. Don't know (PROBE: "In general ...")
10. "How concerned are you about climate change. Would you say you are very concerned,

somewhat concerned, not too concerned, or not at all concerned?”

1. Very concerned
2. Somewhat concerned
3. Not too concerned
4. Not at all concerned
5. Don't know (PROBE: “In general ...”)

11. “How concerned are you about obtaining energy independence for the United States. Would you say you are very concerned, somewhat concerned, not too concerned, or not at all concerned?”

1. Very concerned
2. Somewhat concerned
3. Not too concerned
4. Not at all concerned
5. Don't know (PROBE: “In general ...”)

12. “When it comes to cost, do you think that turning to nuclear energy as a source of electricity will end up being a lot less expensive, a little less expensive, about the same cost, a little more expensive, or a lot more expensive than other available alternatives?”

1. A lot less expensive
2. A little less expensive
3. Cost about the same
4. A little more expensive
5. A lot more expensive
6. Don't know (PROBE: “In general ...”)

13. “Overall, would you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose expanding a nuclear power plant in the Midlands of South Carolina as one of the ways to provide electricity for the state?”

1. Strongly favor
2. Somewhat favor
3. Somewhat oppose
4. Strongly oppose
5. Don't know (PROBE: “In general ...”)

14. “How important is the issue of expanding nuclear power plants in South Carolina to you, personally. Would you say it is the most important issue, a very important issue, somewhat important, or not too important?”

1. Most important issue
2. Very important
3. Somewhat important
4. Not too important
5. Don’t know (PROBE: “In general ...”)

15. “And if you disagree with the final decision about expanding a nuclear power plant in the Midlands – whatever that decision might be – would you be very angry, somewhat angry, not too angry, or not at all angry?”

1. Very angry
2. Somewhat angry
3. Not too angry
4. Not at all angry
5. Don’t know (PROBE: “In general ...”)

16. “Would you say you have heard a lot, some, a little, or nothing at all about the possibility of expanding nuclear power production in South Carolina?”

1. A lot
2. Some
3. A little
4. Nothing at all
5. Don’t know (PROBE: “In general ...”)

17. “In an average day, how much attention do you pay to news in local newspapers, including their websites: a lot, some, a little, or none at all?”

1. A lot
2. Some
3. A little
4. None at all
5. Don’t know (PROBE: “In general ...”)



18. "In an average day, how much attention do you pay to news on local television stations, including their websites: a lot, some, a little, or none at all?"

1. A lot
2. Some
3. A little
4. None at all
5. Don't know (PROBE: "In general ...")

"Now, a few final questions..."

19. "What is your age?"

\_\_\_\_\_ CODE EXACT NUMBER OF YEARS (E.G., 45)

96. NINETY-SIX YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER
97. REFUSED
98. DK

20. "Do you live in an urban, suburban, or rural area of South Carolina?"

1. URBAN (INSIDE CITY LIMITS)
2. SUBURBAN (JUST OUTSIDE CITY LIMITS)
3. RURAL (AWAY FROM A CITY)
4. DK (PROBE: "How would you describe it?")

21. "What is the highest grade of school or year of college that you actually finished and got credit for?"

\_\_\_\_\_ RECORD GRADE

00. NO FORMAL SCHOOLING
98. DK

22. "Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent or what?"

IF REPUBLICAN: "Would you call yourself a strong Republican or a not very strong Republican?"

IF DEMOCRAT: "Would you call yourself a strong Democrat or a not very strong Democrat?"

IF INDEPENDENT, NO PREFERENCE, OR OTHER: "Do you think of yourself as closer to the Republican or to the Democrat party?"

1. STRONG REPUBLICAN
2. NOT VERY STRONG REPUBLICAN
3. INDEPENDENT, BUT CLOSER TO REPUBLICANS
4. INDEPENDENT -- CLOSER TO NEITHER
5. INDEPENDENT, BUT CLOSER TO DEMOCRATS
6. NOT VERY STRONG DEMOCRAT
7. STRONG DEMOCRAT
8. OTHER (SPECIFY: \_\_\_\_\_)

23. "What is your race?" (PROBE BY READING CHOICES IF NECESSARY)

1. BLACK; AFRICAN-AMERICAN
2. WHITE
3. HISPANIC; PUERTO RICAN; MEXICAN OR SPANISH-AMERICAN
4. NATIVE AMERICAN; AMERICAN INDIAN
5. ASIAN; ORIENTAL
6. OTHER (SPECIFY): \_\_\_\_\_

24. "Including yourself, how many people aged 18 or older are currently living in your household?"

\_\_\_\_\_ RECORD NUMBER

7. SEVEN OR MORE

8. DK

25. "Not counting business lines, cell phones, extension phones, faxes, or modems -- on how many different land line telephone numbers can your household be reached?"

1. ONE

2. TWO

3. THREE

4. FOUR

5. FIVE

6. SIX

7. SEVEN OR MORE

8. DK

26. "And what is your zip code?" RECORD \_\_\_\_\_

27. RECORD SEX: 1. MALE  
2. FEMALE

"That's all the questions I have. Is there anything else you would like to tell the researchers for this study about your views on the issue of nuclear power?"

1. NO

2. YES ("What is that?" – RECORD: \_\_\_\_\_)

\_\_\_\_\_

"We'd like to contact you in a couple of weeks to conduct a brief follow-up study. Could you please tell me your first name, so that we know who to ask for when we call-back?"

1. GAVE NAME (RECORD: \_\_\_\_\_)

2. WOULD NOT GIVE NAME, BUT OK TO CALL BACK

3. REFUSED TO PARTICIPATE IN FOLLOW-UP

"Thank you very much for your cooperation."

SURVEY RESEARCH LABORATORY  
SURVEY ON NUCLEAR POWER ATTITUDES  
Post-test Training Version - 12/11/08

"Hello, this is \_\_\_\_\_ calling for the University of South Carolina. May I please speak to \_\_\_\_\_.

[WHEN SELECTED RESPONDENT IS ON THE PHONE]: "Several weeks ago we spoke with you about a group of energy producers in South Carolina that have asked the state's Public Service Commission for permission to expand the existing nuclear power plant near Jenkinsville, which is about 25 miles north of Columbia. At that time you indicated that we could contact you for a follow-up study, and that is the purpose of this call.

As you may be aware, there was a two-week-long public hearing on this issue at the beginning of December. The questions we will ask you are still about nuclear power. The commission isn't expected to make its decision until February but we would like to know where your views stand now that the hearings are complete. Again, the questions are not designed to promote support or opposition to nuclear power, but rather to find out how you feel about this issue.

As before, the first set of questions is on your feelings about nuclear power in the State of South Carolina and the decision-makers who were involved in the public hearing process.

1. "When it comes to the potential BENEFITS of nuclear power production in South Carolina, do you think people like you will receive a very fair, somewhat fair, somewhat unfair, or very unfair share of the benefits? By fair, we mean whether people like you will get an appropriate share of the benefits."

1. Very fair
2. Somewhat fair
3. Somewhat unfair
4. Very unfair
5. Don't know (PROBE: "In general ...")

2. "When it comes to the potential RISKS of nuclear power production in South Carolina, do you think that the share of the risks for people like you will be very fair, somewhat fair, somewhat unfair, or very unfair? Again, by fair we mean whether people like you will get an appropriate share of the risks."

1. Very fair
2. Somewhat fair
3. Somewhat unfair
4. Very unfair
5. Don't know (PROBE: "In general ...")

3. "What about the EFFECTIVENESS of public hearings ... would you say that the process

of public hearings is a very effective, somewhat effective, not too effective, or not at all effective way to hear all sides of the debate about nuclear power in South Carolina?”

1. Very effective
2. Somewhat effective
3. Not too effective
4. Not at all effective
5. Don't know (PROBE: “In general ...”)

4. “When it comes to the VOICE of citizens at public hearings, would you say that the process of public hearings is a very fair, somewhat fair, somewhat unfair, or very unfair way to give citizens in South Carolina a voice in decision-making about nuclear power?”

1. Very fair
2. Somewhat fair
3. Somewhat unfair
4. Very unfair
5. Don't know (PROBE: “In general ...”)

5. “How much respect do you think that decision-makers in the process of public hearings about issues such as nuclear power have for the views of the public ... a great deal of respect, some respect, not too much respect, or no respect at all?”

1. A great deal of respect
2. Some respect
3. Not too much respect
4. No respect at all
5. Don't know (PROBE: “In general ...”)

6. “How would you rate the trustworthiness of decision-makers in the process of public hearings about issues such as nuclear power ... do you feel these decision-makers are very trustworthy, somewhat trustworthy, not too trustworthy, or not at all trustworthy?”

1. Very trustworthy
2. Somewhat trustworthy
3. Not too trustworthy
4. Not at all trustworthy
5. Don't know (PROBE: “In general ...”)

7. “Overall, how satisfied are you with the public hearing process as a way to decide whether South Carolina should increase the number of nuclear power plants in South Carolina ... very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?”

1. Very satisfied
2. Somewhat satisfied
3. Somewhat dissatisfied
4. Very unsatisfied
5. Don’t know (PROBE: “In general ...”)

8a. “Overall, how legitimate do you think the public hearing process is for deciding whether to expand nuclear power plants in South Carolina, very legitimate, somewhat legitimate, not too legitimate, or not at all legitimate?”

1. Very legitimate
2. Somewhat legitimate
3. Not too legitimate
4. Not at all legitimate
5. Don’t know (PROBE: “In general ...”)

8b. “How would you rate the trustworthiness of energy companies when it comes to issues such as nuclear power ... do you feel energy companies are very trustworthy, somewhat trustworthy, not too trustworthy, or not at all trustworthy?”

1. Very trustworthy
2. Somewhat trustworthy
3. Not too trustworthy
4. Not at all trustworthy
5. Don’t know (PROBE: “In general ...”)

“Now I’d like to ask you a few questions specifically about energy related issues.”

9. “How concerned are you about the safety of nuclear power? Would you say you are very concerned, somewhat concerned, not too concerned, or not at all concerned?”

1. Very concerned
2. Somewhat concerned
3. Not too concerned
4. Not at all concerned
5. Don’t know (PROBE: “In general ...”)

10. "How concerned are you about the environmental impact of nuclear power? Would you say you are very concerned, somewhat concerned, not too concerned, or not at all concerned?"

1. Very concerned
2. Somewhat concerned
3. Not too concerned
4. Not at all concerned
5. Don't know (PROBE: "In general ...")

12. "When it comes to cost, do you think that turning to nuclear energy as a source of electricity will end up being a lot less expensive, a little less expensive, about the same cost, a little more expensive, or a lot more expensive than other available alternatives?"

1. A lot less expensive
2. A little less expensive
3. Cost about the same
4. A little more expensive
5. A lot more expensive
6. Don't know (PROBE: "In general ...")

13. "Overall, would you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose expanding a nuclear power plant in the Midlands of South Carolina as one of the ways to provide electricity for the state?"

1. Strongly favor
2. Somewhat favor
3. Somewhat oppose
4. Strongly oppose
5. Don't know (PROBE: "In general ...")

14. "How important is the issue of expanding nuclear power plants in South Carolina to you, personally? Would you say it is the most important issue, a very important issue, somewhat important, or not too important?"

1. Most important issue
2. Very important
3. Somewhat important
4. Not too important
5. Don't know (PROBE: "In general ...")

15. "And if you disagree with the final decision about expanding a nuclear power plant in the Midlands – whatever that decision might be – would you be very angry, somewhat angry, not too angry, or not at all angry?"
1. Very angry
  2. Somewhat angry
  3. Not too angry
  4. Not at all angry
  5. Don't know (PROBE: "In general ...")
16. "Overall, how likely do you think it is that the Public Service Commission will accept or reject the proposal to expand nuclear power in the Midlands: Very likely to accept, somewhat likely to accept, somewhat likely to reject, or very likely to reject?"
1. Very likely to accept
  2. Somewhat likely to accept
  3. Somewhat likely to reject
  4. Very likely to reject
  5. Don't know (PROBE: "If you had to estimate ...")
17. "In the past month, about how many stories you have seen specifically seen about the power plant expansion in the newspaper, on television, or on the Internet ...none, one or two, three to five, or more than five?"
1. None
  2. One or two
  3. Three to five
  4. More than five
  5. Don't know (PROBE: "In general ...")
18. "How many of your family, friends, or acquaintances have you talked to about the proposed nuclear power plant expansion .... none, one or two, three to five, or more than five?"
1. None
  2. One or two
  3. Three to five
  4. More than five
  5. Don't know (PROBE: "In general ...")



"Now, a few final questions..."

19. "What is your age?"

\_\_\_\_\_ CODE EXACT NUMBER OF YEARS (E.G., 45)

96. NINETY-SIX YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER

97. REFUSED

98. DK

20. "We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. What about yourself – that is, in politics, do you generally think of yourself as a liberal, a moderate, or a conservative?" (PROBE: "In general...?")

(IF LIBERAL): "Would you say you are very liberal or just somewhat liberal?"

(IF CONSERVATIVE): "Would you say you are very conservative or just somewhat conservative?"

(IF MODERATE OR DON'T KNOW): "Would you say you lean a little more toward the liberal side, or a little more toward the conservative side?"

1. VERY LIBERAL

2. SOMEWHAT LIBERAL

3. MODERATE, LEANS LIBERAL

4. MODERATE, LEANS TOWARD NEITHER SIDE

5. MODERATE, LEANS TOWARD CONSERVATIVE

6. SOMEWHAT CONSERVATIVE

7. VERY CONSERVATIVE

8. DON'T KNOW

23. "What is your race?" (PROBE BY READING CHOICES IF NECESSARY)

1. BLACK; AFRICAN-AMERICAN

2. WHITE

3. HISPANIC; PUERTO RICAN; MEXICAN OR SPANISH-AMERICAN

4. NATIVE AMERICAN; AMERICAN INDIAN

5. ASIAN; ORIENTAL

6. OTHER (SPECIFY): \_\_\_\_\_

26. "And what is your zip code?" RECORD \_\_\_\_\_

27. RECORD SEX:    1. MALE  
                          2. FEMALE

“That's all the questions I have. Is there anything else you would like to tell the researchers for this study about your views on the issue of nuclear power?”

1. NO  
2. YES (“What is that?” – RECORD: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

“Thank you very much for your cooperation.”

SURVEY RESEARCH LABORATORY  
SURVEY ON NUCLEAR POWER ATTITUDES  
Post-test2 Training Version – 2/12/09

"Hello, this is \_\_\_\_\_ calling for the University of South Carolina. May I please speak to \_\_\_\_\_.

[WHEN SELECTED RESPONDENT IS ON THE PHONE]: "In mid-December ago we spoke with you about a group of energy producers in South Carolina that have asked the state's Public Service Commission for permission to expand the existing nuclear power plant near Jenkinsville, which is about 25 miles north of Columbia. At that time you indicated that we could contact you for a follow-up study, and that is the purpose of this call.

As you may be aware, there was a three-week-long public hearing on this issue at the beginning of December. The commission has recently approved the energy's company's proposal to expand the nuclear plant in Jenkinville. The federal government is now reviewing the application. Again, the questions are not designed to promote support or opposition to nuclear power, but rather to find out how you feel about this issue.

As before, the first set of questions is on your feelings about nuclear power in the State of South Carolina and the decision-makers who were involved in the public hearing process.

1. "When it comes to the potential BENEFITS of nuclear power production in South Carolina, do you think people like you will receive a very fair, somewhat fair, somewhat unfair, or very unfair share of the benefits? By fair, we mean whether people like you will get an appropriate share of the benefits."

1. Very fair
2. Somewhat fair
3. Somewhat unfair
4. Very unfair
5. Don't know (PROBE: "In general ...")

2. "When it comes to the potential RISKS of nuclear power production in South Carolina, do you think that the share of the risks for people like you will be very fair, somewhat fair, somewhat unfair, or very unfair? Again, by fair we mean whether people like you will get an appropriate share of the risks."

1. Very fair
2. Somewhat fair
3. Somewhat unfair
4. Very unfair
5. Don't know (PROBE: "In general ...")

3. “When it comes to the VOICE of citizens at public hearings, would you say that the process of public hearings is a very fair, somewhat fair, somewhat unfair, or very unfair way to give citizens in South Carolina a voice in decision-making about nuclear power?”

1. Very fair
2. Somewhat fair
3. Somewhat unfair
4. Very unfair
5. Don’t know (PROBE: “In general ...”)

4. “How would you rate the trustworthiness of decision-makers in the process of public hearings about issues such as nuclear power ... do you feel these decision-makers are very trustworthy, somewhat trustworthy, not too trustworthy, or not at all trustworthy?”

1. Very trustworthy
2. Somewhat trustworthy
3. Not too trustworthy
4. Not at all trustworthy
5. Don’t know (PROBE: “In general ...”)

5. “Overall, how satisfied are you with the public hearing process as a way to decide whether South Carolina should increase the number of nuclear power plants in South Carolina ... very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?”

1. Very satisfied
2. Somewhat satisfied
3. Somewhat dissatisfied
4. Very unsatisfied
5. Don’t know (PROBE: “In general ...”)

6. “Overall, how legitimate do you think the public hearing process is for deciding whether to expand nuclear power plants in South Carolina, very legitimate, somewhat legitimate, not too legitimate, or not at all legitimate?”

1. Very legitimate
2. Somewhat legitimate
3. Not too legitimate
4. Not at all legitimate
5. Don’t know (PROBE: “In general ...”)

7. "Overall, would you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose expanding a nuclear power plant in the Midlands of South Carolina as one of the ways to provide electricity for the state?"
1. Strongly favor
  2. Somewhat favor
  3. Somewhat oppose
  4. Strongly oppose
  5. Don't know (PROBE: "In general ...")
8. "How important is the issue of expanding nuclear power plants in South Carolina to you, personally? Would you say it is the most important issue, a very important issue, somewhat important, or not too important?"
1. Most important issue
  2. Very important
  3. Somewhat important
  4. Not too important
  5. Don't know (PROBE: "In general ...")
9. "In the past couple of months, about how many stories you have seen specifically seen about the power plant expansion in the newspaper, on television, or on the Internet ...none, one or two, three to five, or more than five?"
1. None
  2. One or two
  3. Three to five
  4. More than five
  5. Don't know (PROBE: "In general ...")
10. "How many of your family, friends, or acquaintances have you talked to about the proposed nuclear power plant expansion .... none, one or two, three to five, or more than five?"
1. None
  2. One or two
  3. Three to five
  4. More than five
  5. Don't know (PROBE: "In general ...")

"Now, a few final questions..."

19. "What is your age?"

\_\_\_\_\_ CODE EXACT NUMBER OF YEARS (E.G., 45)

96. NINETY-SIX YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER

97. REFUSED

98. DK

20. "We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. What about yourself – that is, in politics, do you generally think of yourself as a liberal, a moderate, or a conservative?" (PROBE: "In general...?")

(IF LIBERAL): "Would you say you are very liberal or just somewhat liberal?"

(IF CONSERVATIVE): "Would you say you are very conservative or just somewhat conservative?"

(IF MODERATE OR DON'T KNOW): "Would you say you lean a little more toward the liberal side, or a little more toward the conservative side?"

1. VERY LIBERAL

2. SOMEWHAT LIBERAL

3. MODERATE, LEANS LIBERAL

4. MODERATE, LEANS TOWARD NEITHER SIDE

5. MODERATE, LEANS TOWARD CONSERVATIVE

6. SOMEWHAT CONSERVATIVE

7. VERY CONSERVATIVE

8. DON'T KNOW

23. "What is your race?" (PROBE BY READING CHOICES IF NECESSARY)

1. BLACK; AFRICAN-AMERICAN

2. WHITE

3. HISPANIC; PUERTO RICAN; MEXICAN OR SPANISH-AMERICAN

4. NATIVE AMERICAN; AMERICAN INDIAN

5. ASIAN; ORIENTAL

6. OTHER (SPECIFY): \_\_\_\_\_

26. "And what is your zip code?" RECORD \_\_\_\_\_

27. RECORD SEX:    1. MALE  
                          2. FEMALE

“That's all the questions I have. Is there anything else you would like to tell the researchers for this study about your views on the issue of nuclear power?”

1. NO  
2. YES (“What is that?” – RECORD: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

“Thank you very much for your cooperation.”

# **ICPSR 34871**

## **Public Opinion About Nuclear Energy in the Context of Local Public Hearings About the Expansion of the V.C. Summer Nuclear Station, South Carolina, 2008-2009**

### **Variable Description and Frequencies**

**Note: Frequencies displayed for the variables are not weighted. They are purely descriptive and may not be representative of the study population. Please review any sampling or weighting information available with the study.**

**Summary statistics (minimum, maximum, mean, median, and standard deviation) may not be available for every variable in the codebook. Conversely, a listing of frequencies in table format may not be present for every variable in the codebook either. However, all variables in the dataset are present and display sufficient information about each variable. These decisions are made intentionally and are at the discretion of the archive producing this codebook.**

**ICPSR has an FAQ on [copyright and survey instruments](#).**



---

**RESPNUM: RESPNUM**

Respondent ID Number

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	1	0.2 %
3	-	1	0.2 %
5	-	1	0.2 %
6	-	1	0.2 %
7	-	1	0.2 %
8	-	1	0.2 %
9	-	1	0.2 %
10	-	1	0.2 %
12	-	1	0.2 %
14	-	1	0.2 %
15	-	1	0.2 %
16	-	1	0.2 %
18	-	1	0.2 %
19	-	1	0.2 %
20	-	1	0.2 %
25	-	1	0.2 %
27	-	1	0.2 %
28	-	1	0.2 %
29	-	1	0.2 %
31	-	1	0.2 %
32	-	1	0.2 %
33	-	1	0.2 %
34	-	1	0.2 %
35	-	1	0.2 %
36	-	1	0.2 %
37	-	1	0.2 %
39	-	1	0.2 %
40	-	1	0.2 %
41	-	1	0.2 %
42	-	1	0.2 %
43	-	1	0.2 %
45	-	1	0.2 %
46	-	1	0.2 %
48	-	1	0.2 %
49	-	1	0.2 %
53	-	1	0.2 %
54	-	1	0.2 %
55	-	1	0.2 %
59	-	1	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
60	-	1	0.2 %
63	-	1	0.2 %
65	-	1	0.2 %
66	-	1	0.2 %
67	-	1	0.2 %
71	-	1	0.2 %
72	-	1	0.2 %
75	-	1	0.2 %
77	-	1	0.2 %
78	-	1	0.2 %
80	-	1	0.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 606 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Mean: 491.30
- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 1041
- Standard Deviation: 298.91

*Location:* 1-9 (width: 9; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

## Q1: SHARE BENEFITS OF NUCLEAR POWER IN SC

When it comes to the potential BENEFITS of nuclear power production in South Carolina, do you think people like you will receive a very fair, somewhat fair, somewhat unfair, or very unfair share of the benefits? By fair, we mean whether people like you will get an appropriate share of the benefits.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	VERY FAIR	134	22.1 %
2	SOMEWHAT FAIR	275	45.4 %
3	SOMEWHAT UNFAIR	86	14.2 %
4	VERY UNFAIR	57	9.4 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	50	8.3 %
6	REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINED	4	0.7 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 552 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

*Location:* 10-10 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric  
(Range of) Missing Values: 5 , 6

## Q2: SHARE RISKS OF NUCLEAR POWER IN SC

When it comes to the potential RISKS of nuclear power production in South Carolina, do you think that the share of the risks for people like you will be very fair, somewhat fair, somewhat unfair, or very unfair? Again, by fair we mean whether people like you will get an appropriate share of the risks.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	VERY FAIR	162	26.7 %
2	SOMEWHAT FAIR	243	40.1 %
3	SOMEWHAT UNFAIR	78	12.9 %
4	VERY UNFAIR	63	10.4 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	56	9.2 %
6	REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINED	4	0.7 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 546 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

Location: 11-11 (width: 1; decimal: 0)  
Variable Type: numeric  
(Range of) Missing Values: 5 , 6

## Q3: PUBLIC HEARINGS HEAR ALL SIDES OF DEBATE

What about the EFFECTIVENESS of public hearings... would you say that the process of public hearings is a very effective, somewhat effective, not too effective, or not at all effective way to hear all sides of the debate about nuclear power in South Carolina?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	VERY EFFECTIVE	113	18.6 %
2	SOMEWHAT EFFECTIVE	302	49.8 %
3	NOT TOO EFFECTIVE	130	21.5 %
4	NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE	51	8.4 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	10	1.7 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 596 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

Location: 12-12 (width: 1; decimal: 0)  
Variable Type: numeric  
(Range of) Missing Values: 5 , 6

---

#### Q4: PUBLIC HEARINGS FAIR WAY TO GIVE SC CITIZENS VOICE

When it comes to the VOICE of citizens at public hearings, would you say that the process of public hearings is a very fair, somewhat fair, somewhat unfair, or very unfair way to give citizens in South Carolina a voice in decision-making about nuclear power?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	VERY FAIR	134	22.1 %
2	SOMEWHAT FAIR	299	49.3 %
3	SOMEWHAT UNFAIR	100	16.5 %
4	VERY UNFAIR	61	10.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	11	1.8 %
6	REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINED	1	0.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 594 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

*Location:* 13-13 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 5 , 6

---

#### Q5: RESPECT DECISION-MAKERS IN PUBLIC HEARING PROCESS

How much respect do you think that decision-makers in the process of public hearings about issues such as nuclear power have for the views of the public... a great deal of respect, some respect, not too much respect, or no respect at all?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	A GREAT DEAL OF RESPECT	44	7.3 %
2	SOME RESPECT	314	51.8 %
3	NOT TOO MUCH RESPECT	192	31.7 %
4	NO RESPECT AT ALL	50	8.3 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	5	0.8 %
6	REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINED	1	0.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 600 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

*Location:* 14-14 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 5 , 6

---

#### Q6: TRUSTWORTHINESS OF DECISION-MAKERS IN PUBLIC HEARING PROCESS

How would you rate the trustworthiness of decision-makers in the process of public hearings about issues such as nuclear power... do you feel these decision-makers are very trustworthy, somewhat trustworthy, not too trustworthy, or not at all trustworthy?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	VERY TRUSTWORTHY	52	8.6 %
2	SOMEWHAT TRUSTWORTHY	327	54.0 %
3	NOT TOO TRUSTWORTHY	164	27.1 %
4	NOT AT ALL TRUSTWORTHY	49	8.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	13	2.1 %
6	REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINED	1	0.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 592 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

*Location:* 15-15 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 5 , 6

## Q7: KNOWLEDGE AND EXPERTISE OF DECISION-MAKERS IN PUBLIC HEARING PROCESS

When it comes to knowledge and expertise about nuclear power, do you think that the decision-makers at a public hearing about nuclear power would be very knowledgeable, somewhat knowledgeable, not too knowledgeable, or not at all knowledgeable about nuclear power issues?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	VERY KNOWLEDGEABLE	169	27.9 %
2	SOMEWHAT KNOWLEDGEABLE	304	50.2 %
3	NOT TOO KNOWLEDGEABLE	89	14.7 %
4	NOT AT ALL KNOWLEDGEABLE	30	5.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	14	2.3 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 592 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

*Location:* 16-16 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 5 , 6

## Q8: PUBLIC HEARINGS LEGITIMATE FOR DECIDING WHETHER TO EXPAND NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

Overall, how legitimate do you think the public hearing process is for deciding whether to expand nuclear power plants in South Carolina, very legitimate, somewhat legitimate, not too legitimate, or not at all legitimate?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	VERY LEGITIMATE	83	13.7 %
2	SOMEWHAT LEGITIMATE	322	53.1 %
3	NOT TOO LEGITIMATE	139	22.9 %
4	NOT AT ALL LEGITIMATE	53	8.7 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	8	1.3 %
6	REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINED	1	0.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 597 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

*Location:* 17-17 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 5 , 6

---

## Q9: HOW CONCERNED ABOUT SAFETY OF NUCLEAR POWER

How concerned are you about the safety of nuclear power? Would you say you are very concerned, somewhat concerned, not too concerned, or not at all concerned?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	VERY CONCERNED	306	50.5 %
2	SOMEWHAT CONCERNED	147	24.3 %
3	NOT TOO CONCERNED	93	15.3 %
4	NOT AT ALL CONCERNED	57	9.4 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	2	0.3 %
6	REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINED	1	0.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 603 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

*Location:* 18-18 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 5 , 6

---

## Q10: HOW CONCERNED ABOUT CLIMATE CHANGE

How concerned are you about climate change. Would you say you are very concerned, somewhat concerned, not too concerned, or not at all concerned?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	VERY CONCERNED	270	44.6 %
2	SOMEWHAT CONCERNED	196	32.3 %
3	NOT TOO CONCERNED	88	14.5 %
4	NOT AT ALL CONCERNED	50	8.3 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	2	0.3 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 604 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

*Location:* 19-19 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 5 , 6

## Q11: HOW CONCERNED ABOUT OBTAINING ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

How concerned are you about obtaining energy independence for the United States. Would you say you are very concerned, somewhat concerned, not too concerned, or not at all concerned?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	VERY CONCERNED	465	76.7 %
2	SOMEWHAT CONCERNED	110	18.2 %
3	NOT TOO CONCERNED	19	3.1 %
4	NOT AT ALL CONCERNED	7	1.2 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	4	0.7 %
6	REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINED	1	0.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 601 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

*Location:* 20-20 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 5 , 6

## Q12: HOW EXPENSIVE NUCLEAR ENERGY FOR ELECTRICITY

When it comes to cost, do you think that turning to nuclear energy as a source of electricity will end up being a lot less expensive, a little less expensive, about the same cost, a little more expensive, or a lot more expensive than other available alternatives?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	A LOT LESS EXPENSIVE	67	11.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	A LITTLE LESS EXPENSIVE	131	21.6 %
3	ABOUT THE SAME COST	167	27.6 %
4	A LITTLE MORE EXPENSIVE	119	19.6 %
5	A LOT MORE EXPENSIVE	69	11.4 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
6	DO NOT KNOW	51	8.4 %
7	REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINED	2	0.3 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 553 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 5

*Location:* 21-21 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 6 , 7

### Q13: FAVOR OR OPPOSE EXPANDING NUCLEAR PLANT IN THE MIDLANDS OF SC

Overall, would you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose expanding a nuclear power plant in the Midlands of South Carolina as one of the ways to provide electricity for the state?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	STRONGLY FAVOR	176	29.0 %
2	SOMEWHAT FAVOR	236	38.9 %
3	SOMEWHAT OPPOSE	116	19.1 %
4	STRONGLY OPPOSE	61	10.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	17	2.8 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 589 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

*Location:* 22-22 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 5 , 6

### Q14: HOW IMPORTANT IS EXPANDING NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS IN SC

How important is the issue of expanding nuclear power plants in South Carolina to you, personally. Would you say it is the most important issue, a very important issue, somewhat important, or not too important?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE	15	2.5 %



Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	VERY IMPORTANT ISSUE	194	32.0 %
3	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	276	45.5 %
4	NOT TOO IMPORTANT	112	18.5 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	7	1.2 %
6	REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINED	2	0.3 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 597 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

*Location:* 23-23 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 5 , 6

## Q15: HOW ANGRY IF DISAGREE WITH FINAL DECISION ABOUT EXPANDING

And if you disagree with the final decision about expanding a nuclear power plant in the Midlands - whatever that decision might be - would you be very angry, somewhat angry, not too angry, or not at all angry?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	VERY ANGRY	34	5.6 %
2	SOMEWHAT ANGRY	215	35.5 %
3	NOT TOO ANGRY	157	25.9 %
4	NOT AT ALL ANGRY	186	30.7 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	12	2.0 %
6	REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINED	2	0.3 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 592 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

*Location:* 24-24 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 5 , 6

## Q16: HOW MUCH HEARD ABOUT EXPANDING NUCLEAR POWER IN SC

Would you say you have heard a lot, some, a little, or nothing at all about the possibility of expanding nuclear power production in South Carolina?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	A LOT	82	13.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	SOME	162	26.7 %
3	A LITTLE	220	36.3 %
4	NOTHING AT ALL	140	23.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	2	0.3 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 604 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

*Location:* 25-25 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 5 , 6

---

## Q17: HOW MUCH ATTENTION PAID TO NEWS IN LOCAL NEWSPAPERS

In an average day, how much attention do you pay to news in local newspapers, including their websites: a lot, some, a little, or none at all?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	A LOT	239	39.4 %
2	SOME	186	30.7 %
3	A LITTLE	99	16.3 %
4	NONE AT ALL	77	12.7 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	4	0.7 %
6	REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINED	1	0.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 601 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

*Location:* 26-26 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 5 , 6

---

## Q18: HOW MUCH ATTENTION PAID TO NEWS ON LOCAL TV STATIONS

In an average day, how much attention do you pay to news on local television stations, including their websites: a lot, some, a little, or none at all?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	A LOT	239	39.4 %
2	SOME	211	34.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	A LITTLE	117	19.3 %
4	NONE AT ALL	37	6.1 %
	Missing Data		
5	DO NOT KNOW	1	0.2 %
6	REFUSED/NOT ASCERTAINED	1	0.2 %
	Total	606	100%

Based upon 604 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

Location: 27-27 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: 5 , 6

## D2: AGE OF RESPONDENT

What is your age?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
18	-	1	0.2 %
19	-	2	0.3 %
20	-	3	0.5 %
21	-	2	0.3 %
22	-	3	0.5 %
23	-	3	0.5 %
24	-	2	0.3 %
25	-	6	1.0 %
26	-	4	0.7 %
27	-	3	0.5 %
28	-	6	1.0 %
29	-	6	1.0 %
30	-	4	0.7 %
31	-	3	0.5 %
32	-	7	1.2 %
33	-	9	1.5 %
34	-	8	1.3 %
35	-	11	1.8 %
36	-	8	1.3 %
37	-	8	1.3 %
38	-	11	1.8 %
39	-	12	2.0 %
40	-	6	1.0 %
41	-	5	0.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
42	-	8	1.3 %
43	-	9	1.5 %
44	-	12	2.0 %
45	-	11	1.8 %
46	-	19	3.1 %
47	-	13	2.1 %
48	-	10	1.7 %
49	-	5	0.8 %
50	-	21	3.5 %
51	-	15	2.5 %
52	-	16	2.6 %
53	-	18	3.0 %
54	-	13	2.1 %
55	-	13	2.1 %
56	-	11	1.8 %
57	-	8	1.3 %
58	-	12	2.0 %
59	-	12	2.0 %
60	-	28	4.6 %
61	-	10	1.7 %
62	-	15	2.5 %
63	-	12	2.0 %
64	-	10	1.7 %
65	-	13	2.1 %
66	-	10	1.7 %
67	-	9	1.5 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
97	REFUSED	13	2.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 593 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Mean: 54.24
- Median: 54.00
- Mode: 60.00
- Minimum: 18
- Maximum: 90
- Standard Deviation: 15.88

*Location:* 28-29 (width: 2; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 97

---

### D3: AREA OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Do you live in an urban, suburban, or rural area of South Carolina?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	URBAN	143	23.6 %
2	SUBURBAN	274	45.2 %
3	RURAL	188	31.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	NA OR REFUSE	1	0.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 605 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 3

*Location:* 30-30 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 4 , 5

---

### D4: EDUCATION

What is the highest grade of school or year of college that you actually finished and got credit for?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	NO FORMAL SCHOOLING	0	0.0 %
1	FIRST GRADE	0	0.0 %
2	SECOND GRADE	0	0.0 %
3	THIRD GRADE	0	0.0 %
4	FOURTH GRADE	0	0.0 %
5	FIFTH GRADE	1	0.2 %
6	SIXTH GRADE	4	0.7 %
7	SEVENTH GRADE	2	0.3 %
8	EIGHTH GRADE	2	0.3 %
9	NINTH GRADE	5	0.8 %
10	TENTH GRADE	10	1.7 %
11	ELEVENTH GRADE	12	2.0 %
12	TWELFTH GRADE	164	27.1 %
13	ONE YEAR-COLLEGE	40	6.6 %
14	TWO YEARS-COLLEGE	104	17.2 %
15	THREE YEARS-COLLEGE	19	3.1 %
16	FOUR YEARS-COLLEGE	139	22.9 %
17	FIVE YEARS-COLLEGE	13	2.1 %
18	SIX YEARS-COLLEGE	56	9.2 %
19	SEVEN YEARS-COLLEGE	6	1.0 %
20	EIGHT YEARS-COLLEGE	12	2.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
21	NINE YEARS-COLLEGE	2	0.3 %
22	TEN OR MORE YEARS-COLLEGE	10	1.7 %
23	GED	1	0.2 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
24	DO NOT KNOW	1	0.2 %
25	REFUSED	3	0.5 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 602 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 5
- Maximum: 23

*Location:* 31-32 (width: 2; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 24 , 25

## D5: PARTISANSHIP

Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent or what? IF REPUBLICAN: Would you call yourself a strong Republican or a not very strong Republican? IF DEMOCRAT: Would you call yourself a strong Democrat or a not very strong Democrat? IF INDEPENDENT, NO PREFERENCE, OR OTHER: Do you think of yourself as closer to the Republican or to the Democrat party?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	STRONG REPUBLICAN	160	26.4 %
2	NOT STRONG REPUBLICAN	77	12.7 %
3	REPUBLICAN LEANER	53	8.7 %
4	INDEPENDENT	80	13.2 %
5	DEMOCRATIC LEANER	47	7.8 %
6	NOT STRONG DEMOCRAT	25	4.1 %
7	STRONG DEMOCRAT	134	22.1 %
8	OTHER	17	2.8 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
9	NA OR REFUSED	13	2.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 593 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 8

*Location:* 33-33 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 9

## D6: RACE

What is your race? (PROBE BY READING CHOICES IF NECESSARY)

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	BLACK OR AFRICAN-AMERICAN	126	20.8 %
2	WHITE	461	76.1 %
3	HISPANIC	3	0.5 %
4	NATIVE AMERICAN	0	0.0 %
5	ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER	3	0.5 %
6	OTHER	10	1.7 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
7	NA OR REFUSED	3	0.5 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 603 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 6

*Location:* 34-34 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 7

## D8: PEOPLE AGED 18 OR OLDER IN HOUSEHOLD

Including yourself, how many people aged 18 or older are currently living in your household?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	ONE	203	33.5 %
2	TWO	306	50.5 %
3	THREE	80	13.2 %
4	FOUR	12	2.0 %
5	FIVE	1	0.2 %
6	SIX	0	0.0 %
7	SEVEN OR MORE	0	0.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
8	DO NOT KNOW	2	0.3 %
9	NA OR REFUSED	2	0.3 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 602 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 5

*Location:* 35-35 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 8 , 9

## D10: HOW MANY DIFFERENT LAND LINE TELEPHONE NUMBERS IN HOUSEHOLD

Not counting business lines, cell phones, extension phones, faxes, or modems -- on how many different land line telephone numbers can your household be reached?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	ONE	526	86.8 %
2	TWO	56	9.2 %
3	THREE	15	2.5 %
4	FOUR	1	0.2 %
5	FIVE	0	0.0 %
6	SIX	0	0.0 %
7	SEVEN OR MORE	0	0.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
8	DO NOT KNOW	4	0.7 %
9	NA OR REFUSED	4	0.7 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 598 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

*Location:* 36-36 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 8 , 9

## D11: ZIPCODE

And what is your zip code?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
29006	-	4	0.7 %
29009	-	5	0.8 %
29015	-	1	0.2 %
29016	-	9	1.5 %
29020	-	26	4.3 %
29032	-	7	1.2 %
29033	-	7	1.2 %
29036	-	31	5.1 %
29044	-	5	0.8 %
29045	-	20	3.3 %
29052	-	2	0.3 %
29053	-	8	1.3 %
29054	-	17	2.8 %
29061	-	8	1.3 %
29063	-	37	6.1 %
29065	-	2	0.3 %



Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
29066	-	1	0.2 %
29067	-	1	0.2 %
29070	-	14	2.3 %
29072	-	37	6.1 %
29073	-	25	4.1 %
29075	-	2	0.3 %
29078	-	18	3.0 %
29105	-	1	0.2 %
29108	-	13	2.1 %
29112	-	1	0.2 %
29123	-	10	1.7 %
29126	-	5	0.8 %
29127	-	12	2.0 %
29130	-	12	2.0 %
29145	-	1	0.2 %
29160	-	4	0.7 %
29169	-	27	4.5 %
29170	-	19	3.1 %
29172	-	8	1.3 %
29178	-	2	0.3 %
29180	-	5	0.8 %
29201	-	1	0.2 %
29202	-	1	0.2 %
29203	-	19	3.1 %
29204	-	9	1.5 %
29205	-	6	1.0 %
29206	-	14	2.3 %
29209	-	20	3.3 %
29210	-	23	3.8 %
29212	-	30	5.0 %
29223	-	40	6.6 %
29229	-	28	4.6 %
29803	-	2	0.3 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
99997	DO NOT KNOW	3	0.5 %
99998	NA OR REFUSED	3	0.5 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 600 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Mean: 29125.47

- Median: 29108.00
- Mode: 29223.00
- Minimum: 29006
- Maximum: 29803
- Standard Deviation: 84.08

*Location:* 37-41 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 99997 , 99998

## D12: SEX OF RESPONDENT

Sex of Respondent

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	MALE	237	39.1 %
2	FEMALE	369	60.9 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 606 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 2

*Location:* 42-42 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

## OTHINFO: ANYTHING ELSE TO TELL RESEARCHERS

That's all the questions I have. Is there anything else you would like to tell the researchers for this study about your views on the issue of nuclear power?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	NO	409	67.5 %
2	YES - GAVE RESPONSE	0	0.0 %
101	WILL BE DONE ANYWAY	6	1.0 %
102	DO NOT KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT ISSUE	3	0.5 %
103	NOT SOLD ON NUCLEAR POWER	1	0.2 %
104	DO SURVEY ON NUCLEAR WASTE	1	0.2 %
105	NOT ENOUGH PUBLIC AWARENESS ABOUT HEARINGS	3	0.5 %
106	MAKE SURE THEY KNOW WHAT THEY ARE DOING	13	2.1 %
107	HEARD ABOUT IT ON THE RADIO	1	0.2 %
108	SUPPORT NUCLEAR POWER	32	5.3 %
109	DID NOT KNOW ABOUT POSSIBLE EXPANSION	1	0.2 %
110	CONCERNED ABOUT COSTS	9	1.5 %
111	RESPECT DECISION TO EXPAND	1	0.2 %
112	PUBLIC SAFETY IS VERY IMPORTANT	8	1.3 %
113	NEED TO BE ENERGY INDEPENDENT	12	2.0 %
114	GET BUSY - DO IT	3	0.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
115	HOPE THEY HAVE BEST PEOPLE WORKING ON THIS ISSUE	3	0.5 %
116	CONSIDER ALTERNATIVE ENERGY SOURCES	16	2.6 %
117	HAVE MORE PUBLIC HEARINGS	1	0.2 %
118	LET MILITARY RUN POWER PLANTS	1	0.2 %
119	WHERE WILL WASTE PRODUCTS BE STORED	1	0.2 %
120	MAKE HEARING LOCATION MORE CONVENIENT FOR CITIZENS	1	0.2 %
121	SEND ME MY CHECK	1	0.2 %
122	CONCERNED ABOUT NUCLEAR WASTE	9	1.5 %
123	PUT ONE IN ALASKA AND ONE IN ARIZONA	1	0.2 %
124	GOOD LUCK	1	0.2 %
125	HOW WILL THIS IMPACT SUPPORT FOR EDUCATION	1	0.2 %
126	GIVE ISSUE FULL CONSIDERATION	1	0.2 %
127	PUBLIC HEALTH VERY IMPORTANT	4	0.7 %
128	DO NOT TRUST POLITICIANS AND CEO-S	2	0.3 %
129	CONCERNED ABOUT ENVIRONMENT	4	0.7 %
130	KEEP PUBLIC INFORMED ABOUT ISSUE	16	2.6 %
131	DO NOT NEED IN SC	1	0.2 %
132	AGAINST EXPANSION	1	0.2 %
133	SURVEY NOT WELL BALANCED	3	0.5 %
134	FIND SAFE WAY TO DO SURVEYS	1	0.2 %
135	NOT HAPPY ABOUT POLITICAL CHANGES IN SC	1	0.2 %
136	CONDUCT PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE DOING SURVEY	1	0.2 %
137	NEED LOWER ENERGY COSTS	2	0.3 %
138	CONCERNED ABOUT WHAT THIS WILL DO TO OUR STATE	1	0.2 %
139	NEEDS MORE STUDY	7	1.2 %
140	NEED GREEN POWER	1	0.2 %
141	WHAT ABOUT COAL FUSION	1	0.2 %
142	SHOULD NOT BE BUILT ON EARTHQUAKE FAULT	1	0.2 %
143	USE METHODS OTHER THAN PUBLIC HEARINGS TO GET PUBLIC INPUT	3	0.5 %
144	SURVEY VERY PROFESSIONAL	1	0.2 %
145	WANT WHAT IS BEST AND SAFEST	1	0.2 %
146	CHEAPER IN THE LONG RUN	2	0.3 %
147	NOT A MAJOR ISSUE FOR ME	1	0.2 %
148	ADDITIONAL POWER NOT NEEDED	1	0.2 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
999	REFUSED	2	0.3 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 604 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1

- Maximum: 156

Location: 43-45 (width: 3; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: 999

## SRLID: ID NUMBER

ID Number

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3800004	-	1	0.2 %
3800005	-	1	0.2 %
3800009	-	1	0.2 %
3800011	-	1	0.2 %
3800013	-	1	0.2 %
3800020	-	1	0.2 %
3800021	-	1	0.2 %
3800025	-	1	0.2 %
3800028	-	1	0.2 %
3800037	-	1	0.2 %
3800050	-	1	0.2 %
3800053	-	1	0.2 %
3800060	-	1	0.2 %
3800064	-	1	0.2 %
3800071	-	1	0.2 %
3800077	-	1	0.2 %
3800080	-	1	0.2 %
3800086	-	1	0.2 %
3800088	-	1	0.2 %
3800094	-	1	0.2 %
3800100	-	1	0.2 %
3800103	-	1	0.2 %
3800109	-	1	0.2 %
3800110	-	1	0.2 %
3800113	-	1	0.2 %
3800118	-	1	0.2 %
3800119	-	1	0.2 %
3800124	-	1	0.2 %
3800127	-	1	0.2 %
3800132	-	1	0.2 %
3800133	-	1	0.2 %
3800135	-	1	0.2 %
3800136	-	1	0.2 %
3800140	-	1	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3800145	-	1	0.2 %
3800148	-	1	0.2 %
3800151	-	1	0.2 %
3800153	-	1	0.2 %
3800155	-	1	0.2 %
3800160	-	1	0.2 %
3800165	-	1	0.2 %
3800171	-	1	0.2 %
3800174	-	1	0.2 %
3800177	-	1	0.2 %
3800179	-	1	0.2 %
3800184	-	1	0.2 %
3800194	-	1	0.2 %
3800195	-	1	0.2 %
3800198	-	1	0.2 %
3800199	-	1	0.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 606 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Mean: 3842776.30
- Minimum: 3800004
- Maximum: 6900509
- Standard Deviation: 135243.15

*Location:* 46-52 (width: 7; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

---

## DATE: DATE OF INITIAL INTERVIEW

Date of initial interview

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
20081113	-	60	9.9 %
20081114	-	39	6.4 %
20081115	-	38	6.3 %
20081117	-	43	7.1 %
20081118	-	59	9.7 %
20081119	-	48	7.9 %
20081120	-	63	10.4 %
20081121	-	37	6.1 %
20081122	-	46	7.6 %
20081123	-	29	4.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
20081124	-	73	12.0 %
20081125	-	28	4.6 %
20081126	-	14	2.3 %
20081128	-	6	1.0 %
20081129	-	23	3.8 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 606 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Mean: 20081119.75
- Median: 20081120.00
- Mode: 20081124.00
- Minimum: 20081113
- Maximum: 20081129
- Standard Deviation: 4.27

*Location:* 53-60 (width: 8; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

## CENSUSWT: CENSUSWT

Census Tract Weight

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.121357521691	-	2	0.3 %
0.149155637074	-	1	0.2 %
0.150956767179	-	1	0.2 %
0.161837736118	-	1	0.2 %
0.168748887408	-	2	0.3 %
0.186687564889	-	9	1.5 %
0.193227236237	-	1	0.2 %
0.197075138912	-	2	0.3 %
0.200144010948	-	6	1.0 %
0.226435150768	-	25	4.1 %
0.238007840156	-	2	0.3 %
0.241257721489	-	1	0.2 %
0.242756604177	-	14	2.3 %
0.255163453411	-	3	0.5 %
0.259281344262	-	2	0.3 %
0.273708144237	-	1	0.2 %
0.278302314502	-	2	0.3 %
0.298362354846	-	2	0.3 %
0.304786814018	-	1	0.2 %
0.307213049975	-	1	0.2 %
0.314484846992	-	3	0.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.337555565530	-	8	1.3 %
0.339633342900	-	1	0.2 %
0.340157277406	-	2	0.3 %
0.350133624393	-	1	0.2 %
0.352129447149	-	2	0.3 %
0.354807417540	-	4	0.7 %
0.361886582234	-	12	2.0 %
0.364114125867	-	2	0.3 %
0.365006682759	-	1	0.2 %
0.370126143785	-	1	0.2 %
0.373375129777	-	4	0.7 %
0.380381948326	-	1	0.2 %
0.388899821448	-	1	0.2 %
0.394217769310	-	17	2.8 %
0.400288021896	-	15	2.5 %
0.408027230333	-	1	0.2 %
0.418044358368	-	1	0.2 %
0.420023483419	-	4	0.7 %
0.422632999599	-	12	2.0 %
0.433008701400	-	2	0.3 %
0.447517991920	-	1	0.2 %
0.452870301536	-	14	2.3 %
0.468814625366	-	1	0.2 %
0.476015680311	-	2	0.3 %
0.485513208353	-	23	3.8 %
0.493413534281	-	1	0.2 %
0.510326906822	-	3	0.5 %
0.510698834676	-	2	0.3 %
0.518562688524	-	1	0.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 606 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Mean: 0.999929932920
- Median: 0.706936864690
- Mode: 0.226435150768
- Minimum: 0
- Maximum: 13
- Standard Deviation: 1.080607902212

*Location:* 61-75 (width: 15; decimal: 12)

*Variable Type:* numeric

---

## Q1\_W2: SHARE BENEFITS OF NUCLEAR POWER IN SC

When it comes to the potential BENEFITS of nuclear power production in South Carolina, do you think people like you will receive a very fair, somewhat fair, somewhat unfair, or very unfair share of the benefits? By fair, we mean whether people like you will get an appropriate share of the benefits.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	VERY FAIR	107	17.7 %
2	SOMEWHAT FAIR	221	36.5 %
3	SOMEWHAT UNFAIR	55	9.1 %
4	VERY UNFAIR	33	5.4 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	12	2.0 %
6	REFUSED	7	1.2 %
.	-	171	28.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 416 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

*Location:* 76-76 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 5 , 6 , .

---

## Q2\_W2: SHARE RISKS OF NUCLEAR POWER IN SC

When it comes to the potential RISKS of nuclear power production in South Carolina, do you think that the share of the risks for people like you will be very fair, somewhat fair, somewhat unfair, or very unfair? Again, by fair we mean whether people like you will get an appropriate share of the risks.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	VERY FAIR	98	16.2 %
2	SOMEWHAT FAIR	209	34.5 %
3	SOMEWHAT UNFAIR	64	10.6 %
4	VERY UNFAIR	45	7.4 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	17	2.8 %
6	REFUSED	2	0.3 %
.	-	171	28.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 416 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

*Location:* 77-77 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric



(Range of) Missing Values: 5 , 6 , .

### Q3\_W2: PUBLIC HEARINGS HEAR ALL OF THE DEBATE

What about the EFFECTIVENESS of public hearings... would you say that the process of public hearings is a very effective, somewhat effective, not too effective, or not at all effective way to hear all sides of the debate about nuclear power in South Carolina?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	VERY EFFECTIVE	62	10.2 %
2	SOMEWHAT EFFECTIVE	206	34.0 %
3	NOT TOO EFFECTIVE	121	20.0 %
4	NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE	40	6.6 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	5	0.8 %
6	REFUSED	1	0.2 %
.	-	171	28.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 429 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

Location: 78-78 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: 5 , 6 , .

### Q4\_W2: PUBLIC HEARINGS FAIR WAY TO GIVE SC CITIZENS VOICE

When it comes to the VOICE of citizens at public hearings, would you say that the process of public hearings is a very fair, somewhat fair, somewhat unfair, or very unfair way to give citizens in South Carolina a voice in decision-making about nuclear power?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	VERY FAIR	83	13.7 %
2	SOMEWHAT FAIR	233	38.4 %
3	SOMEWHAT UNFAIR	80	13.2 %
4	VERY UNFAIR	32	5.3 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	4	0.7 %
6	REFUSED	3	0.5 %
.	-	171	28.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 428 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

Location: 79-79 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: 5 , 6 , .

## Q5\_W2: RESPECT DECISION-MAKERS IN PUBLIC HEARING PROCESS

How much respect do you think that decision-makers in the process of public hearings about issues such as nuclear power have for the views of the public... a great deal of respect, some respect, not too much respect, or no respect at all?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	A GREAT DEAL OF RESPECT	39	6.4 %
2	SOME RESPECT	239	39.4 %
3	NOT TOO MUCH RESPECT	120	19.8 %
4	NO RESPECT AT ALL	32	5.3 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	3	0.5 %
6	REFUSED	2	0.3 %
.	-	171	28.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 430 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

Location: 80-80 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: 5 , 6 , .

## Q6\_W2: TRUSTWORTHINESS OF DECISION-MAKERS IN PUBLIC HEARING PROCESS

How would you rate the trustworthiness of decision-makers in the process of public hearings about issues such as nuclear power... do you feel these decision-makers are very trustworthy, somewhat trustworthy, not too trustworthy, or not at all trustworthy?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	VERY TRUSTWORTHY	42	6.9 %
2	SOMEWHAT TRUSTWORTHY	253	41.7 %
3	NOT TOO TRUSTWORTHY	104	17.2 %
4	NOT AT ALL TRUSTWORTHY	30	5.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	5	0.8 %
6	REFUSED	1	0.2 %
.	-	171	28.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 429 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

Location: 81-81 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: 5 , 6 , .

## Q7\_W2: SATISFIED WITH PUBLIC HEARING AS WAY TO DECIDED ABOUT # OF NUCLEAR PLANTS IN SC

Overall, how satisfied are you with the public hearing process as a way to decide whether South Carolina should increase the number of nuclear power plants in South Carolina... very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	VERY SATISFIED	60	9.9 %
2	SOMEWHAT SATISFIED	196	32.3 %
3	SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED	130	21.5 %
4	VERY DISSATISFIED	38	6.3 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	8	1.3 %
6	REFUSED	3	0.5 %
.	-	171	28.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 424 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

Location: 82-82 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: 5 , 6 , .

## Q8A\_W2: PUBLIC HEARINGS ARE LEGITIMATE FOR DECIDING ABOUT # OF NUCLEAR PLANTS IN SC

Overall, how legitimate do you think the public hearing process is for deciding whether to expand nuclear power plants in South Carolina, very legitimate, somewhat legitimate, not too legitimate, or not at all legitimate?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	VERY LEGITIMATE	56	9.2 %
2	SOMEWHAT LEGITIMATE	214	35.3 %
3	NOT TOO LEGITIMATE	121	20.0 %
4	NOT AT ALL LEGITIMATE	38	6.3 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	6	1.0 %
.	-	171	28.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 429 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

Location: 83-83 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric  
(Range of) Missing Values: 5 , 6 , .

## Q8B\_W2: TRUSTWORTHINESS OF ENERGY COMPANIES IN NUCLEAR POWER ISSUE

How would you rate the trustworthiness of energy companies when it comes to issues such as nuclear power... do you feel energy companies are very trustworthy, somewhat trustworthy, not too trustworthy, or not at all trustworthy?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	VERY TRUSTWORTHY	63	10.4 %
2	SOMEWHAT TRUSTWORTHY	207	34.2 %
3	NOT TOO TRUSTWORTHY	104	17.2 %
4	NOT AT ALL TRUSTWORTHY	55	9.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	5	0.8 %
6	REFUSED	1	0.2 %
.	-	171	28.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 429 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

Location: 84-84 (width: 1; decimal: 0)  
Variable Type: numeric  
(Range of) Missing Values: 5 , 6 , .

## Q9\_W2: HOW CONCERNED ABOUT SAFETY OF NUCLEAR POWER

How concerned are you about the safety of nuclear power? Would you say you are very concerned, somewhat concerned, not too concerned, or not at all concerned?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	VERY CONCERNED	223	36.8 %
2	SOMEWHAT CONCERNED	92	15.2 %
3	NOT TOO CONCERNED	77	12.7 %
4	NOT AT ALL CONCERNED	39	6.4 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	3	0.5 %
6	REFUSED	1	0.2 %
.	-	171	28.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 431 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

Location: 85-85 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric  
(Range of) Missing Values: 5 , 6 , .

## Q10\_W2: HOW CONCERNED ABOUT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF NUCLEAR POWER

How concerned are you about the environmental impact of nuclear power? Would you say you are very concerned, somewhat concerned, not too concerned, or not at all concerned?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	VERY CONCERNED	198	32.7 %
2	SOMEWHAT CONCERNED	128	21.1 %
3	NOT TOO CONCERNED	65	10.7 %
4	NOT AT ALL CONCERNED	42	6.9 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	1	0.2 %
6	REFUSED	1	0.2 %
.	-	171	28.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 433 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

Location: 86-86 (width: 1; decimal: 0)  
Variable Type: numeric  
(Range of) Missing Values: 5 , 6 , .

## Q12\_W2: HOW EXPENSIVE NUCLEAR ENERGY FOR ELECTRICITY

When it comes to cost, do you think that turning to nuclear energy as a source of electricity will end up being a lot less expensive, a little less expensive, about the same cost, a little more expensive, or a lot more expensive than other available alternatives?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	A LOT LESS EXPENSIVE	46	7.6 %
2	A LITTLE LESS EXPENSIVE	120	19.8 %
3	ABOUT THE SAME COST	137	22.6 %
4	A LITTLE MORE EXPENSIVE	64	10.6 %
5	A LOT MORE EXPENSIVE	52	8.6 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
6	DO NOT KNOW	15	2.5 %
7	REFUSED	1	0.2 %
.	-	171	28.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 419 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 5

Location: 87-87 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: 6 , 7 , .

### Q13\_W2: FAVOR OR OPPOSE EXPANDING NUCLEAR PLANT IN THE MIDLANDS OF SC

Overall, would you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose expanding a nuclear power plant in the Midlands of South Carolina as one of the ways to provide electricity for the state?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	STRONGLY FAVOR	128	21.1 %
2	SOMEWHAT FAVOR	166	27.4 %
3	SOMEWHAT OPPOSE	76	12.5 %
4	STRONGLY OPPOSE	57	9.4 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	7	1.2 %
6	REFUSED	1	0.2 %
.	-	171	28.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 427 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

Location: 88-88 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: 5 , 6 , .

### Q14\_W2: HOW IMPORTANT IS EXPANDING NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS IN SC

How important is the issue of expanding nuclear power plants in South Carolina to you, personally? Would you say it is the most important issue, a very important issue, somewhat important, or not too important?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE	10	1.7 %
2	VERY IMPORTANT ISSUE	152	25.1 %
3	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	181	29.9 %
4	NOT TOO IMPORTANT	89	14.7 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	2	0.3 %
6	REFUSED	1	0.2 %
.	-	171	28.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 432 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

Location: 89-89 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: 5 , 6 , .

## Q15\_W2: HOW ANGRY IF DISAGREE WITH FINAL DECISION ABOUT EXPANDING

And if you disagree with the final decision about expanding a nuclear power plant in the Midlands - whatever that decision might be - would you be very angry, somewhat angry, not too angry, or not at all angry?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	VERY ANGRY	23	3.8 %
2	SOMEWHAT ANGRY	149	24.6 %
3	NOT TOO ANGRY	132	21.8 %
4	NOT AT ALL ANGRY	121	20.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	8	1.3 %
6	REFUSED	2	0.3 %
.	-	171	28.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 425 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

Location: 90-90 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: 5 , 6 , .

## Q16\_W2: PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION WILL ACCEPT OR REJECT PROPOSAL TO EXPAND NUCLEAR PLANTS IN SC

Overall, how likely do you think it is that the Public Service Commission will accept or reject the proposal to expand nuclear power in the Midlands: Very likely to accept, somewhat likely to accept, somewhat likely to reject, or very likely to reject?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	VERY LIKELY TO ACCEPT	142	23.4 %
2	SOMEWHAT LIKELY TO ACCEPT	224	37.0 %
3	SOMEWHAT LIKELY TO REJECT	47	7.8 %
4	VERY LIKELY TO REJECT	12	2.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	10	1.7 %
.	-	171	28.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 425 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

Location: 91-91 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: 5 , 6 , .

---

## Q17\_W2: HOW MANY STORIES SEEN IN PAST MONTH

In the past month, about how many stories you have seen specifically seen about the power plant expansion in the newspaper, on television, or on the Internet... none, one or two, three to five, or more than five?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	NONE	134	22.1 %
2	ONE OR TWO	158	26.1 %
3	THREE TO FIVE	92	15.2 %
4	MORE THAN FIVE	48	7.9 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	3	0.5 %
.	-	171	28.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 432 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

Location: 92-92 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: 5 , 6 , .

---

## Q18\_W2: HOW MANY FAMILY OR FRIENDS HAVE YOU TALKED TO ABOUT EXPANSION OF NUCLEAR PLANTS IN SC

How many of your family, friends, or acquaintances have you talked to about the proposed nuclear power plant expansion... none, one or two, three to five, or more than five?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	NONE	201	33.2 %
2	ONE OR TWO	139	22.9 %
3	THREE TO FIVE	59	9.7 %
4	MORE THAN FIVE	36	5.9 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
.	-	171	28.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 435 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

Location: 93-93 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: 5 , 6 , .



## D2\_W2: AGE OF RESPONDENT

What is your age?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
18	-	1	0.2 %
20	-	3	0.5 %
21	-	2	0.3 %
22	-	1	0.2 %
23	-	1	0.2 %
25	-	3	0.5 %
26	-	3	0.5 %
27	-	2	0.3 %
28	-	6	1.0 %
29	-	6	1.0 %
30	-	1	0.2 %
31	-	1	0.2 %
32	-	3	0.5 %
33	-	3	0.5 %
34	-	5	0.8 %
35	-	6	1.0 %
36	-	5	0.8 %
37	-	3	0.5 %
38	-	9	1.5 %
39	-	9	1.5 %
40	-	3	0.5 %
41	-	5	0.8 %
42	-	7	1.2 %
43	-	5	0.8 %
44	-	6	1.0 %
45	-	7	1.2 %
46	-	9	1.5 %
47	-	12	2.0 %
48	-	9	1.5 %
49	-	8	1.3 %
50	-	15	2.5 %
51	-	8	1.3 %
52	-	15	2.5 %
53	-	13	2.1 %
54	-	10	1.7 %
55	-	7	1.2 %
56	-	10	1.7 %
57	-	8	1.3 %
58	-	10	1.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
59	-	7	1.2 %
60	-	19	3.1 %
61	-	8	1.3 %
62	-	13	2.1 %
63	-	8	1.3 %
64	-	9	1.5 %
65	-	6	1.0 %
66	-	8	1.3 %
67	-	9	1.5 %
68	-	4	0.7 %
69	-	4	0.7 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
97	REFUSED	4	0.7 %
.	-	171	28.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 431 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Mean: 55.83
- Median: 56.00
- Mode: 60.00
- Minimum: 18
- Maximum: 90
- Standard Deviation: 15.60

*Location:* 94-95 (width: 2; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 97 , .

## D5A\_W2: IDEOLOGY

We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. What about yourself - that is, in politics, do you generally think of yourself as a liberal, a moderate, or a conservative? (PROBE: In general...?) (IF LIBERAL): Would you say you are very liberal or just somewhat liberal? (IF CONSERVATIVE): Would you say you are very conservative or just somewhat conservative? (IF MODERATE OR DON'T KNOW): Would you say you lean a little more toward the liberal side, or a little more toward the conservative side?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	VERY LIBERAL	17	2.8 %
2	SOMEWHAT LIBERAL	35	5.8 %
3	MODERATE, LEANS LIBERAL	51	8.4 %
4	MODERATE, LEANS TOWARD NEITHER SIDE	23	3.8 %
5	MODERATE, LEANS TOWARD CONSERVATIVE	77	12.7 %
6	SOMEWHAT CONSERVATIVE	113	18.6 %
7	VERY CONSERVATIVE	86	14.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
8	DO NOT KNOW	27	4.5 %
9	REFUSAL	6	1.0 %
.	-	171	28.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 402 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 7

*Location:* 96-96 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 8 , 9 , .

## D6\_W2: RACE

What is your race?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	BLACK OR AFRICAN-AMERICAN	73	12.0 %
2	WHITE	352	58.1 %
3	HISPANIC	2	0.3 %
4	NATIVE AMERICAN	0	0.0 %
5	ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER	3	0.5 %
6	OTHER	3	0.5 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
9	NA OR REFUSED	2	0.3 %
.	-	171	28.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 433 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 6

*Location:* 97-99 (width: 3; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 9 , .

## D11\_W2: ZIPCODE

And what is your zip code?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
29009	-	4	0.7 %
29015	-	1	0.2 %
29016	-	8	1.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
29020	-	16	2.6 %
29032	-	7	1.2 %
29033	-	6	1.0 %
29036	-	23	3.8 %
29044	-	4	0.7 %
29045	-	17	2.8 %
29052	-	1	0.2 %
29053	-	6	1.0 %
29054	-	14	2.3 %
29060	-	1	0.2 %
29061	-	6	1.0 %
29063	-	26	4.3 %
29065	-	1	0.2 %
29067	-	1	0.2 %
29069	-	1	0.2 %
29070	-	8	1.3 %
29072	-	29	4.8 %
29073	-	15	2.5 %
29075	-	2	0.3 %
29078	-	10	1.7 %
29105	-	1	0.2 %
29108	-	9	1.5 %
29123	-	6	1.0 %
29126	-	6	1.0 %
29127	-	9	1.5 %
29130	-	10	1.7 %
29160	-	1	0.2 %
29163	-	1	0.2 %
29169	-	20	3.3 %
29170	-	11	1.8 %
29172	-	7	1.2 %
29177	-	1	0.2 %
29178	-	2	0.3 %
29180	-	3	0.5 %
29202	-	2	0.3 %
29203	-	10	1.7 %
29204	-	7	1.2 %
29205	-	5	0.8 %
29206	-	11	1.8 %
29209	-	13	2.1 %
29210	-	17	2.8 %
29212	-	23	3.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
29223	-	33	5.4 %
29229	-	18	3.0 %
29290	-	1	0.2 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
99997	DO NOT KNOW	1	0.2 %
.	-	171	28.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 434 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Mean: 29123.74
- Median: 29115.50
- Mode: 29223.00
- Minimum: 29009
- Maximum: 29290
- Standard Deviation: 74.95

*Location:* 100-104 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 99997 , 99998 , .

## D12\_W2: SEX OF RESPONDENT

Sex of Respondent

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	MALE	189	31.2 %
2	FEMALE	246	40.6 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
.	-	171	28.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 435 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 2

*Location:* 105-105 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

## OTHINFO\_W2: ANYTHING ELSE TO TELL RESEARCHERS

That's all the questions I have. Is there anything else you would like to tell the researchers for this study about your views on the issue of nuclear power?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	NO	283	46.7 %
2	YES - GAVE RESPONSE	0	0.0 %
101	WILL BE DONE ANYWAY	7	1.2 %
102	DO NOT KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT ISSUE	4	0.7 %
103	NOT SOLD ON NUCLEAR POWER	0	0.0 %
104	DO SURVEY ON NUCLEAR WASTE	0	0.0 %
105	NOT ENOUGH PUBLIC AWARENESS ABOUT HEARINGS	6	1.0 %
106	MAKE SURE THEY KNOW WHAT THEY ARE DOING	0	0.0 %
107	HEARD ABOUT IT ON THE RADIO	0	0.0 %
108	SUPPORT NUCLEAR POWER	25	4.1 %
109	DID NOT KNOW ABOUT POSSIBLE EXPANSION	0	0.0 %
110	CONCERNED ABOUT COSTS	9	1.5 %
111	RESPECT DECISION TO EXPAND	3	0.5 %
112	PUBLIC SAFETY IS VERY IMPORTANT	10	1.7 %
113	NEED TO BE ENERGY INDEPENDENT	4	0.7 %
114	GET BUSY - DO IT	8	1.3 %
115	HOPE THEY HAVE BEST PEOPLE WORKING ON THIS ISSUE	0	0.0 %
116	CONSIDER ALTERNATIVE ENERGY SOURCES	12	2.0 %
117	HAVE MORE PUBLIC HEARINGS	1	0.2 %
118	LET MILITARY RUN POWER PLANTS	0	0.0 %
119	WHERE WILL WASTE PRODUCTS BE STORED	3	0.5 %
120	MAKE HEARING LOCATION MORE CONVENIENT FOR CITIZENS	0	0.0 %
121	SEND ME MY CHECK	0	0.0 %
122	CONCERNED ABOUT NUCLEAR WASTE	4	0.7 %
123	PUT ONE IN ALASKA NAD ONE IN ARIZONA	0	0.0 %
124	GOOD LUCK	2	0.3 %
125	HOW WILL THIS IMPACT SUPPORT FOR EDUCATION	0	0.0 %
126	GIVE ISSUE FULL CONSIDERATION	1	0.2 %
127	PUBLIC HEALTH VERY IMPORTANT	2	0.3 %
128	DO NOT TRUST POLITICIANS AND CEO-S	2	0.3 %
129	CONCERNED ABOUT ENVIRONMENT	2	0.3 %
130	KEEP PUBLIC INFORMED ABOUT ISSUE	3	0.5 %
131	DO NOT NEED IN SC	0	0.0 %
132	AGAINST EXPANSION	0	0.0 %
133	SURVEY NOT WELL BALANCED	1	0.2 %
134	FIND SAFE WAY TO DO SURVEYS	0	0.0 %
135	NOT HAPPY ABOUT POLITICAL CHANGES IN SC	0	0.0 %
136	CONDUCT PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE DOING SURVEY	0	0.0 %
137	NEED LOWER ENERGY COSTS	3	0.5 %
138	CONCERNED ABOUT WHAT THIS WILL DO TO OUR STATE	0	0.0 %
139	NEEDS MORE STUDY	0	0.0 %
140	NEED GREEN POWER	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
141	WHAT ABOUT COAL FUSION	1	0.2 %
142	SHOULD NOT BE BUILD ON EARTHQUAKE FAULT	1	0.2 %
143	USE METHODS OTHER THAN PUBLIC HEARINGS TO GET PUBLIC INPUT	4	0.7 %
144	SURVEY VERY PROFESSIONAL	0	0.0 %
145	WANT WHAT IS BEST AND SAFEST	2	0.3 %
146	CHEAPER IN THE LONG RUN	0	0.0 %
147	NOT A MAJOR ISSUE FOR ME	1	0.2 %
148	ADDITIONAL POWER NOT NEEDED	0	0.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
999	REFUSED	1	0.2 %
.	-	171	28.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 434 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 173

*Location:* 106-108 (width: 3; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 999 , .

---

## DATE\_W2: DATE OF REINTERVIEW -WAVE 2

Date of reinterview -Wave 2-

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
20081213	-	57	9.4 %
20081214	-	37	6.1 %
20081215	-	120	19.8 %
20081216	-	55	9.1 %
20081217	-	41	6.8 %
20081218	-	29	4.8 %
20081219	-	26	4.3 %
20081220	-	17	2.8 %
20081222	-	5	0.8 %
20081227	-	3	0.5 %
20081229	-	11	1.8 %
20081230	-	3	0.5 %
20090106	-	12	2.0 %
20090107	-	11	1.8 %
20090108	-	3	0.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
20090109	-	1	0.2 %
20090110	-	4	0.7 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
.	-	171	28.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 435 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Mean: 20081849.92
- Median: 20081216.00
- Mode: 20081215.00
- Minimum: 20081213
- Maximum: 20090110
- Standard Deviation: 2289.95

*Location:* 109-116 (width: 8; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

## Q1\_W3: SHARE BENEFITS OF NUCLEAR POWER IN SC

When it comes to the potential BENEFITS of nuclear power production in South Carolina, do you think people like you will receive a very fair, somewhat fair, somewhat unfair, or very unfair share of the benefits? By fair, we mean whether people like you will get an appropriate share of the benefits.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	VERY FAIR	75	12.4 %
2	SOMEWHAT FAIR	170	28.1 %
3	SOMEWHAT UNFAIR	52	8.6 %
4	VERY UNFAIR	25	4.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	11	1.8 %
.	-	273	45.0 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 322 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

*Location:* 117-117 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 5 , .

## Q2\_W3: SHARE RISKS OF NUCLEAR POWER IN SC

When it comes to the potential RISKS of nuclear power production in South Carolina, do you think that the share of the risks for people like you will be very fair, somewhat fair, somewhat unfair, or very unfair? Again, by fair we mean whether people like you will get an appropriate share of the risks.



Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	VERY FAIR	87	14.4 %
2	SOMEWHAT FAIR	143	23.6 %
3	SOMEWHAT UNFAIR	54	8.9 %
4	VERY UNFAIR	34	5.6 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	15	2.5 %
.	-	273	45.0 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 318 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

*Location:* 118-118 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 5 , .

#### Q4\_W3: PUBLIC HEARINGS FAIR WAY TO GIVE SC CITIZENS VOICE

When it comes to the VOICE of citizens at public hearings, would you say that the process of public hearings is a very fair, somewhat fair, somewhat unfair, or very unfair way to give citizens in South Carolina a voice in decision-making about nuclear power?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	VERY FAIR	82	13.5 %
2	SOMEWHAT FAIR	134	22.1 %
3	SOMEWHAT UNFAIR	71	11.7 %
4	VERY UNFAIR	40	6.6 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	6	1.0 %
.	-	273	45.0 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 327 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

*Location:* 119-119 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 5 , .

#### Q6\_W3: TRUSTWORTHINESS OF DECISION-MAKERS IN PUBLIC HEARING PROCESS

How would you rate the trustworthiness of decision-makers in the process of public hearings about issues such as nuclear power... do you feel these decision-makers are very trustworthy, somewhat trustworthy, not too trustworthy, or not at all trustworthy?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	VERY TRUSTWORTHY	34	5.6 %
2	SOMEWHAT TRUSTWORTHY	186	30.7 %
3	NOT TOO TRUSTWORTHY	76	12.5 %
4	NOT AT ALL TRUSTWORTHY	31	5.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	6	1.0 %
.	-	273	45.0 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 327 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

*Location:* 120-120 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 5 , .

### Q7\_W3: SATISFIED WITH PUBLIC HEARING AS WAY TO DECIDED ABOUT # OF NUCLEAR PLANTS IN SC

Overall, how satisfied are you with the public hearing process as a way to decide whether South Carolina should increase the number of nuclear power plants in South Carolina... very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	VERY SATISFIED	58	9.6 %
2	SOMEWHAT SATISFIED	156	25.7 %
3	SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED	70	11.6 %
4	VERY DISSATISFIED	38	6.3 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	11	1.8 %
.	-	273	45.0 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 322 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

*Location:* 121-121 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 5 , .

### Q8A\_W3: PUBLIC HEARINGS ARE LEGITIMATE FOR DECIDING ABOUT # OF NUCLEAR PLANTS IN SC

Overall, how legitimate do you think the public hearing process is for deciding whether to expand nuclear power plants in South Carolina, very legitimate, somewhat legitimate, not too legitimate, or not at all legitimate?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	VERY LEGITIMATE	55	9.1 %
2	SOMEWHAT LEGITIMATE	161	26.6 %
3	NOT TOO LEGITIMATE	76	12.5 %
4	NOT AT ALL LEGITIMATE	33	5.4 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	8	1.3 %
.	-	273	45.0 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 325 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

*Location:* 122-122 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 5 , .

### Q13\_W3: FAVOR OR OPPOSE EXPANDING NUCLEAR PLANT IN THE MIDLANDS OF SC

Overall, would you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose expanding a nuclear power plant in the Midlands of South Carolina as one of the ways to provide electricity for the state?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	STRONGLY FAVOR	116	19.1 %
2	SOMEWHAT FAVOR	115	19.0 %
3	SOMEWHAT OPPOSE	60	9.9 %
4	STRONGLY OPPOSE	35	5.8 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	7	1.2 %
.	-	273	45.0 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 326 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

*Location:* 123-123 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* 5 , .

### Q14\_W3: HOW IMPORTANT IS EXPANDING NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS IN SC

How important is the issue of expanding nuclear power plants in South Carolina to you, personally? Would you say it is the most important issue, a very important issue, somewhat important, or not too important?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE	10	1.7 %
2	VERY IMPORTANT ISSUE	115	19.0 %
3	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	150	24.8 %
4	NOT TOO IMPORTANT	55	9.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	3	0.5 %
.	-	273	45.0 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 330 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

Location: 124-124 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: 5 , .

### Q17\_W3: HOW MANY STORIES SEEN IN PAST COUPLE OF MONTHS

In the past couple of months, about how many stories you have seen specifically seen about the power plant expansion in the newspaper, on television, or on the Internet... none, one or two, three to five, or more than five?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	NONE	69	11.4 %
2	ONE OR TWO	111	18.3 %
3	THREE TO FIVE	94	15.5 %
4	MORE THAN FIVE	58	9.6 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	1	0.2 %
.	-	273	45.0 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 332 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

Location: 125-125 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: 5 , .

### Q18\_W3: HOW MANY FAMILY OR FRIENDS HAVE YOU TALKED TO ABOUT EXPANSION OF NUCLEAR PLANTS IN SC

How many of your family, friends, or acquaintances have you talked to about the proposed nuclear power plant expansion... none, one or two, three to five, or more than five?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	NONE	135	22.3 %
2	ONE OR TWO	130	21.5 %
3	THREE TO FIVE	43	7.1 %
4	MORE THAN FIVE	23	3.8 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
5	DO NOT KNOW	2	0.3 %
.	-	273	45.0 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 331 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Minimum: 1
- Maximum: 4

Location: 126-126 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: 5 , .

---

## DATE\_W3: DATE OF INTERVIEW - WAVE 3

Date of reinterview -Wave 3-

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
20090217	-	145	23.9 %
20090218	-	44	7.3 %
20090219	-	27	4.5 %
20090220	-	28	4.6 %
20090221	-	15	2.5 %
20090223	-	28	4.6 %
20090224	-	8	1.3 %
20090225	-	10	1.7 %
20090226	-	12	2.0 %
20090227	-	2	0.3 %
20090228	-	14	2.3 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
.	-	273	45.0 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 333 valid cases out of 606 total cases.

- Mean: 20090219.49
- Median: 20090218.00
- Mode: 20090217.00
- Minimum: 20090217
- Maximum: 20090228
- Standard Deviation: 3.24

*Location:* 127-134 (width: 8; decimal: 0)  
*Variable Type:* numeric