附錄一：在報告期內的詳細民情資料（民意調查）

索引	名稱
A1001	**ESOMAR/WAPOR Guideline on Opinion Polls and Published Surveys** （只有英文版）
A1002	研究期內與政改直接相關的民意調查(102 項)

ESOMAR
WORLD RESEARCH

WAPOR
WORLD ASSOCIATION FOR PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH

World Research Codes and Guidelines

ESOMAR/WAPOR GUIDELINE ON OPINION POLLS AND PUBLISHED SURVEYS

ESOMAR, the World Association for Social, Opinion and Market Research, gathers around 4900 members in over 130 countries and is the essential organisation for encouraging, advancing and elevating market research. Codes and guidelines are available at www.esomar.org

WAPOR, the World Association for Public Opinion Research, is a professional society of around 500 individuals from academic and business professions in over 50 countries who share information in the field of public opinion research through conferences, publications, and personal contact. www.wapor.org

CONTENTS

1   INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE

Public opinion is a critical force in shaping and transforming society. Public opinion polls and surveys are regularly conducted in many countries to measure not only support for political parties and candidates, but also public opinion on a wide range of social and political issues. The results are published frequently in the print, online and broadcast media.

Properly conducted and disseminated opinion polls and surveys use scientific statistical methods to provide the public, politicians, the media and other interested groups with access to accurate and objective measures of public behaviour, attitudes and intentions. They give the general public an opportunity for its voice to be heard and to receive feedback about the opinions of their fellow-citizens. They also help guide policy by giving decision-makers impartial and unbiased information about what the public wants. Although some opinion polls are commissioned by political groups or individuals to help determine strategy, a great many opinion polls are meant for public consumption.

The study of people's attitudes and beliefs and behaviours about political, social and other issues forms part of the total market and social research field, but often deals with issues which arouse greater public interest. Consequently, those findings are much more widely published and debated, and may sometimes be presented in a provocative or political way. Those who conduct opinion polls have a special responsibility to the scientific community, clients and other research users, respondents and the general public. This responsibility means not only using samples, methods, and tools that are appropriate, but also delivering to the public the information required to ensure transparent, unbiased reporting of the results supported by comprehensive documentation.

Opinion polls are subject to exactly the same professional and ethical requirements as other forms of market and social research, set out in the ICC/ESOMAR International Code on Market and Social Research to which researchers and research users must conform. The Code sets minimum standards of professional and ethical conduct.

ESOMAR and WAPOR recognise there are particular issues in the collection and reporting of opinion poll and survey information and have therefore issued this Guideline as part of the self-regulatory framework that applies to international research. It highlights the responsibilities of researchers to conduct opinion polls in a professional and ethical way, and report them with sufficient transparency so that the public can judge the quality of results. Both will help ensure public confidence in opinion polls and published surveys.

This Guideline:

☐   Sets out the ethical rules that opinion researchers must follow;

☐   Underlines the rights and safeguards to which participants are entitled;

☐   Highlights the key information to be made available to maintain transparency when results are published;

☐   Specifies standards to guide the agreements to be in place with those who commission polls to ensure published survey results are presented in an unbiased way;

☐   Highlights the core methodological principles that apply in the design and conduct of such research;

☐   Underlines some of the additional issues that arise with specific forms of opinion polls.

All market, social and opinion research involves the gathering and further processing of personal data, which is regulated by law in many countries. In addition, certain countries regulate the conduct and publication of pre-election opinion poll results. Whilst ESOMAR and WAPOR collect information about such restrictions, researchers must verify which requirements are current as this Guideline cannot replace the advice of legal experts and self-regulatory bodies.

Throughout this document the word 'must' is used to identify mandatory requirements. We use the word "must" when describing a principle or practice that researchers are obliged to follow in order to comply with the ICC/ESOMAR Code and the WAPOR Code of Ethics. The word 'should' is used when describing implementation. The usage is meant to recognize that researchers may choose to implement a principle or practice in different ways depending on the design of their research.

2   DEFINITIONS

For the purpose of this Guideline, the following definitions apply:

Opinion polls and opinion surveys include all systematic gathering, aggregating and interpretation of information about policy, electoral and other preferences and behaviours of individuals or organisations using the statistical and analytical methods and techniques of the applied social sciences in order to gain insight and support decision-making. In opinion research, as in all market research, the identity of respondents will not be revealed without explicit consent and no sales approach, or attempt to influence their opinion following the interview, will be made to respondents as a direct result of their having provided information.

Researcher is defined as any individual, institute or organisation carrying out, or acting as a consultant on, an opinion poll or research project.

Research client is defined as any individual or organisation that requests, commissions, sponsors or subscribes to all or any part of an opinion poll or research project. This can include a media organisation or a political group, as well as those who have purchased content on an omnibus survey.

Respondent is defined as any individual or organisation from which information is requested and/or collected for the purposes of an opinion poll or research project.

Interview is defined as any form of contact with a respondent in order to collect information for opinion research purposes.

Pre-election polls are conducted at any point prior to an election and include questions about voting intention.

Survey report is defined as the presentation of polling data, either in tabular form or as an analysis, meant for public consumption in news media, online, or in other public distribution.

Exit polls are conducted to measure how people voted and are usually conducted outside polling stations.

Access panel is defined as a database of potential research participants who declare that they will cooperate with future data collection requests if selected.

3   SPECIAL CHALLENGES WITH THIS AREA

An opinion poll may be designed to measure the views of a specific population or group – for example a country's electorate (for most political polls) or parents or trade union members. Opinion polls may deal with complex and sensitive issues about which respondents have varying degrees of knowledge and interest, and where their views may be half-formed, inconsistent and subject to change.

☐   Scientific opinion polls must not be confused with phone-in polls or other self-selecting surveys, including those that may be open to anyone who visits a particular website, attracting people who feel passionately about the subject of the poll, but do not constitute a representative sample.

☐   Pre-election polls make up only a minority of published surveys. They are however, a very public test of sampling theory and survey research in action. Polls have a good track record for accuracy but the occasional poll which appears to be wrong gets extensive media coverage with a very negative impact on the image of opinion polls and surveys and opinion research in general.

☐   Exit polls (interviewing voters as they leave the polling station) are even more likely to be seen as prediction polls and the analysis of their results is often used to explain why the election came out the way it did.

☐   The means of collecting representative polling data vary country by country. In some places, only face-to-face interviewing is appropriate; in others, opinion polls are conducted by phone or online and the viability as a method largely depends on the accessibility of a representative sample via the phone or the internet (see section 8 for more details).

☐   While special care must be taken by researchers to ensure that results are accurately and fairly reported, clients and journalists also have a key role to play. The published data or survey report is often the only exposure the public has to polling results – and to market research in general. To report poll results well, journalists require a sufficient level of knowledge about opinion polls and methodologies to understand why some poll results need to be treated with caution because of timing, small sample sizes, low response rates,

biased question wording or coverage. ESOMAR and WAPOR take seriously the need for public education in this area and are committed to helping educate journalists on the proper use of opinion polls[1].

Researchers have a responsibility to ensure that both clients and the public have a reasonable understanding of the special challenges in measuring attitudes and beliefs as distinct from behaviour.

It is therefore important that key information is published alongside a poll or survey report to ensure professional and transparent reporting so the audience has the opportunity of judging the evidence presented and deciding whether or not it agrees with the conclusions drawn from the research.

4 RELATIONSHIP WITH PARTICIPANTS

4.1 Honesty

Market, social and opinion research must be clearly distinguished and separated from non-research activities (see Article 1d of the ICC/ESOMAR International Code). This means that:

☐ Activities like political telemarketing, and any enquiry whose primary purpose is to obtain personally identifiable information about individuals for compiling or updating lists, obtaining names for sales, advertising, fundraising or other promotional approaches must not be represented as opinion research.

☐ Researchers must not attempt to sell anything (sugging) or raise money (frugging) in the course of conducting a poll or survey.

☐ Researchers must not engage in negative campaigning that is disguised as a political poll, such as push polling, which aims to persuade large numbers of voters and affect election outcomes. It does not measure opinions.

4.2 Professional responsibility and transparency

Respondents' cooperation is entirely voluntary, and they must not be misled when being asked for their cooperation (see Article 3a of the ICC/ESOMAR International Code). This means that:

☐ Interviewers must not make statements or promises that they know or believe to be incorrect in order to secure the co-operation of respondents or others – for example, about the likely length of the interview.

☐ Researchers must take all reasonable precautions to ensure that respondents are in no way harmed or adversely affected as a direct result of their participation in an opinion poll or research project (Article 3b of the ICC/ESOMAR International Code).

☐ Researchers should ensure they contact potential respondents at appropriate times.

☐ Researchers are required to promptly identify themselves and unambiguously state the purpose of the research and enable respondents to check their identity and bona fides without difficulty. This is especially important, given the possible sensitivity of the subject (Article 4b of the ICC/ESOMAR International Code).

4.3 Data protection and privacy

Researchers must respect the principles of data protection and privacy (see Article 7 of the ICC/ESOMAR International Code). In some parts of the world, especially where democracy is not well-established, the importance of protecting respondents and the confidentiality of the information they provide is even more important. In such places, respondents may be especially concerned about the impact of improper disclosure.

☐ The rights of respondents extend through all stages of the research, including data collection where appropriate measures are required to ensure that respondents understand and can exercise their rights not to participate, to withdraw from the research interview at any time, to require that their personal data are not made available to others and to delete or to rectify incorrect personal data which are held on them.

☐ Personal information must only be collected and used for specified research purposes. The researcher must ensure that respondent's personal identity is withheld from the client/research user and may only

---

[1] British Polling Council journalist guide to opinion polls http://www.britishpollingcouncil.org/questions.html based on ESOMAR work; British Polling Council Seminar; AAPOR/Poynter Training Module; National Council on Public Polls: 20 Questions a Journalist Should Ask about Poll Results

communicate the respondent's identifiable personal information to the client/research user under the following conditions (unless national provisions require stricter regulations):

- The respondent has explicitly expressed this wish and/or

- The respondent has given their explicit consent and

- On the understanding that no commercial or political activity will be directed at them as a direct result of their having provided information.

☐ Researchers must ensure that adequate security measures are employed to prevent unauthorised access, manipulation and disclosure to the personal data, including any possible third parties.

5   RELATIONSHIP WITH THE GENERAL PUBLIC

5.1   Maintaining public confidence

Researchers must not act in a way that could bring discredit on the profession or lead to a loss of public confidence in it (see Article 1 of the ICC/ESOMAR International Code). Opinion polling depends on the public's willingness to participate, and public confidence in the accuracy and reliability of opinion polls and published surveys. This means that researchers must:

☐ Use appropriate methods, and be transparent about sampling, the variables used for weighting, question wording and timing of the opinion poll.

☐ Follow professional standards for disclosure, as indicated in this document.

☐ Make legitimate comparisons between surveys.

☐ Not make claims which exceed the limits of the appropriate scientific principles on which opinion polling is based, such as claims about subgroups with sample sizes too small for statistical reliability.

5.2   Requirements for publishing results

What sets most opinion polling apart from other market research is the fact that it is frequently conducted primarily for publication. When publishing results (by print, television, online or other media), researchers must make available information about how the poll was conducted (see Article 11 of the ICC/ESOMAR International Code), as elaborated below.

Disclosure requirements matter because as opinion polls have grown in number and variety, decision-makers, journalists and the public need to be able to differentiate between professional and unprofessional polls, to use them as appropriate information when evaluating public attitudes. Because all surveys have become more complex and diverse, and the difficulties of conducting polls have grown in recent years, researchers need to provide a higher level of methodological disclosure. Some of this information may be too detailed for publication in newspapers or broadcast, but can easily be provided by linking to a web site.

When opinion poll results are published in the media, researchers must take care to keep their interpretations and statements fully consistent with the data. Limitations and weaknesses in the poll design, its execution, and the results must be noted in all reports and analyses. The following information must be included in the survey report, or made available online or in other published form:

- The **names of the organisation which conducted the poll** and **its sponsor**, **the organisation(s) or person(s) who paid for the poll**. If internal campaign polls are made public, it must be indicated that the data originally were collected for a political entity.

- The **universe** effectively represented (i.e. who was interviewed), whether the poll sample included all adults or only eligible or likely voters, the geographic range of the poll (country, province, state, electoral district, city) and whether certain groups were excluded from the design (those without landline telephones or internet access, for example).

- The actual **sample size** (number of completed interviews included in the reported findings) and the **geographical coverage**. For face-to-face interviewing, the number of sampling units must be included.

- The dates of fieldwork.

- The **sampling method** used. For quota samples and other non-probability samples, provide the characteristics by which the sample was selected. For probability samples, additional information, including

the response rate, must be provided on request, as indicated in Section 5.3.   Further Information to be made available.

- The **method by which the poll was conducted** (face-to-face, telephone interview, internet access panel, mixed mode etc.).

- Whether **weighting** was used to adjust the results and the general **demographic or behavioural characteristics** used for the weights. For example, if respondent distributions were adjusted to reflect known census population characteristics or known voting distributions from previous elections, or if adjustments to the unweighted poll findings are made, this should be noted in the publication of the poll findings. The general weighting variables should be described but proprietary algorithms and specific weighting variables do not need to be disclosed.

- **The percentages of respondents who give 'don't know' answers** (and in the case of voting-intention studies, **of those who say they will not vote**). This information must always be given when it is likely to affect significantly the interpretation of the findings. When comparing findings from different surveys, any changes (other than minor ones) in these percentages must be indicated. There are many occasions on which the interpretation of particular findings will be quite different if the level of 'don't know' answers is 5% or 50%. In the case of voting-intention studies the same consideration also applies to 'will not vote' answers

- **The relevant questions asked**. In order to avoid possible ambiguity the actual wording of the question should be given unless this is a standard question already familiar to the audience, such as an approval rating of the government or the government's leaders or has been given in a previously published report to which reference is made.

- The guiding principle when deciding which question wordings are relevant to publish is the elimination of ambiguity and misunderstanding. This is particularly important where the actual question wording is critical to interpreting the findings, and where the reported answers can be affected by the form of the question or its context – especially on politically or socially sensitive issues such as attitudes towards abortion.

- Certainly where tabular data are given, the full question wording must be included. On websites, the full question wording must be made available, together with, as a minimum, the answers for the weighted sample in total. These answers should include "Don't know and non-response."

- A general indication of the placement of a key question and its context should be provided if it follows other questions that may impact on the way that question is understood by respondents.

- Where the questions form part of a more extensive or 'omnibus' survey, this must be made clear to any enquirer, including a general indication of the placement of the questions in the questionnaire.

Obviously, this information is most easily provided in reports of opinion polls published in print or online. For video and audio reports, the requirement can be satisfied by including this information in an online version of the poll, or in an accompanying press release. However, all video and audio reports must include information about the conduct and sponsorship of the opinion poll, the timing of the interviews and the interview method.

In preparing materials for publication (in print, online or any other medium), journalists and other users of the research connected with the media normally follow their own codes of practice and ethics, many of which require adequate disclosure of polling information[2]. This Guideline is not intended in any way to substitute for these codes, but rather to support them.

One example of a suitable form of wording for print publication would be:

Polling method: Online

Number of interviews: 2222 adults

Dates of interviewing: 5th March 2014 to 7th March 2014

Conducted by: XYZ Research for the *Guardian*

---

[2] New York Times Polling Standards; BBC Guidelines; Australian Press Council Reporting Guidelines

Another alternative is to use a 'data box' of this kind:

> This survey was carried out by ABC Research, on behalf of News Inc., using a national quota sample of 1111 adults of voting age personally interviewed in 102 locations between 1st-5th March 2014, weighted to reflect census characteristics for age, gender, region, and education.

A further example is:

> Survey carried out by XYZ Research, sponsored by QRS interest group.   It is a national survey of 1234 adults aged 18 and above, interviewed by telephone between 25th-28th February 2014 using random digit dialling and quota selection within households, weighted to national voting patterns.

Detailed information within the published survey report itself may not be necessary when an article summarises the results of a **number** of surveys, or when it would be too complicated to give all the key information for each of the surveys referred to. Where a given survey is reported on serially (for example in the course of several consecutive issues of a newspaper) it might be unnecessary to repeat all the technical details in every issue.

However, even in the more complex cases key information should be presented: the conduct and sponsorship of the opinion poll, the timing of the interviews and the interview method.

5.3   Further information to be made available

In all cases, the basic principle of fair and informative reporting requires that **it be made clear how and where the enquirer can obtain additional details**. The survey company and the media should publish all required full details of public polls on their websites within 24 hours of publication, with the website address provided by the media, or the full details presented on the media's own website.

In some countries, market and opinion research association codes may require more detailed disclosure as part of good practice.

The survey company and the media must be prepared to supply the technical information necessary to assess the validity of published findings on request (see Article 11 of the ICC/ESOMAR International Code).   This technical information may include more detailed description of the sampling and general weighting procedures adopted by the organisation, all codes, the weighted and unweighted bases for all demographics and other data that has been published, and, when appropriate, the achieved response rates (using one of the definitions in the AAPOR Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys**)** and any known non-response bias.

There is no obligation for further information **beyond** this to be supplied – although researchers will normally be prepared to discuss their research methods in more detail with enquirers.

5.4   Secondary reporting

Many published opinion polls and surveys are reported by individuals and media other than the original client. The research organisation normally cannot be held responsible for any secondary reporting or subsequent use made of opinion poll results by people other than the original client. It should however be ready to immediately issue such comments or information as may be necessary to correct any cases of misreporting or misuse of results when these are brought to its attention.

6   RELATIONSHIP WITH CLIENTS AND OTHERS REPORTING RESEARCH

6.1   Responsibilities

To avoid possible misunderstandings, the research organisation must make clear to its clients in advance of conducting research (see Article 12 of the ICC/ESOMAR International Code):

☐   that the research organisation itself is bound by the requirements of the Code.

☐   that subsequent wider publication of the research findings by the client is in accordance with this Guideline.

Researchers must make a clear distinction between the results that emerge directly from the questions asked, and any commentary/interpretation based on these results (see Article 11a of the ICC/ESOMAR International Code).

Where the findings are published by the client, the latter shall be asked to consult with the researcher as to the form and content of the findings. Both the researcher and the client have a responsibility to ensure the published results are not misleading (see Article 11b of the ICC/ESOMAR International Code). This means for example:

☐ Misleading comments based on non-significant differences and relationships must be avoided to ensure readers are not confused.

☐ Special care is required to ensure that any graphs or charts used do not convey a misleading impression of the current survey's results or of trends over time.

☐ The public must be able to clearly distinguish between the survey findings as such and any editorial or other comments based upon these findings.

When an organisation conducts fieldwork for published surveys, but has not been involved in the analysis, it should be attentive to how the results are portrayed. That is especially the case when its name is included in the survey report. However, it has no responsibility if its name is not mentioned or when it has no control over how results are reported.

Researchers must always be prepared to make available the technical information necessary to assess the validity of any findings (see Article 11c of the ICC/ESOMAR International Code). Furthermore, researchers must not allow their name to be associated with the dissemination of the conclusions from a market research project unless they are adequately supported by the data (see Article 11d of the ICC/ESOMAR International Code).

This means that the researcher must reserve the right to publish the total study and not just the technical specifications in the event of:

☐ a shortened version of the publication distorting the analysis of the results;

☐ an unforeseen and abridged version of the publication;

☐ a publication which does not conform to the prior agreements.

In the event that a client releases data from a survey that was not originally intended for publication, this Guideline will apply as if it had originally been commissioned for publication.

6.2 Contractual agreements

Contracts between research organisations and their clients that ensure adherence to the ICC/ESOMAR Code (see ESOMAR Guideline on the mutual rights and responsibilities of researchers and clients) are strongly advised, for instance including the Code requirements in the contract. For example, some contracts stipulate that the research organisation has the right to examine and approve a copy of the publication based on its research. Where the research organisation reserves the copyright of the findings this can also help to reduce some of the problems involved in misleading secondary reporting of the findings by other people.

In addition to any other requirements it is suggested that such a contract should cover:

☐ Clarification of the point that the contract binds both the client as survey sponsor and the media commissioning the survey, where these are different parties.

☐ Some measure of control by the researcher over the published form of the results including figures and graphs.

Certain contracts also provide that if research findings commissioned for publication are not published, such findings can subsequently (after a specified period of time) be released by the research organisation itself; or alternatively the researcher is free to repeat the survey for another client/research user.

6.3 Archives

It is increasingly common practice in certain countries for data sets from public opinion surveys to be lodged with appropriate archives for subsequent secondary research by academic researchers and others. Where this is possible, researchers are encouraged to archive their data files, after insuring that all identifiable respondent characteristics have been deleted from the data set.

7   METHODOLOGICAL QUALITY AND TRANSPARENCY

The two main characteristics of quantitative scientific surveys are that respondents are chosen according to explicit statistical sampling criteria to ensure representativeness, rather than being self-selected, and that questions are worded in a balanced way.

Researchers must therefore:

☐   Make clear whether a probability or a quota or other non-probability sample is used.

☐   Allow the client on request to arrange for checks on the quality of data collection and data preparation (see Article 4 of the ICC/ESOMAR International Code).

☐   Provide the client and research users with appropriate technical details of the research project carried out for the client and ensure that projects are designed, carried out, reported and documented accurately, transparently and objectively.

☐   Pay attention to the timing of the fieldwork, interviewer training, the size and method of sample selection and weighting of results.

The following section includes methodological and practical considerations for the conduct of the most visible types of opinion polls and the various ways that data can be collected.

8   ADDITIONAL GUIDELINES FOR SPECIFIC TYPES OF OPINION POLLS AND PUBLISHED SURVEYS

8.1   Pre-election and voting intention polls

Opinion polls taken before elections are highly scrutinised, in part because many people believe that vote projections may affect the way the people vote. The evidence for this belief is limited, with some studies finding little impact, and others suggesting moderate impact in some cases[3].

Objective poll results are just one of the many inputs on social and political issues. Other inputs include events, political advertising, and messages from individuals or organisations with a partisan or ideological approach to presenting their views. Whatever the impact of pre-election polls, the public has the right to receive all kinds of information to help them make a rational voting choice; opinion polls deliver very valid information to the voter.

Pre-election polls are expected to be accurate in their estimates of a voting tally or the share of the vote for parties and candidates in an election, especially if they are conducted close to the election itself. However, they should not be seen as predictions per se. They are instead a reflection of opinion at the time the poll was conducted. Researchers must recognise that new events and information may still change preference and must state if there is any evidence that respondents favouring one party or candidate may be unwilling to indicate their true preference or unwilling to participate in the poll. People do change their mind, some even in the second before marking their vote on the ballot slip and 'undecided' voters can have a decisive impact on the result.

While all opinion polls require high technical standards, pre-election polls need particular care in noting the timing of interviews (how long before an election the poll was taken), the sample from which results are being reported (all adults, those eligible to vote, those who are deemed most likely to vote), and how likely voters have been determined.

As good practice in conducting pre-election polls, researchers should:

☐   Observe the need for samples of appropriate size and quality and technical considerations particularly affecting pre-election polls. For example, such polls must have a sample large enough to draw conclusions about voters, who may be only a percentage of the total adult population (in some cases, the effective sample size may be reduced by as much as half). It is necessary to disclose the actual sample size on which the key vote preference findings are based.

---

[3] Wolfgang Donsbach, "Who's Afraid of Election Polls? Normative and Empirical Arguments for Freedom of Pre-Election Surveys", Foundation for Information, ESOMAR, 2001; Catherine Marsh, "Back on the Bandwagon: The Effect of Opinion Polls on Public Opinion," British Journal of Political Science 15 (1985), pp. 51-74

☐ Measure key variables such as likelihood to vote and wherever possible, reasons for party choice or attitudes on issues or other aspects of the campaign. Such polls will have greater political and social value if they do not confine themselves only to measuring voting intention but also explore the reasons for party choice and opinions on important campaign issues.

☐ Check the demographic profile for representativeness and, if necessary, apply weighting to correctly represent the electorate. Ensure that the population profile that is reported is that of electors eligible to vote rather than the all adults profile normally used in commercial market research.

☐ Attempt to keep key elements of methodology consistent throughout the election campaign. This particularly applies to sampling method, question wording and the positioning of voting intention questions. It does not apply to sample size or composition; polls closer to the election day may rely on samples of "likely voters" rather than all eligible voters. However, if polls move to sample "likely" voters later in the campaign, this adjustment must be clearly noted and distinguished.

☐ In omnibus surveys, ensure that political questions are not affected by the subject matter of the preceding questions. That may mean placing such questions near the beginning of the poll. Political questions that might affect measurements of voting intention should not be placed before the vote question.

Whilst the details specified in Section 5 of this Guideline must always be included, in addition, the importance of providing the percentages that are "undecided," "don't know" or otherwise do not answer the vote question cannot be overstated. These numbers should be published in all pre-election polls, along with percentages that say they will not vote.

Researchers must take all possible technical steps to ensure that polls, especially those published in the last few days of an election campaign, provide reliable and objective information. In some countries, when election polls are conducted face to face, there may be concern about whether respondents will be willing to divulge their preference. If so, it is good practice to ask respondents to write their choice on paper and place it in a "secret ballot box," much like an actual election ballot box.

Many countries have set limits on the length of time before elections for publishing pre-election polls. Researchers need to be aware of any such restrictions.

8.2 Exit polls

Exit polls are mainly conducted on election day with voters interviewed as they leave polling stations about how they voted and why. They may be subject to laws about interviewer access (the distance from a polling place interviewers may stand), and about publication.

Exit polls serve functions that differ somewhat from pre-election polls. Because of the speed with which the results are formulated and disseminated, and the fact that they interview those who have already voted, they do predict election results. They also describe patterns of voter support for parties, candidates, and issues. They have supported extensive academic research efforts.

8.2.1 Respondent protections

☐ Researchers must protect the identity of respondents in exit polls and must not maintain identifying information (e.g. name, address, or other IDs) with the voter-level records or allow the data set to enable deductive disclosure of respondents' identity. Researchers can limit this possibility by not revealing publicly small-area geographic details such as the specific polling place in which votes were cast.

☐ As exit poll interviewing is conducted in a public place, interviewers must take special care about respondent confidentiality. Asking voters to complete a pencil and paper form that is then placed in a box without interviewer intervention, or having voters complete the interview privately on a hand-held device is far preferable to an oral interview.

8.2.2 Study design

Those conducting exit polls must follow these principles:

☐ They must be impartial. Exit polls are designed to collect data from voters and report information on electoral outcomes. They are not tools for partisan advocacy.

☐ Use transparent, public and well-documented methods. These goals can be achieved by publicly describing the methods prior to conducting the exit poll and by adhering to the standards of minimal disclosure delineated in this Guideline. It is also recommended that when the exit poll is used for analysis, the data set

(without individual identifiers) along with appropriate survey documentation be deposited in public archives and/or on websites for general access.

☐ Adopt study designs that are suitable for producing accurate and reliable results and that follow accepted procedural and technical standards.

☐ Follow generally accepted good survey practice. In places where voting takes place by mail or even by internet, exit polls may be conducted on election day itself or in the days preceding the event by methods, like telephone or online. If interviewing at a polling place is forbidden or dangerous, interviews may also be conducted on election day at homes or other sites where polling is normally conducted. Special care must be taken in those circumstances to ensure that respondents actually are voters.

8.2.3   Release of results

☐ Exit polls used for projections should be reported as soon as is practical after the polls close. Any delay in disseminating the results will raise questions about the legitimacy of the effort, especially with regard to estimating the outcome of the election. If analysis is the only purpose of the exit poll, prompt release is less important.

☐ In some countries, election laws prohibit the publication of exit poll data until after the polls have closed. In general, statements about the outcome of an election based on exit polls must not be published before all the polling places in the contest have closed.

☐ In national elections with a range of poll closing times, this can mean exit polls relating to results for elections in smaller voting units (such as individual states in the United States) can be reported when all the polling stations have closed in those locations, rather than waiting until all polling stations used for voting that day have closed. Descriptive information other than voting behaviour may be published before the polls have closed, unless this is prohibited by local legislation or codes of practice.

☐ In addition to the requirements for publication in Section 5 of this Guideline, because of their timing, exit poll results must be released to the public and other interested parties through the general media and simultaneously made accessible to all. It is good practice to disclose as much of the methodology in advance as possible.

8.2.4   Accompanying information

The following information must be included with exit poll reports and election projections, made available in a similar way as required in Section 5 of this Guideline:

☐ The name of the firm conducting and analysing the exit poll and its sponsor;

☐ Whether the sponsor of the exit poll has any ties to political parties, candidates, political organisations or governmental bodies;

☐ Number of interviews;

☐ Number of polling stations or sampling points and how they were selected;

☐ The sampling frame and the sample's geographic dispersion and coverage;

☐ Any legal limits on data collection that might affect polling accuracy (e.g. minimum distance of interviewers from the polling station);

☐ Whether interviewing was conducted throughout the election day or for only part of the day and if people who have voted before election day have been included;

☐ Whether interviewers are part of a permanent field staff or hired for the occasion;

☐ How respondent anonymity is guaranteed (paper questionnaires, etc.);

☐ The interview schedule or questionnaire and instructions;

☐ Which results are based on parts of the sample, rather than the whole sample;

☐ A description of the precision of the findings, including estimates of sampling error;

☐ Monitoring and validation procedures (if any);

- □   The demographic and behavioural characteristics used for weighting;

- □   Response rates (using one of the definitions in the [AAPOR Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys](#)) and item non-response on vote questions and any known non-response bias;

- □   General description of how estimates are made, the kinds of variables being used, and whether adjustments for non-response have been made and have known design effects.

8.3   Polls in times of crisis

Opinion surveys are often conducted in times of crisis and researchers must be sensitive to respondent concerns and ability to answer specific questions. They also must note whether there are any locations where interviewing may be problematic because of the crisis. This can include areas affected by natural disasters and those that have been the sites of military action, terrorist attacks, or other forms of violence. The requirement that no harm come to survey participants is particularly important in these circumstances.

8.4   Requirements for specific modes of data collection

8.4.1   Face-to-face interviewing

The face-to-face interview, also known as the in-person interview as an interviewer meets an interviewee in person, is probably the oldest form of survey data collection. Today it is conducted by pencil and paper interviewing (PAPI), where the questionnaire is on paper, or increasingly via computer-assisted personal interviewing (CAPI), where the questionnaire is stored on a laptop. It is used in places with limited landline phone and internet availability, where it is essential for collecting high-quality data, and also for complex, long and difficult questionnaires.

As the face-to-face interview is time-consuming and expensive, it is often replaced by telephone interviews (CATI) and online interviewing. However, face-to-face interviewing has its advantages since response rates are usually higher than for telephone or online interviews, even though response rates are falling for all types of interviews.

Researchers must ensure that:

- □   Interviewers are specially trained on how to conduct an interview – how to select respondents and gain their trust.

- □   Interviewers assure respondents that their participation is voluntary, and their personal data and answers will remain confidential.

- □   Interviewers act properly, know the questionnaire, and are a neutral transmitter for the respondents' answers.

- □   Interviewers are adequately supervised, and incompetent or dishonest ones are removed from the interviewing team.

Researchers need to be aware of:

- □   Interviewer effects – the influence of the interviewer, their manner of behaviour during the interview, and even their appearance and gender - on the answers given by respondents.

- □   Interviewing in stressful electoral situations or on sensitive topics may impact respondents' willingness to answer accurately and this possibility must be taken into account when analysing and reporting results.

- □   If interviewing involves some type of quota selection, or the sample is drawn from a list, this information must be disclosed in poll reports as well as the number of sampling points (PSUs) and their geographic dispersion.

- □   If face-to-face interviewing is the only valid method of data collection in certain places, but accessibility to large parts of the country is limited, "national" polling results may include only interviews in metropolitan areas and if so, the geographic limitations of coverage must be clearly indicated.

8.4.2   Phone interviewing

Telephone interviewing is by far the most popular method of conducting opinion polls in developed countries and in principle can offer high quality, unclustered, random samples with centralised and supervised interviewing. It permits quick turnaround of fieldwork, with the possibility of multiple contacts of potential respondents. It has been extremely useful in places where there is information available on the allocation of phone numbers, which makes random digit dialling the primary method of sampling phone numbers. Random

samples can also be drawn from existing lists, such as lists of registered voters or all residents. However some recent developments, as well as some local issues, can make probability phone sampling difficult. In some countries many households have never owned landline phones. In others, people are using only mobile devices.

☐ In many countries a growing number of households cannot be sampled from public registers, as they are not listed. However a sample is drawn, researchers must disclose any non-coverage.

☐ In places where a significant percentage of adults is only reachable by mobile phones, researchers who wish to reach a representative sample of the population should include mobile phones in their sampling frames. The specific proportion of interviews on mobile phones and the sample mix of landline and mobiles is dependent on the specific proportions of landline and mobile phones which varies country by country. In the United States, for example, some companies conduct more than half their opinion poll interviews on mobile phones. In countries where mobile phone coverage is very high, and there are few demographic differences between those with and without mobile phones, it may be possible to reach a representative sample with mobile phone numbers only.

☐ In each of these cases, incorporating mobile phones will require researchers to follow the ESOMAR Guideline for Conducting Mobile Market Research. This includes taking into account such things as respondent safety.

☐ For many reasons, phone ownership is frequently correlated with voting intention, with those who cannot be contacted by phone more likely to support one party rather than another in an election. If phone ownership is not high and/or likely to produce an unrepresentative sample, this method of interview should not be used for pre-election polls, or it should be supplemented with data collected using another mode of interviewing.

☐ If phone samples are used for polls, methods must be applied to correct for any under-representation of supporters of particular political parties. Simple demographic profile adjustments may not be adequate.

8.4.3   Online polls

Online surveys are now commonly used for opinion and election polling and have provided estimates with similar levels of accuracy to traditional polling methods; but they continue to be controversial. At issue is the question of representativeness – whether a methodology that is frequently based on respondents who have chosen to be part of an access panel is representative – especially when traditional opinion polling has relied on probability sampling. Unlike face-to-face and telephone interviewing, there is no agreed-upon sampling frame for online sampling.

As with telephone polling, online polling's viability as a method of carrying out pre-election polls depends largely on the accessibility of a representative sample via the internet, or on the ability to construct a replica sample that reflects the population from what was originally a volunteer and often non-representative access panel. Given the increasing reach of the internet, there are many countries where this can be done, if care is taken to include people who cannot use the internet at home, but connect to the internet at work or some other place. ESOMAR's 28 questions to help buyers of online samples contains additional guidance on requirements including online sampling and the use of access panels.

Most online polls are conducted using panels of pre-recruited respondents. Methods for panellist recruitment include both conventional probability sampling and non-probability volunteer panels. Usually, the sample for a particular survey involves a second stage of selection to determine which panellists are invited to participate. Finally, as is typical of almost all surveys, the resulting sample is weighted to better represent the target population.

The major points of controversy involving online surveys concern population coverage (who is able to participate in the survey) and the use of non-probability methods for panel selection. Internet access has expanded rapidly in Europe and North America and is becoming a decreasing problem for most, though not all, population groups. Most surveys today involve large amounts of self-selection, even if random selection is used initially to select respondents (due to non-response), though the problem is usually more severe for approaches that do not begin with a sampling frame.

☐ As with other types of polls, all published survey reports from online polling must include basic methodological information, such as the sponsor of the poll, the number of interviews, the sample source and any screening criteria, the mode of interviewing, and the field period.

☐ Additional information is needed so readers can evaluate the poll's reliability and validity. This information is more technical, and should be available on a website of the research organisation or the publication. It must be made available when requested. That information includes:

☐ Whether respondents were selected from a panel (or multiple panels), the names of the panels and whether they were created using probability or non-probability methods. If the panel is a probability sample, the cumulative response rate (reflecting recruitment, attrition, and the within-panel response rate for a study) should be made available. For non-probability samples, the participation rate (the number of panel members providing a usable response divided by the total number of initial personal invitations requesting members to participate) should be provided.

☐ The method of selection of panelists for the particular study. This usually involves some form of stratification or quotas, intended to represent the target population. The variables used to define the strata, quotas, or other selection methods (such as matching and propensity score groups) should be listed.

☐ In most cases, the final sample will be weighted. The most important information to disclose is which variables were used to form the weights. If cell weighting or raking ("rim weighting") is used, the unweighted sample distributions should be included in tabulations. For more complex methods (such as propensity score weighting or matching), a more detailed methodology report should be made available on request.

These disclosures are intended to provide information about the procedures used to conduct a specific survey with a given panel, but do not cover details of panel recruitment (aside from identification of the panel source or sources). For more details see ESOMAR's 28 questions to help buyers of online samples.

8.4.4   Mixed modes

The use of multiple modes within a single poll is becoming common, especially as ways of insuring coverage for groups that may be difficult to reach by the main polling method. For example, face-to- face interviewing may supplement phone interviewing in countries with relatively low phone penetration. Some research organisations offer respondents a choice as to how they wish to be interviewed.

☐ The value of using multiple modes is their representativeness; however, researchers must always be aware of the possibilities of mode effects as different modes may produce different answers.

☐ When publishing results from polls using mixed modes, researchers must provide the number of interviews in each mode and provide the information relevant to each mode of interviewing.

9   PROJECT TEAM

☐ Kathy Frankovic (Chair), former Director of Surveys at CBS News; Consultant to YouGov and a member of the ESOMAR Professional Standards Committee

☐ Miroslawa Grabowska, Professor at University of Warsaw and Director of the Center for Public Opinion Research (CBOS)

☐ Richard Hilmer, Managing Director, Infratest Dimap

☐ Kathy Joe, Director, International Standards and Public Affairs, ESOMAR

☐ Christophe Jourdain, International Managing Director, IFOP

☐ Nick Moon, Managing Director, GfK NOP Social Survey and secretary to the British Polling Council

☐ Alejandro Moreno, Professor at the Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México (ITAM); Director of the public opinion polling unit at newspaper Reforma and President of WAPOR

☐ Adam Phillips, Chair of the ESOMAR Professional Standards and Legal Affairs Committees

☐ Doug Rivers, Professor at Stanford University and Founder of YouGov America

研究期內與政改直接相關的民意調查(102 項)

公佈日期	委託機構	調查機構	訪問時間	受訪對象	訪問數量（成功）	訪問形式	範圍	部分結果摘錄（自本地報章及調查機構）	包括在民間民情報告內？	政府報告有沒有包括？
2014 年 5 月 12 日	蘋果日報	蘋果日報	5 月 7 至 10 日	香港市民 (18+)	714	電話訪問	全港	不作分析		
2014 年 5 月 26 日	明報	香港大學民意研究計劃	5 月 14 至 20 日	香港市民 (18+)	1011	由真實訪員以電腦隨機抽樣電話訪問形式	全港	明報委託香港大學民意研究計劃進行第五輪調查，目的是了解市民對 2017 年特首選舉及「佔領中環」行動的意見。結果發現，57%受訪者認為，若中央及特區政府最終提出的政改方案，讓一人一票選特首，但泛民主派人士被排拒參加，他們會接受方案；28%表示反對，寧願政制原地踏步。（港大民研網站）	✓	

2014 年 6 月 1 日	蘋果日報	蘋果日報	2014 年 6 月 1 日	六四遊行期間遊行人士	193	訪問	遊行人士	不作分析		
2014 年 6 月 2 日	香港研究協會	香港研究協會	2014 年 5 月 18 至 23 日	香港市民 (18+)	1077	隨機抽樣電話訪問	全港	市民對『佔領中環』行動的意見調查(一):兩成六受訪者表示「支持」「佔領中環」行動,而表示「不支持」的則佔六成。至於會否參與行動,百分之五受訪者對此表示「會」,而表示「不會」的則佔八成七,當問及是否有信心「佔領中環」行動可以成功推動落實 2017 年普選行政長官時,一成四受訪者對此表示「有信心」,而表示「無信心」的則佔七成一。(香港研究協會)	✓	

2014 年 6 月 13 日	香港研究協會	香港研究協會	2014 年 6 月 2 至 7 日	香港市民 (18+)	1083	隨機抽樣電話訪問	全港	市民對『佔領中環』行動的意見調查（二）：兩成半受訪者表示「支持」「佔領中環」行動，而表示「不支持」的則佔六成一，當問及是否有信心「佔領中環」行動可以成功推動落實 2017 年普選行政長官時，一成半受訪者對此表示「有信心」，較上次調查升百分之一，而表示「無信心」的則佔七成二. 有意見認為「佔領中環」行動會破壞香港法治的核心價值，五成半受訪者對此表示「認同」，較上次升百分之二，而表示「不認同」的則佔三成半，較上次跌百分之二。（香港研究協會）	✓	
2014 年 6 月 15 日	香港政改民意關注組	嶺南大學公共管治研究部	5 月 19 至 26 日	香港市民 (18+)	1020	隨機抽樣電話訪問	全港	調查結果反映五成二受訪者都認為，公民提名沒有違反《基本法》；但同時五成四人認為，即使不滿最終方案的提名程序都	✓	

								應「食住先」，令二〇一七年可先實行一人一票選特首，寧願原地踏步的只有三成半。（信報財經新聞）		
2014 年 6 月 18 日	蘋果日報	蘋果日報	6 月 12 至 16 日	香港市民 (18+)	1609	電話訪問	全港	不作分析		
2014 年 6 月 19 日	真普選聯盟	香港大學民意研究計劃	5 月 27 至 30 日	香港市民	1019	由真實訪員以電腦隨機抽樣電話訪問形式	全港	結果顯示政府拒納三軌方案後，仍有 45% 市民支持三軌方案，只較 4 月時跌兩個百分點，反對則有 16%，較 4 月時跌一個百分點。鄭宇碩稱結果與過去港大民調相若，受訪者一直以約「三比一」的比例支持三軌方案。（港大民研網站）	✔	

| 2014 年 6 月 24 日 | 香港政策研究所 | 香港政策研究所民意調查中心 | 5 月 12 至 20 日 | 香港市民 | 602 | 隨機抽樣電話訪問 | 全港 | 結果顯示，對一七年能夠實現特首普選感到悲觀的受訪者有三成，一般的佔三成四，感樂觀的受訪者有兩成三。而悲觀和一般的受訪者中，兩成五人認為，主要原因是基於中央政府；一成五的受訪者認為是主要原因在於香港特區政府，而認為主要原因是基於激進民主組織及泛民主政黨的受訪者分別有一成四及一成一，兩者相加後的比例，與中央政府佔的比重一樣。三成一受訪者認為，今次政改的主要訴求是「公民提名」，排第二的是「擴大提名委員會的人數及代表性」，佔兩成八，認為是「公民推薦」和「泛民政黨代表能夠參與」的分別是百分之六和百分之五。（星島日報） | ✓ | |

2014 年 6 月 25 日	香港研究協會	香港研究協會	2014 年 6 月 17 至 21 日	香港市民 (18+)	1076	隨機抽樣電話訪問	全港	市民對『佔領中環』行動的意見調查（三）：六成三受訪者表示「不支持」「佔領中環」行動，較上次調查升百分之二；而表示「支持」的則佔兩成六，較上次升百分之一. 至於會否參與行動，百分之七受訪者對此表示「會」，較上次升百分之一；而表示「不會」的則佔八成八. 當問及是否有信心「佔領中環」行動可以成功推動落實 2017 年普選行政長官時，一成六受訪者對此表示「有信心」，而表示「無信心」的則佔七成三，兩者同樣較上次調查升百分之一。（香港研究協會）	✓	
2014 年 6 月 28 日	香港公民行動	香港公共管治學會	6 月 12 至 17 日	香港市民	2840	電話形式訪問	全港	調查發現，54.1%受訪者認為「佔中」違反香港法律，33.3% 受訪者則稱「不違法」，「無意見」則佔 12.6%。（文匯報）	✓	

2014 年 7 月 2 日	蘋果日報	蘋果日報	7 月 1 日	7.1 遊行人士	300	以問卷形式訪問	維園	不作分析		
2014 年 7 月 2 日	明報	明報	7 月 1 日	7.1 遊行人士	410	訪問	維園	不作分析		
2014 年 7 月 2 日	真普選聯盟	香港大學民意研究計劃	6 月 6 至 16 日	香港市民	1016	由真實訪員以電腦隨機抽樣電話訪問形式	全港	真普聯委託港大民意研究計劃就政改問題進行第五輪調查。調查問及受訪者可以說出多少個坊間提出的 2017 年普選行政長官方案，近七成受訪者表示連一個都不知道；能分別說出真普聯方案及學界方案的，則只有 7% 及 6%。調查並要求受訪者在「佔中投票」的 3 個方案中，選擇一個最支持的方案，結果超過三成一受訪者表示，3 個方案都不支持。若一定要三選一的話，有五成半人支持真普聯方案。（港大民研網站）	✓	

| 2014 年 7 月 18 日 | 香港研究協會 | 香港研究協會 | 2014 年 7 月 10 至 15 日 | 香港市民 (18+) | 1097 | 隨機抽樣電話訪問 | 全港 | 市民對『佔領中環』行動的意見調查(四):六成三受訪者表示「不支持」「佔領中環」行動,比例維持不變;表示「支持」的佔兩成七,較上次調查升百分之一;而表示「未決定」的則佔百分之六,較上次升百分之一. 至於會否參與行動,百分之七受訪者對此表示「會」,比例維持不變;表示「不會」的則佔八成六,較上次跌百分之二;而表示「未決定」的則佔百分之五,較上次升百分之一。(香港研究協會) | ✓ | |
| 2014 年 7 月 29 日 | 真普選聯盟 | 香港大學民意研究計劃 | 7 月 21 至 24 日 | 香港市民 | 1009 | 由真實訪員以電腦隨機抽樣電話訪問形式 | 全港 | 《真普選聯盟》「三軌提名方案」定期調查 (7 月份)。結果顯示在六二二佔中公投、七一遊行及佔中預演後,真普聯三軌方案的支持度由之前的百分之五,急升至最新的五成。以十分為滿分計算,受訪者對三軌方案的平均評 | ✓ | |

							分亦達六點一分。(港大民研計劃)		
2014 年 7 月 29 日	香港研究協會	香港研究協會	2014 年 7 月 21 至 25 日	香港市民 (18+)	1103	隨機抽樣電話訪問	全港	市民對『佔領中環』行動的意見調查（五）:六成八（+5%）受訪者表示「不支持」「佔領中環」行動，表示「支持」的佔兩成半（-2%），而表示「未決定」的則佔百分之五（-1%），至於會否參與行動，百分之七（比例維持不變）受訪者對此表示「會」，而表示「不會」的則佔八成八（+2%），而表示「未決定」的則佔百分之三（-2%）。當問及是否有信心「佔領中環」行動可以成功推動落實 2017 年普選行政長官時，一成四（-2%）受訪者對此表示「有信心」，而表示「無信心」的則佔七成六（+2%）(香港研究協會)	✓	

2014 年 8 月 7 日	香港研究協會	香港研究協會	7 月 30 日至 8 月 4 日	香港市民 (18+)	1,071	隨機抽樣電話訪問	全港	不作分析		
2014 年 8 月 7 日	香港政改民意關注組	嶺南大學公共管治研究部	7 月 21 日至 27 日	市民	1,017	隨機抽樣電話訪問	全港	調查顯示，五成半市民贊成即使政改方案未滿意都「袋先住」，較兩個月前僅微升一個百分點；寧願原地踏步的有百分之三十六點五，亦微升一點三個百分點。雖整體結果變化不大，但深入分析發現，自稱泛民受訪者贊成「袋住先」的有四成八，較上次大幅跌八點三個百分點；同時寧願原地踏步的，也急升十一點六個百分點至四成七。自稱建制派情況相反，贊成「袋住先」的升一點五個分點至五成八，寧願地踏步的跌五點八個百分點至三成半。而自稱非建制或泛民的，支持「袋住先」的大增十點七個百分點至六成一，寧原地踏	✔	

								步的亦大跌七點三個百分點至兩成八。(星島日報)		
2014 年 8 月 18 日	香港 2020	香港中文大學傳播與民意調查中心	8 月 6 日至 8 月 11 日	香港市民 (18+)	824	隨機抽樣電話訪問	全港	調查顯示，近六成市民都認為如果 2017 年的普選方案有政治篩選，立法會應予以否決；有三成市民則認為要通過。超過七成市民認為，如果政府否決公民提名，市民應有份選出提名委員會的成員，只有不足兩成市民反對」。立法會選舉方面，四分三人贊成把團體、公司票，全部改為個人票；近四成人認為要全面取消功能組別，23%建議減少功能組別及增加直選議席，僅 24%認為應維持現狀。另外，48%人要求取消分組點票，支持保留不足四成。(蘋果日報)	✓	

2014 年 8 月 18 日	明報	明報	8 月 17 日	「8·17 和平普選大遊行」參與者	409	問卷訪問	維園	不作分析		
2014 年 8 月 28 日	香港九龍社團聯會	香港九龍社團聯會	8 月 23 日至 25 日	香港市民 (18+)	3,765	電話訪問	全港	不作分析		
2014 年 9 月 1 日	蘋果日報	蘋果日報	8 月 29 至 31 日	市民	522	隨機電話訪問	全港	不作分析		✓
2014 年 9 月 3 日	香港研究協會	香港研究協會	8 月 31 日至 9 月 2 日	本港市民 (18+)	1,086	電話訪問	全港	調查顯示，53%受訪者「接受」提名委員會按照現時選委會，由 1200 人、依四大界別以相同的比例組成，「不接受」的佔 36%。59%的受訪者「接受」按照少數服從多數的原則，行政長官候選人須取得 50%以上提名委員支持，亦有 58%的受訪者表示「接受」將行政長官候選人數定為 2 至 3 人，「不接受」的佔 46%。(經濟日報)	✓	✓

2014 年 9 月 5 日	無線電視新聞部	嶺南大學公共管治研究部	8 月 31 日晚至 9 月 3 日	市民	1,114	隨機抽樣電話訪問	全港	結果顯示，認為立法會應通過按人大框架制訂的普選方案比率為 45%、認為應否決的則有 40.7%，無意見或不知道的比率為 14.2%（見圖）。若分析受訪者背景，可見 50 歲以上受訪者傾向接受人大決定及認為立法會要通過政改方案，而 30 至 49 歲受訪者則傾向不接受和認為不應通過。(明報)	✓	✓
2014 年 9 月 5 日	香港青年聯會	香港民意調查中心(一國兩制研究中心)	9 月 2 至 3 日	18 歲或以上操廣東話的香港市民	630	以電腦隨機抽取電話樣本訪過真實訪問員以電話進行問卷訪問	全港	調查顯示，47.5%受訪者接受提委會由選舉委員會四大界別組成。53.6%受訪者接受參與行政長官普選的人士須得到提委會過半數支持才可成為正式候選人。53.3% 的人接受候選人數目為 2 至 3 人。62.8%的人不贊同佔領中環的方式爭取普選。(香港青年聯會)	✓	✓

| 2014 年 9 月 7 日 | 香港商報 | 香港商界民調公司（商報） | 9 月 1 至 5 日 | 香港各大商會、中小企業商會、商會社團和港商 | 462 (500) | 電話訪問、訪談、問卷和網上答卷等方式 | 業界會員 | 調查顯示，多達八成一的受訪者在整體上表示支持，其中 50%「很支持」，31.3%「支持」，18.6%的表示「可以接受」。對於人大在當前時空條件下給出的最佳方案，雖有人覺得未必盡善盡美，但商界近九成人認為可「袋住先」，其中表示「完全可以」的有 34.4%，56.3%指「可以」，而覺得「一般」的受訪者為 9.3%，僅 2 人選擇反對。不過，商界對五步曲的第三步，即立法會通過政改議案信心不足，受訪者中「大有信心」及「有信心」的只有一半，多達 43.7%的人覺得信心「一般」，更有 3.2%的人直言「無信心」。(經濟日報) | ✓ | ✓ |

2014 年 9 月 10 日	明報	香港大學民意研究計劃	9 月 1 至 6 日	市民 (18+)	1,004	由真實訪員以電腦隨機抽樣電話訪問形式	全港	《明報》第六次委託香港大學民意研究計劃進行是次調查,目的是了解市民對 2017 年特首選舉及「佔領中環」行動的意見。結果顯示,政改方案若排拒泛民參選,52%受訪者接受先要一人一票,比率較 4 個月前同樣調查下跌約 5 百分點;相反,「寧政制原地踏步」升 9 個百分點至 37%。(港大民研網站)	✓	✓
2014 年 9 月 10 日	香港教育工作者聯會	香港教育工作者聯會	9 月 1 日至 3 日	會員	427	網上問卷	業界會員	調查結果發現,會員對人大決議傾向持正面態度。65%認同提名委員會的人數、構成及產生辦法,66%支持特首候選人人數為兩至三人,及要取得提委會過半數支持才能「出閘」。對於人大對選民有行政長官選舉權的意見,更有多達 87% 會員認同。(大公報)	✓	✓

2014 年 9 月 11 日	新世紀論壇	新世紀論壇	9 月 1 至 9 日	市民	1,314	隨機訪問	全港	調查顯示，35%受訪者支持人大框架，23%表示人勉強接受，38%則反對。其中 514 名表示傾向建制派的受訪者，雖然有 76%人支持人大的決定，但有 87%人認為應該討論提名委員會如何擴大選民基礎。調查又發現，311 名傾向泛主民的受訪者中，雖有 64%支持以抗爭手法爭取普選，但僅 25%人認為佔中可改變中央決定，38%人認為不能，36%表示很難說。(新報)	✓	✓
2014 年 9 月 12 日	民建聯及青言社	民建聯及青言社	2014 年 9 月 1 至 7 日	15 至 40 歲青年人	485	網上及街頭問卷訪問	全港	調查顯示，超過 80%受訪年青人認同普選應按基本法規定進行. 超過 65%青年人認同特首候選人應獲過平數或以上提名. 超過 75%受訪年青人認同普選方案行前一步比原地踏步好。（民建聯）	✓	✓

2014 年 9 月 15 日	南華早報	香港大學民意研究計劃	9 月 4 至 11 日	市民 (18+)	1,008	由真實訪員以電腦隨機抽樣電話訪問形式	全港	《南華早報》於 2014 年 9 月委託香港大學民意研究計劃進行是次調查,目的是了解市民對政改的意見。調查顯示,有 39% 受訪者認為立法會應通過人大常委會提出框架下的方案,有 48% 認為應該否決。另外,有 54% 受訪者認為 2017 年特首普選方案通過後,將沒有機會/非常不可能/不可能再修改。(港大民研網站)	✓	✓
2014 年 9 月 17 日	會計界立法會議員梁繼昌	會計界立法會議員梁繼昌	9 月 10 日	業界	1,201	問卷	業界	不作分析		✓
2014 年 9 月 17 日	真普選聯盟	香港大學民意研究計劃	8 月 21 至 27 日	市民	1000+	以隨機電話訪問形式	全港	不作分析		
2014 年 9 月 18 日	香港青年學生動力	香港青年學生動力	9 月 2 日	市民(25 以下)	316	網上問卷調查	N/A	不作分析		

2014 年 9 月 19 日	香港建設管理交流中心	香港建設管理交流中心	9月5至8日	香港工程界	387	問卷調查	業界	不作分析		
2014 年 9 月 20 日	香港政協青年聯會	香港政協青年聯會	9月12至16日	市民	2,003	電話系統以隨機抽樣方式訪問	全港	不作分析		✓
2014 年 9 月 20 日	香港公民行動	香港公共管治學會	9月4日至9月12日	市民(18+)	1,851	隨機抽樣方式訪問	全港	儘管不少受訪者表示清楚規定內容,但調查發現有 34.6%受訪者表示接受,整體仍有 44.9%受訪者不接受人大決定框架,結果反映受訪者對是否接受全國人大常委會決定的意見極為分歧,雙方均未能獲得過半數。不過,整體有 57.8%受訪者表示,就算對人大決定的框架有不滿,2017 年仍應該落實一人一票選行政長官。調查中有 43.1%受訪者贊成「佔中行動」,不贊成則有 49.1%,兩者僅相差 6 個百	✓	✓

							分點。罷課方面則有 49.5%受訪者不贊成，有 42.8%表示贊成，相差 6.7 個百分點，與「佔中行動」情況相若。然而，有 65.7%受訪者認為，有關行動並不能改變人大常委會決定。（大公報）		
2014 年 9月 21 日	香港中文大學傳播與民意調查中心	香港中文大學傳播與民意調查中心	2014 年 9月 10 至17 日	15(+)操粵語的香港市民	1,006	電話訪問	全港	調查結果顯示如果政府方案會令到與中央不同政見的人士不能夠成為行政長官候選人，53.7%的受訪者認為立法會到時應該否決方案；認為應該通過方案的有 29.3%。51.8%的受訪者「不同意」香港如何普選行政長官會影響到國家 46.3%的受訪者表示「不支持」「佔領中環」行動。(中大傳播與民意調查中心)	✓	✓

| 2014 年 9 月 21 日 | 香港政改民意關注組 | 嶺南大學公共管治研究部 | 2014 年 9 月 5 至 10 日 | 市民 (18+) | 1,036 | 隨機抽樣電話訪問 | 全港 | 調查顯示，對於全國人大常委會關於行政長官普選問題的決定，有三成三的被訪者表示接受，四成三表示不接受。此外，有兩成八的被訪者對決定表示滿意，有四成五對決定表示不滿意。對於在人大常委作出決定後，抗爭能否爭取更合理的 2017 年行政長官普選方案的問題上，有五成五的被訪者認為不可能，三成則認為可能。此外，分別有五成九和四成三的被訪者表示贊成「應該取消『團體票』和『公司票』」和「應該爭取改變提名委員會不同界別的議席分配，使提名委員會更有代表性」。再者，有五成的被訪者表示贊成「人大常委會已經對普選行政長官的各項原則作出規定，現時社會應該集中精力，爭取改善普選行政長官的細節」， | ✓ | ✓ |

								但也有三成六表示贊成「既然人大已經對各項原則作出規定，即使爭取到改善普選行政長官的細節也沒有意義」。（嶺南大學公共管治研究部）		
2014 年 9 月 24 日	香港電台《議事論事》	香港中文大學傳播與民意調查中心	9 月 10 至 17 日	市民 (15+)	1,006	電話訪問	全港	調查顯示，47.2% 受訪者表示不滿意人大框架，26.5% 表示一般，僅 18.7% 表示滿意。另外，47.8% 稱人大框架令他們對香港落實「一國兩制」的信心減少，36.7%稱無改變，12.6%說有增加。對於立法會應否通過政改方案，27.1%被訪者認為應該，25.4%贊成否決，亦有 39.9%認為應該根據民間全民投票結果決定。不過，直至目前為止，並未有團體表示會進行全民投票。如方案最終不獲通過，37%受訪者認為最大責任在中央政府、31.5%認為是泛民議員，	✓	✓

日期	機構	來源	調查日期	對象	樣本	方法	地點	內容		
								29.7%則認為特區政府要負責。（明報）		
2014 年 9 月 27 日	香港大學民意研究計劃	香港大學民意研究計劃	2014 年 9 月 19 至 24 日	市民 (18+)	1,011	訪員直接進行電話訪問	全港	調查顯示，若從社會整體考慮，反對人大常委決定的人有 44%，支持的有 35%。若從個人考慮，反對的高達 47%，支持的有 30%。在反對的群體中，有 56% 至 59% 是 18 至 39 歲的年輕人。(港大民研)	✔	
2014 年 9 月 27 日	明報	明報	9 月 26 日	參與罷課集會中學生	100	問卷調查	金鐘添美道集會場地	不作分析		
2014 年 9 月 30 日	香港理工大學社會政府研究中心	香港理工大學社會政策研究中心	2014 年 9 月 29 日	香港市民	729	以隨機抽樣方式電話調查	全港	「香港市民對『佔中』運動的意見」電話調查(第一輪)：近六成 (59.8%)受訪者非常不同意 /不同意香港警方由 9 月 28 日開始，處理「佔中」示威者的做法。	✔	✔

							對於「佔中」運動發展到今時日的狀況，較多受訪者 受訪者認為 特首梁振英/香港政府 /政府官員最需要為此負責，佔整體的46.3%。對於人大常委會就香港政改的決定，逾六成 (62.4%)受訪者非常唔同意或不同意「袋住先」；而表示同意或非常同意「袋住先」的則共有 29.4% 。(香港理工大學社會政策研究中心)		
2014 年 10 月 1 日	真普選聯盟	香港大學民意研究計劃	9 月 19 至 24 日	香港市民 (18+)	1012	由真實訪員以電腦隨機抽樣電話訪問形式	全港	《真普選聯盟》「三軌提名方案」定期調查 (9 月份)：結果顯示，只有 30%(個人而言)或 35%(從社會整體考慮)認為應該支持人大決定，而反對人大決定的，則分別有 47%(個人而言)和44%(從社會整體考慮)，反映無論從什麼層面考慮，社會反對人大決定的都比支持者多，當中尤以年青人的反 對比例更高，達	✔	✔

							59%。（港大民研網站）		
2014 年 10 月 3 日	明報記者 調查	明報記者 調查	10 月 2 日 午	參與佔領 的示威者	334	問卷形式	金鐘、銅 鑼灣、 旺角 及尖 沙嘴 4 個「佔 領區」	調查顯示，七成受訪者表明若政 府沒回應訴求，會無限期留守佔 領區，但亦有 13.2%受訪者打算 留守至昨日便離場。（明報）	✓	✓
2014 年 10 月 4 日	明報記者 調查	明報記者 調查	10 月 3 日 3 時至晚 上 9 時 半	參與佔領 的示威者	293	問卷形式	金鐘、銅 鑼 灣、旺 角三 佔領 區	調查顯示，受訪者當中 191 人 （65.2%）贊成應減少佔領區， 相反，有 86 人（29.4%）不贊成， 其餘為無意見。至於贊成縮減佔 領區的人中，多達 99.4%認為要 優先守住金鐘佔領區；有 40.8% 人認為其次要守住銅鑼灣，9.4% 認為其次要守住旺角。（明報）	✓	✓

| 2014 年 10 月 5 日 | 香港理工大學社會政府研究中心 | 香港理工大學社會政策研究中心 | 10 月 4 日晚上 | 香港市民 | 850 | 以隨機抽樣方式電話調查 | 全港 | 「香港市民對『佔中』運動的意見」電話調查(第二輪): 旺角佔領現場連日暴亂後進行民調，最多受訪者認為出現「佔領運動」及近日的暴力、襲擊事件，特首梁振英、港府及政府官員最需要負責。有關調查訪問了 850 名市民，結果顯示，對於佔領現場有襲擊佔中示威者的暴力事件，最多受訪認為特首梁振英、港府及政府官員最需要為此負責，有 28.6%；其次是「愛」字頭組織及反佔中人士，佔 17.3%；另有 13.3%認為警務處處長曾偉雄、前線警察要負責。至於認為負責在佔中三子、示威者的，分別有 12.5%及 10.6%。（蘋果日報） | ✓ | ✓ |

2014 年 10 月 6 日	香港研究協會	香港研究協會	2014 年 9 月 30 至 10 月 5 日	香港市民 (18+)	1361	隨機抽樣電話訪問	全港	市民對『佔領中環』行動的意見調查（六）：對於學聯及學民思潮、「佔中」發起人、示威人士在是次集會示威活動中的表現，表示「非常接受」及「頗接受」的合共分別佔四成四、三成八及五成一。當問及是次集會示威活動對受訪者的日常生活有否造成影響時，表示有「很大影響」及「較大影響」的合共佔五成四。（香港研究協會）	✓	✓
2014 年 10 月 6 日	經濟通及《晴報》	經濟通及《晴報》	2014 年 9 月 26 日及 9 月 28 日	網民	分別為 4138 至 8527	網上投票	N/A	不作分析		✓
2014 年 10 月 6 日	香港零售管理協會	香港零售管理協會	2014 年 10 月 1 至 5 日	協會會員	不詳	不詳	業界	不作分析		✓

2014 年 10 月 6 日	東方報業民意調查	東方報業民意調查	10 月 2 至 4 日	香港市民 (18+)	278	街頭問卷及電話形式	全港	不作分析		✓
2014 年 10 月 7 日	中小企協會聯同香港工商總會	中小企協會聯同香港工商總會	10 月 2 至 8 日	中小企業，當中包括裝修、建材、海味、蔬果檔、街市商販等	139 (122 街訪; 17 網絡問卷)	問卷形式	個別界別	結果顯示，受訪中小企業認為「佔中」對其影響達到「非常嚴重」程度，所有受訪店舖損失總額達到每天超過 121 萬。問卷中的一項是讓企業自己評價「佔中」影響程度，選擇 1 至 3 分代表沒有影響或影響很少，4 至 6 分代表一般影響，7 至 10 分代表影響非常嚴重。結果顯示，總體平均分為 7.18 分，有近四成受訪企業填了最嚴重的 10 分，有 70 多間企業都填了 7 分以上。另外，接近七成受訪店舖表示，每天減少生意額高達四成以上，大多數店舖每日減少生意額超過 1 萬元，平均減少 1 萬 2 千元。(香港中小企協會)	✓	✓

日期	委託／發布機構	調查機構	調查日期	調查對象	樣本數	調查方法	範圍	分析／結果		
2014 年 10 月 8 日	星島日報	星島地產網	不詳	香港市民 (18+)	225	不詳	全港	不作分析		✓
2014 年 10 月 9 日	香港商報	香港商界民調公司（商報）	9 月 29 日 至 10 月 7 日	香港各大商會、中小企業商會、商會社團和港商	486(500)	通過電話訪問、訪談、問卷和網上答卷等	個別界別	不作分析		
2014 年 10 月 16 日	香港青年聯會	香港民意調查中心（一國兩制研究中心）	10 月 14 日至 15 日	香港市民 (18+)	655	電腦電話訪問輔助系統，用電腦隨機抽取電話樣本，透過真實訪問員以電話問卷訪問	全港	「市民對佔中及不合作運動的意見調查」：結果發現，77.1% 受訪市民要求示威者盡快撤離主要幹道；75.6% 支持或非常支持警方移除示威者在主要幹道設置的路障，以確保主要道路暢通；57.8% 認為倘「佔中」組織者同意撤離主要幹道但有部分示威者堅持留低，警方應該用適當武力去移走這些示威人士。（新報）	✓	✓

2014 年 10 月 19 日	香港研究協會	香港研究協會	10 月 14 至 16 日	香港市民 (18+)	1164	隨機抽樣電話訪問	全港	調查透過與過往部分調查結果作比較，以跟進市民對「佔領中環」行動意見的變化。調查結果顯示，六成八（+1%）受訪者表示「不支持」「佔領中環」行動，而表示「支持」的則佔兩成七（-2%）。（香港研究協會）	✔	✔
2014 年 10 月 20 日	明報	明報	10 月 16 至 17 日	凌晨留守的佔領者	285	問卷調查	在金鐘、銅鑼灣和旺角等 3 個佔領區	調查顯示，69.1%受訪者對中央或特區政府會讓步感到悲觀或非常悲觀，持樂觀態度者僅 5.3%；逾七成半受訪者贊成佔領運動需要升級。在開放提問下，受訪者對於如何升級行動，較多填寫的包括「不合作運動」、「持續佔領」、「罷工」等。（明報）	✔	✔
2014 年 10 月 22 日	香港中文大學傳播與民意調查中心	香港中文大學傳播與民意調查中心	10 月 8 至 15 日	香港市民 (15+)	802	電話訪問	全港	調查結果發現，佔中支持度較上月佔中啟動前明顯增加，並多於反對率。同時，認為立法會應通過 2017 年特首普選方案的比率亦較上月顯著上升。民調中心問	✔	✔

							受訪者在不同情況下，立法會應否通過政改方案，當中提到「若政府對提名委員會的組成和投票方式作出修改，減低政治篩選的可能性」（即提委會民主化），支持通過政改的市民有 55.6%，反對的只有 6.1%。(明報)		
2014 年 10 月 22 日	香港研究協會	香港研究協會	10 月 20 至 21 日	香港市民 (18+)	1071	隨機抽樣電話訪問	全港	調查結果顯示，七成的受訪市民不支持「佔中」行動，而支持的則只佔兩成四，顯示行動未獲大部分市民支持。（香港研究協會）	✓	✓
2014 年 10 月 24 日	明報	明報	2014 年 10 月 22 至 23 日	凌晨留守的佔領者	296 (金鐘 150; 旺角 146)	問卷調查	兩個主要示威地點 (金鐘及旺角區)	調查顯示，超過 90% 的人不滿政府的四項回應，85.2% 對中央祉港府會否讓步不樂觀，有 73.3% 的人認為「人大撤回普選框架決定」可終止佔領。（明報）	✓	✓

2014 年 10 月 27 日	東方報業 民意調查	東方報業 民意調查	10 月 23 至 25 日	香港市民 (18+)	245	街頭問卷 及電話	全港	不作分析		
2014 年 10 月 30 日	路透社	路透社	10 月 28 日	街道佔領 者	121	書面調查	兩個主要示威地點 (金鐘及旺角區)	不作分析		
2014 年 10 月 30 日	明報	明報	2014 年 10 月 28 日	街道佔領 者	210 (105 旺角; 107 金鐘)	問卷調查	旺角及金鐘佔領區	調查顯示，有 17% 的人會自首，有 45% 不會自首，當中有 25% 的人「我不認為自己犯法」。（明報）	✓	✓
2014 年 11 月 2 日	明報	明報	2014 年 10 月 28 至 31 日	市民	1000	電話錄音	全港	不作分析		✓

2014 年 11 月 2 日	香港商報	香港商界民調公司（商報）	10 月 25 日至 31 日	香港各大商會、中小企業商會、商會社團和港商	563	電話訪問、訪談、問卷和網上答卷等	業界會員	不作分析		
2014 年 11 月 3 日	東方報業民意調查	東方報業民意調查	10 月 30 至 11 月 1 日	市民 (18+)	251	街頭問卷及電話形式	全港	不作分析		✓
2014 年 11 月 3 日	金鐘佔領者	金鐘佔領者	不詳	佔領者	300+	不詳	金鐘佔領區	不作分析		✓
2014 年 11 月 4 日	香港理工大學社會政策研究中心	香港理工大學社會政策研究中心	11 月 1 日至 2 日	市民	554	電話調查	全港	就佔領行動進行第三輪電話調查。調查顯示，73.2%受訪者表明支持佔領人士現時退場、結束佔領；反對的則有 26.8%。（香港理工大學社會政策研究中心）	✓	✓

2014 年 11 月 5 日	鄧皓文 (香港中文大學新聞與傳播學院博士候選人/兼任講師)	鄧皓文 (香港中文大學新聞與傳播學院博士候選人/兼任講師)	2014 年 10 月 21 日 29 日	街道佔領者	755	問卷調查	三個佔領地點 (金鐘、旺角及銅鑼灣區)	調查顯示，93.6%受訪者的訴求是真普選，亦有 93.3%受訪者不滿政府在政改的做法。有 65.2%是為了保護學生。有 72.1%認同有公民提名是結束佔領的條件。（明報）	✓	✓
2014 年 11 月 6 日	民建聯	民建聯	10 月中旬	香港居民 (12+)	5531	問卷調查	香港十八區	不作分析		✓
2014 年 11 月 10 日	香港教育工作者聯會	香港教育工作者聯會	2014 年 10 月 31 至 11 月 2 日	會員	392	網上問卷調查	業界	調查發現，近 7 成(68%) 受訪會員表示反對或十分反對佔領行動，問到佔領行動能否改變全國人大常委會對本港特首普選的決議，近 7 成(68%)會員指不能夠，認為能夠改變人大決議的會員則有 19%，至於佔領行動為本港社會帶來的影響，近 7 成(68%)會員指對市民日常生活造成影	✓	✓

							響，表示令路面交通癱瘓的會員有 66%，過半數(53%)會員認為佔領行動衝擊社會秩序。此外，逾4成受訪會員分別認為佔領行動「影響本港經濟」(47%)、「加劇社會分化」(46%)及「法治根基被動搖」(45%)等。（香港教育工作者聯會）		
2014 年 11 月 10 日	明報	香港大學民意研究計劃	10 月 31 日至 11 月 5 日	香港居民 (18+)	1005	電話隨機訪問	全港	特首選舉及佔領中環民意調查 (第七輪)：結果顯示，年輕一代及教育程度較高的受訪者都傾向支持繼續佔領，他們不少都曾參加近期佔領行動的集會。在受訪的 18 至 29 歲組別中，有 55%的人認為要繼續佔領；相反，50歲或以上受訪者者中，79%支持停止佔領。（明報）	✓	✓

| 2014 年 11 月 12 日 | 星島日報 | 星島日報 | 2014 年 11 月 5 至 6 日晚上 | 街道佔領者 | 182 | 問卷調查 | 金鐘「夏愨村」 | 調查發現，留宿者中，學生只佔兩成，但有逾六成是三十歲以下的年輕人，而大專或以上學歷人士高達八成。顯示佔領行動的「死硬派」，主體是年輕高學歷人士；而受訪者中，更有八成半表明不支持退場。受訪留守人士中，只有兩成學生。非學生的留守市民職業五花八門，當中一成為文職人員，分別約百分之七為教師及從事金融業人士，分別約百分之六為廣告設計或藝術界人士，其他職業包括傳媒、技工、資訊科技、會計、零售、出入口、醫護、航空旅遊、保險等等。（星島日報） | ✓ | ✓ |

| 2014 年 11 月 13 日 | 公民議會民調 | 公民議會民調 | 11 月 5 至 12 日 | 金鐘佔領者 | 2329 | 智能電話問卷或實體問卷 | 金鐘佔領區 | 公民議會調查顯示， 92%受訪者主要逗留在金鐘佔領區。佔領人士普遍在過去個多月中多次來到佔領區，當中有接近41%受訪者來了 21 天以上，數據分佈顯示參與 者平均來到佔領區的日數遞增，反映他們有持續參與運動的傾向，即「回頭客」佔了一定比例。近80%受訪者每次逗留 1- 6 小時，18%逗留超過 6 小時，少於 1 小時的則只有 4 %，反映大部份受訪者在佔領區傾向逗留頗久。受訪者當中，有近 60%曾留守過夜──38%受訪者留守了 1- 5 晚，只有5%是長期留守者（21 晚以上）。在 2017 普選行政長官的提名程序中，仍然有最多意見選擇公民提名 (74%)，其次為特首候選人出閘人數不限於 2-3 人 (42%)、提名委員會提名門檻由 50%降低至 | ✓ | ✓ |

							原來的 12.5% (41%)、 以及提委會由公司票及團體票轉為個人票(40%)。結果顯示,除了公民提名以外,不少人認同應就人大8.31 決定進行修改,例如提名門檻和候選人人數,而 且意見分佈平均。(公民議會網頁)		
2014 年 11 月 13 日	香港中文大學新聞與傳播學院陳韜文與李立峯教授	香港中文大學新聞與傳播學院陳韜文與李立峯教授	10 月 4 至 5 日	金鐘佔領人士	969	問卷調查	金鐘佔領區	在金鐘進行現場問卷調查,由學生助手在佔領區內依指定路綫行走。訪問對象是行走時身邊經過的每第十位參與者,兩天共收回九百六十九份問卷。調查發現,四十歲以下參與者佔逾九成一,平均年齡為二十七點七歲,而具有大專以上教育程度的參與者佔近八成。陳韜文指出,參與佔領人士,主要是教育水平高的年輕一代,如果以集會高峰期計算,參與者數以萬計,代表着香港的新生力量,他們的訴求絕	✓	

							對不容忽視。（星島日報）		
2014 年 11 月 13 日	旺角小店關注組	旺角小店關注組	2014 年 11 月 5 至 11 月 13 日	小店，包括信和中心、旺角新之城、旺角中心內的商戶及佔領區附近之地鋪	150 戶	問卷調查	旺角佔領區附近	調查並了解小店過去租金佔收入比例、加租幅度、生意受影響之情況、對業主減租之意見，數據顯示有一半受訪商戶的租金佔收入比例超過 50%，而租金佔收入比例少於 3 成的店舖只有約 15%，反映大部份商戶的租金比重極大.約有八成位處信和中心及旺角中心的受訪商戶表示佔領行動對店舖營運有影響.超過七成受訪者提出希望業主減租，只有約四份一受訪者認為留守人士盡快撤離。（佔領撐小店 Facebook 專頁）	✓	✓

2014 年 11 月 16 日	香港中文大學傳播與民意調查中心	香港中文大學傳播與民意調查中心	11 月 5 至 11 日	市民 (15+)	1030	電話訪問	全港	「香港民意與政治發展專題研究小組」進行第三次民調：結果顯示，43.5%受訪者不支持佔領運動，支持的有 33.9%，比例與 9 月佔領運動出現前同一調查結果相約，但對照上月，支持比率下跌近 4 個百分點，反對則增 8 個百分點，民意有逆轉趨勢。調查又發現，年紀越輕與教育程度越高的受訪者，越傾向支持運動，15 至 24 歲受訪者有 67.7%，大專以上學歷者亦有 45.8%表示支持。（蘋果日報）	✓	✓
2014 年 11 月 19 日	香港大學民意研究計劃	香港大學民意研究計劃	11 月 17-18 日	市民 (18+)	513	由真實訪員以電腦隨機抽樣電話訪問形式進行	全港	第一次普及民意平台調查：訪問對佔領行動的意見，當中 88%受訪者表示近期沒參與佔領運動。調查結果顯示，有 82.9%受訪者表示應停止佔領，較 11 月初港大進行同樣民調的 70%，增加近 13 個百分點；當中 40.4%	✓	✓

							認為應改用其他方式爭取，11.3% 的人認為已達到目的，31.2% 的人認為根本不應該佔領；認為應繼續佔領的受訪者有 13%，亦較本月初的 25% 減少 12 個百分點。（明報）		
2014 年 11 月 20 日	香港大學民意研究計劃	香港大學民意研究計劃	11 月 19 日	市民 (18+)	507	由真實訪員以電腦隨機抽樣電話訪問形式進行	全港	第二次普及民意平台調查：調查於本月 19 日、即立法會大樓被暴力衝擊的當日。調查發現，58.2% 受訪者反對「佔領」行動，比前日發表的 17 至 18 日的調查上升 3.5 個百分點，其中 39.9% 表示「好反對」，「幾反對」、「一半半」者分佔 18.3% 及 13%，支持「佔領」行動的受訪者僅 28.3%。調查又發現，從短期來說，有 73.1% 受訪者認為「佔領」行動帶來的壞處較多，認為好處較多的僅 13.8%，表示「一半半」者佔 10.6%。從長期來說，	✓	✓

							64.5%受訪市民認為「佔領」行動壞處較多，稱「好處較多」及「一半半」僅分別佔 19.2%和 9.1%。至於人大常委會應否撤回政改決定，受訪市民意見分歧，認為「應該撤回」、「不應撤回」及「唔知/難講」者，各佔 35.8%、34.1%及 30%。（文匯報）		
2014 年 11 月 21 日	舉辦雨傘民意日的港大學生	舉辦雨傘民意日的港大學生	11 月 14 至 16 日	市民及佔領區人士	2300	問卷	佔領區	雨傘民意日由數名香港大學法律系學生發起，於 2014 年 11 月 14 至 16 日於金鐘佔領區進行調查。是次調查聯合金鐘佔領區 26 個物質站及義工進行，期間於金鐘收集 2100 份意見書，另外也在旺角收集 200 份意見書。調查以問卷形式進行，舉辦單位在傳媒及網上平台呼籲市民親身到雨傘廣場提交意見書。調查對象並沒有限制，但是問卷內容是以與多名雨傘運動長期支持者及	✔	

								各個物資站交流所得的意見為設計藍本。大部分問題均有開放式的選項，意見收集以不記名方式進行。物資站及義工向市民派發列有數條問題的意見書，並建議市民在填寫及回答問題前，先與場內最少兩至三名市民討論。金鐘雨傘廣場亦劃出討論區及擺放大型白板，方便市民進行互動交流。所有收集回來的意見書於活動期間，全面開放予市民自由翻閱。市民在完成自己的意見書後可查閱其他意見書，以了解各方意見背後的理據。調查發現，佔領者當中，有 66% 是在職人士，只有 18% 是學生。超過 70% 受訪者期望繼續對話，即使部分參與者認為對話沒有用。超過 50% 人士認為重啟政改是退場條件。（填妥的問卷可從網上看 到		

							https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B-Qa2HBxVZG4dkVZdDRjYXhJQjQ&usp=sharing） (雨傘民意日發起人鄭諾銘先生資料提供)			
2014 年 11 月 21 日	香港中小型企業大聯盟	香港中小型企業大聯盟	估計 11 月 1 至 15 日	會員公司	508	問卷調查	業界會員	調查發現，自「佔領」發生以來，有 27% 會員公司生意額下跌「10% 以下」、下跌「10% 至 30%」有 42%、下跌「30% 至 50%」有 10%，下跌「50% 以上」就有 11%，無意見的則有 10%。被問到估計生意何時能夠恢復，有 8% 受訪會員認為要「半個月內」，表示「一個月內」的有 17%、表示「兩個月內」的有 13%、表示「難以估算」的則有 62%。有 85% 受訪會員表示「佔中」影響市民消費意慾，其中 52% 表示有影響，表示影響極大則有 33%，稱沒有影響及影響較	✓	✓

								小僅 5%及 10%。82%則指出，「佔領」已對他們的日常生活、生意及工作有影響，其中 41%表示極大影響，有影響的佔 41%，而表示影響較小及沒有影響的分別僅 13%及 5%。多達 93%受訪會員認為，「佔領」已影響香港「金融中心」及「購物天堂」的美譽，其中有 62%表示影響極大，表示有影響的有 31%，而表示沒有影響及影響較小分別有 5%及 2%。(文匯報)		

| 2014 年 11 月 21 日 | 全國港澳研究會 | 香港研究協會 | 11 月 13 日至 18 日 | 市民 (18+) | 1,682 | 真實訪問員電腦輔助電話訪問系統 | 全港 | 調查結果發現，91.2%的受訪者認為，「佔中」不可能改變全國人大常委會有關香港特首普選的決定，認為能夠改變的僅佔 6.1%。在中央對香港的政策是否變化的問題上，多數受訪者不認可中央對港政策收緊。55%受訪者認為中央的政策沒有變化，7.8%表示中央對港政策放寬，認為政策收緊的為 30.1%。數據顯示，共計 62.8%的受訪者並不認同中央對港政策收緊。被問及「佔中」行動是否背後有人組織，61.9%受訪者認為，「佔中」是一次有組織策劃的行動，34.8%不同意。48.2%受訪者認為，「佔中」有外國勢力插手，45.3%受訪者不同意。對於「佔中」如何收場，67.5%受訪者認為「佔領」行動最終需要警方清場；16.7%認為「佔領」者會自 | ✓ | ✓ |

							行散去；4%認為「佔領」行動會被反「佔領」人士驅散而收場，7.4%則認為會以其他形式收場，表示無意見的佔4.4%。調查又發現，72.8%受訪者認為「佔中」行動已導致香港社會撕裂，不認同此觀點的受訪者為25.5%。多達80.3%的受訪者認為，香港社會在「後佔中時期」應該重新凝聚社會共識，12%認為不需要，另有7.7%表示無意見。(文匯報)		
2014年11月23日	新民黨及公民力量	新民黨及公民力量	11月13至19日	市民	1738	街頭問卷	全港三十六個地點	調查發現，八成二受訪者認為佔領人士應該盡快撤離，只有百分之六市民不認同佔領者退場六成六受訪者反對佔領，而支持的只有一成。佔領運動初期一般較受年輕人支持，然而調查發現，十八歲以下及年齡介乎十八至二十九歲的組群中，亦分別有六	✓	✓

日期								內容		
								成三及六成六的受訪者認為應盡快結束佔領。有關生活方面，六成受訪者認為在交通上受到佔領運動影響，達一千零四十二人，亦有四百四十五人認為情緒上有影響。三成七受訪者稱佔領運動開始後，曾因政見不同而與家人或朋友出現爭拗，另有三成受訪市民感到佔領運動對家庭及社交關係構成負面影響。(東方日報)		
2014 年 11 月 23 日	香港社會工作者總工會（社總）	香港社會工作者總工會（社總）	不詳	龍和道清場後被捕人士	25	不詳	全港三十六個地點	不作分析		
2014 年 11 月 24 日	東方報業	東方報業民意調查	11 月 20 至 22 日	市民 (18+)	262	街頭問卷及電話	全港	不作分析		✓

2014 年 11 月 26 日	香港教育學院亞洲及政策研究學系	香港大學民意研究計劃	10 月 23 日至 11 月 6 日	操粵語市民(18+)	1012	電話訪問	全港	調查結果發現，近一半受訪者「反佔中」，僅得三成半受訪者支持「佔中」。近三成受訪者經常閱讀有關時事或政治的博客文章，約一成人經常於網上參與時事或政治討論。當中以 18 至 29 歲的年齡組別最喜愛閱讀博客文章，其次是 50 歲以上人士，而教育程度越高的人亦越傾向閱讀博客文章。被問到接觸新聞的渠道，常看博客文章的人，超過七成半傾向看網上新聞，近八成半看電台或電視新聞，僅得不足六成會閱讀印刷媒體。（港大民研網站）	✓	✓
2014 年 11 月 28 日	香港西醫工會	香港西醫工會	2014 年 11 月 10 日至 11 月 27 日	會員	164（在 1550 份問卷中）	問卷調查	業界會員	調查發現，69.93%受訪者不同意「佔領」，同意的僅有 22.22%。被問到是否贊成參與「佔領」的學生現時撤離，高達 85.93%受訪者贊成，不贊成的只有 6.66%。	✓	✓

								調查又問到受訪者是否接受學生和警方於「佔領」行動中的表現。65.19%受訪者不接受學生表現，接受的有 31.11%；相反，70.37% 受訪者接受警方的表現，不接受的有 23.7%。在政改問題方面，54.07%受訪者贊成根據全國人大常委會 2007 年的決定，提委會可參照選委會組成，不用改變，不贊成的有 36.3%，有 9.63%表示無意見。回答不贊成或無意見的受訪者中，有 72.58%同意選出提委的團體票或公司票改成個人票。被問及提委會的提名門檻，45.93%受訪者認為應維持現時的八分之一，14.81% 認為門檻應該較高，26.67%認為應該較低。(香港西醫工會)		

2014 年 11 月 28 日	中大香港亞太研究所	中大香港亞太研究所	11 月份	市民 (18+)	800+	電話訪問	全港	調查發現，七成三受訪者表示，本港市民在政治上各有堅持及日益嚴重的社會衝突，令他們感到不開心，當中有三成六人感到「非常不開心」。有近兩成受訪者表示，因政治立場不同與他人關係變差，當中近六成人與朋友關係變差，近三成人則與家人關係變差。(頭條日報)	✓	✓
2014 年 11 月 29 日	鄭煒及袁瑋熙團隊	鄭煒及袁瑋熙團隊	10 月 20 日至 26 日	佔領區長期留守者、義工和日間參與者	1562	隨機取樣	金鐘、旺角和銅鑼灣佔領區	調查結果發現，參與者以年輕一代為骨幹，61%為 29 歲或以下，24%介乎 30 至 39 歲，相比政府公布的人口統計數據，參與者明顯年輕一大截。另外，雨傘運動雖被認定為學生運動，學生組織的確也在運動中扮演了核心角色，但學生其實只佔 26%，反而白領和自僱人士佔 58%，構成參與者的大多數。教育方面，有逾五成受訪者擁有學士或研究院	✓	✓

| | | | | | | | | 學歷（55%），比例大幅超越全港的平均數（16%）。問卷於 10 月下旬進行，但近四成人在 9 月 22 日罷課周已參與運動，逾五成則在 9 月 28 日警方使用催淚彈後一周加入。參與者往佔領區的次數也頗頻繁，11 至 20 天的佔 37%，21 天以上佔 22%；平均逗留時間頗久，停留 1 至 6 小時有近七成，超過 6 小時則有三成，更有逾五成人曾留守過夜，留守 8 晚以上也佔了當中的 27%。現場民調顯示熱心市民自發捐獻才是佔領區出現大量物資的主因。除了小部分人是閒逛外（7%），其他人均以不同方式投入運動：如閱讀、討論、聽講座（58%）、說服親戚朋友（45%）、藝術創作（35%）、參與義務工作（35%）及鞏固防線、衝擊 | | |

							（19%）。(明報)		
2014 年 12 月 1 日	東方報業 民意調查	東方報業 民意調查	11 月至 12 月份	市民 (18+)	277	街頭問卷 及電話形 式訪問	全港	不作分析		✔
2014 年 12 月 3 日	香港政策 研究所	香港政策 研究所民 意調查中 心	11 月 28 日晚	佔領人士 (16+)	195	問卷訪問	金鐘 佔領 區	調查顯示,若「雙學」被迫退場, 有 11%示威者表示會離開「佔 領」區;反之,若「雙學」自願 離開,有 33%示威者表示願意跟 隨離開。調查又問到,如果 2017 年特首普選時,提名辦法是按照 全國人大常委會決定的框架下 進行,有 53%示威者稱會投票, 只有 28%人表示不會。（香港政 策研究所民意調查中心）	✔	
2014 年 12 月 5 日	明報	明報	11 月底	港九新界 的中學的 高中生, 以及本港 8 間大學	1032	問卷訪問	全港	不作分析		✔

			和 2 間專上院校的學生						
2014 年 12 月 10 日	香港大學民意研究計劃	香港大學民意研究計劃	12 月 8 至 9 日	市民	514	電話系統隨機抽樣方法	全港	有關佔領行動的第 3 次民調：調查顯示，當中 49%反對佔領行動，較上次調查減少 9 個百分點；支持的有 31%，略升 3 個百分點。另外，有 46%受訪者反對政府處理佔領人士做法，支持的不足四成。（信報財經新聞）	✓	✓
2014 年 12 月 10 日	九龍社團聯會	九龍社團聯會	12 月 6 至 9 日	市民 (18+)	2864	電話系統隨機抽樣方法	全港	九龍社團聯會先後於今年4月及8月進行了兩次「對 2017 年落實普選行政長官的期望意見調查」，並再次透過進行第三次調查，深入了解有關普選問題的意見，並加入有關「佔中」及社會撕裂問題。調查顯示，有超過七成半被訪者表示希望及非常希望 2017 年能夠落實「一人一票」普選，結果與 4 月的調查結果相	✓	✓

| | | | | | | | | 約，有近五成半人表示一直支持按全國人大常委會決定落實普選，六成民意認同人大決定是極具參考意義的數據，僅得不足三成人指一直反對人大決定。被問到社會撕裂問題，五成半人認為社會撕裂程度嚴重，認為一般的有三成，更有逾七成被訪者對現時的撕裂情況感到憂慮和非常憂慮。超過六成人反對以「佔中」試圖改變香港的政治制度，約七成人支持政府立即清場，另外，有近四成人認為現時政府應再次與學生領袖對話，以期在短期內減少佔領行動帶來的社會影響。（文匯報） | | |

| 2014 年 12 月 11 日 | 香港研究協會 | 香港研究協會 | 12 月 6 至 10 日 | 市民 (18+) | 1077 | 全港隨機抽樣電話訪問 | 全港 | 調查顯示，七成二受訪者表示「支持」高等法院對佔領區域頒布禁制令,而表示「不支持」的則佔一成八,顯示高院的做法得到大部分市民的認同及尊重。至於政府對所有佔領區進行清場,七成半受訪者對此表示「支持」,而表示「不支持」的則佔一成三。對於警方早前於旺角清除障礙物的式,五成半受訪者對此表示「支持」,而表示「不支持」的則佔三成半。（大公報） | ✓ | ✓ |

| 2014 年 12 月 11 日 | 香港中文大學政治與行政學系 | 香港中文大學傳播與民意調查中心 | 2014 年 11 月 12-14, 17-20 日 | 能操粵語的香港市民(18+) | 1006 | 全港隨機抽樣電話訪問 | 全港 | 調查顯示，支持運動的受訪者中，逾三成是 30 歲以下的青年，比 55 歲以上的受訪者多近一成；反觀不支持運動的一方，其中逾四成達 55 歲或以上，30 歲以下的只佔不足 8%。再看雙方的媒體使用習慣。互聯網在運動的支持者中相當普及，使用率達八成半；與此同時，令人驚訝的是有三成半不支持運動的受訪者是完全不上網的。我們也調查了 facebook 的使用頻密度，兩個組別中「十分經常」及「好少或無」使用這個主要社交媒體的受訪者，都分別錄得多達兩成的差異。在支持者中，「十分經常」使用 facebook 的佔超過 43%，但在不支持者中，只有 23.62%的受訪者「十分經常」使用 facebook。此外，竟有超過四成的不支持者「好少或無」使用 facebook。政 | ✓ | ✓ |

							治動員方面，近半支持運動的受訪者曾透過互聯網邀請或鼓勵他人作政治行動，遠遠拋離不支持者網上政治動員的比例。除了互聯網使用習慣的差異外，當留意雙方有關公共事務的主要資訊來源時，也發現了值得重視的差異。支持者中，透過看電視接收資訊的只有不足兩成，選擇社交媒體的卻達三成之多；不支持者中，逾四成半受訪者以電視為資訊途徑，使用社交媒體接收資訊的只有約半成。（蘋果日報）		
2014 年 12 月 12 日	公民議會 民調	公民議會 民調	2014 年 11 月 14 日至 20 日	街道佔領者	257	問卷訪問	銅鑼灣佔領區	調查顯示，關於 2017 年行政長官選舉提名程序，銅鑼灣大部份意見(70%)支持公民提名，與金鐘(74%)相若;其次為出閘人數不限於 2-3 人(43%). 銅鑼灣有約 53%受訪者學歷為學士或以上。銅鑼灣 33%受訪者為專業人士	✓	✓

日期	機構	調查機構	日期	對象	樣本	方法	範圍	內容		
								或經理及行政人員。銅鑼灣 27% 受訪者為 40 歲或以上。銅鑼灣大部份受訪者意見(55%)視運輸,房屋及城市規劃為現行政制下最迫切需要處理的議題。（公民議會網頁）		
2014 年 12 月 18 日	香港中文大學傳播與民意調查中心	香港中文大學傳播與民意調查中心	12 月 8 日至 12 日	市民 (15+)	1011	電話訪問	全港	調查顯示,市民是否支持「佔領運動」。42.3%的受訪者表示「不支持」(「非常不支持」/「幾不支持」)「佔領運動」,33.9%的受訪者表示「支持」(「非常支持」/「幾支持」),21.6%的受訪者表示「一般」。（星島日報）	✔	
2014 年 12 月 23 日	真普選聯盟	香港大學民意研究計劃	2014 年 12 月 15 至 18 日	香港市民 (18+)	1010	由真實訪員以電腦隨機抽樣電話訪問形式	全港	《真普選聯盟》就政制改革進行的民意調查 (2014 年 12 月份),目的是了解市民對「人大常委會 8 月 31 日決議」的意見。是次調查詢問受訪者是否同意「人大常委 8 月 31 日的決議,等於將 2017 年的行政長官選舉變成假	✔	

							普選」。結果顯示 45%受訪者同意以上立場，比反對率的 23%高約一倍。調查更發現年紀愈輕的受訪者愈傾向表示同意；在 18 至 29 歲的組別更錄得高達 71%的同意率。（港大民研網站）		
2015 年 1 月 5 日	東方報業	東方報業民意調查	2015 年 1 月 2 至 4 日	香港市民 (18+)	203	不詳	全港	不作分析		
2015 年 1 月 7 日	全國港澳研究會	香港研究協會	2014 年 12 月 29 日至 2015 年 1 月 4 日	市民	1,623	電話訪問	全港	民調顯示，44.7%的受訪者表示香港沒可能在 2017 年實現行政長官的普選，30.6%表示有可能。另有 50%的受訪者認為，香港經濟受佔中影響將變差，而 68.6%的受訪者認為，內部政治爭拗嚴重影響香港競爭力和經濟發展。對於佔中後如何改善管治，49.3%的受訪者認為，當前存在進一步理順與中央的關係、行政與立法機構不協調等深	✔	

								層次問題；17.8%受訪者認為，香港的法治根基沒有改變，所以沒有必要進行任何改革。（香港經濟日報）		