Human Participant Ethics Protocol Submission
CONFIDENTIAL

---

0 - Identification

RIS Human Protocol Number
24041

Protocol Title
Heritage languages inToronto and at home: Fieldwork

Protocol Type
Investigator Submission

Applicant Information

Applicant Name
Dr Naomi Nagy

Rank / Position	**Department / Faculty**
~~Assoc~~ Professor	Dept of Linguistics - Faculty of Arts & Science

Business Telephone   **Extension**
416-978-1767

Email Address
naomi.nagy@utoronto.ca

Amendments Details

Please describe the proposed study amendments or modifications. (Amend the body of the protocol as required) :

> Please see attached letter summarizing changes.

Will the proposed amendment change the overall purpose of the study? if Yes, a new protocol maybe requested by the REB.   ○ Yes ⦿ No

Will the proposed amendment affect the vulnerability of the participant group or the research risk?   ○ Yes ⦿ No

What follow-up action do you recommend for study participants who are already enrolled in the study. Select all that apply.

Inform study Participants: ☐

Revise consent / assent forms (attach forms in section 9):   ☐

Other- Please Describe: ☐

No action required: ☒

Protocol #:25991

Status:Delegated Review App	Version:0003	Sub Version:0000	Approved On:19-Mar-21	Expires On:13-Mar-22	Page 1 of 11

Collaborators/Co-Investigators

Name	Department	Email	Phone	Designation	Alt Contact
WALKER , JAMES	LaTrobe University	J.Walker2@latrobe.edu.au	+61 94796355	Alternate Contact	X
Yoon Kang	UTSC:Ctr-French & Linguistics	kang@utsc.utoronto.ca	(416) 287-7172		

Projected Project Dates

Estimated Start Date
30-Apr-14

Estimated End Date
31-Aug-23

1 - History of the Protocol

Study Status

⦿ Research participants are currently being recruited / participating

Start Date `2009-05-01`   End Date `2022-04-29`

○ Research participants will be recruited
○ Research participant involvement has been completed
○ On Hold-Please elaborate in detail
○ Final Analysis in progress
○ This study involves secondary data analysis only

Participant Numbers

Number of participants originally projected	0
How many participants that have completed the study?	309
How many currently are participants?	309
How many participants have withdrawn?	0
How many participants are yet to be recruited?	177

Study Summary

Brief Summary of Study progress, or interim findings over the last 12 months:

Data collection has been slow during COVID, but continues online. We are NOT conducting any face-to-face research.
In the past year, we interviewed 10 participants.
Analysis, presentation and publication continue: 9 conference presentations (mostly with student co-authors) and 2 publications, as well as guest lectures.
I am not sure why I can't edit "Number of participants originally projected," just above. It was not 0 but 120.

Recruitment /Data Management:

Any issues or concerns that have been encountered with Recruitment or Data Management

Emergent Issues

Ethical Concerns

Since receiving original eithcs approval, have any ethical concerns(Major or Minor) arisen?   ○ Yes ⦿ No

Adverse/Unanticipated Events

Have there been any adverse or anticipated event?   ○ Yes ⦿ No

Please submit an Adverse/Unanticipated Event Report as soon as possible.

Change in Risk Assessment

Since the last REB review, have there been any changes in your assessment of the risk and the potential benefit of the study based on your findings?　　○ Yes　◉ No

Privacy

In order to fulfil policy requirements, researchers must de-link identifying information, encrypt personally identifiable information and/or allow personnel access to data on need to know basis. Are all these procedures currently in place?　◉ Yes　○ No

2 - Location

Location of the Research:　　☒ University of Toronto　　☒ Other Locations

Other Location Details

Type	Name	Location	Country	Contact	Email	Description
Non-Institutional Field Location			Philippines			online data collection in Toronto and Philippines

Administrative Approval/Consent

Administrative Approval/Consent Needed:　　○ Yes　◉ No

Community Based Particatory Research Project?　　○ Yes　◉ No

Other Ethic Boards Approval(s)

Another Institution or Site involved?　　○ Yes　◉ No

3 - Agreements and Reviews

Funding

Project Funded?　　◉ Yes　○ No

External Funds Administered by U of T

App No.	Fund No.	Sponsor/Program	Status	Fund End Date	Peer Reviewed
102900	487013	Social Sciences & Humanities	Awarded	2013-03-31	
125595		Social Sciences & Humanities		0000-00-00	
131858	492548	Social Sciences & Humanities	Awarded	2014-03-31	
142879		Social Sciences & Humanities		0000-00-00	
144187		Shevchenko Foundation		0000-00-00	
153527		Social Sciences & Humanities		0000-00-00	
161139				0000-00-00	
162488	500358	Social Sciences & Humanities	Awarded	2022-03-31	
208550		Canada Council for the Arts		0000-00-00	

Agreements

Funding/non-funding Agreement in Place?　　○ Yes　◉ No

Any Team Member Declared Conflict of Interest?　　○ Yes　⊙ No

Reviews

☒ This research has gone under scholarly review by thesis committee, departmental review committee, peer review committee, or some other equivalent

Type of Review : -e.g.: departmental research committee, supervisor, CIHR, SSHRC, OHTN, etc.

SSHRC

☒ This review was specific to this protocol

☐ The review was part of a larger grant

☐ This research will go under scholarly review prior to funding

☐ This review will not go under a scholarly review

4 - Potential Conflicts

Conflict of Interest

Will researchers, research team members, or immediate family members receive any personal benefit?　　○ Yes　⊙ No

Restrictions on Information

Are there any restrictions regarding access to, or disclosure of information (during or after closure)?　○ Yes　⊙ No

Researcher Relationships

Are there any pre-existing relationships between the researchers and the researched?　　○ Yes　⊙ No

Collaborative Decision Making

Is this a community based project - i.e.: a collaboration between the university and a community group?　○ Yes　⊙ No

5 - Project Details

Summary

Rationale

Describe the purpose and scholarly rationale for the project

The Heritage Language Variation and Change Project (HLVC) is systematically describing and comparing variable usage and change in several non-official languages spoken in Toronto, a city where 2,314,530 residents report a Mother Tongue other than French or English (Statistics Canada 2012). We document and describe heritage languages spoken by immigrants and two generations of their descendants in the Greater Toronto Area, contrasting grammars at various degrees of contact to homeland varieties and to English spoken in those communities. Additionally, we record participants in each corresponding "homeland" countries (e.g., Italy for Italians), using the same protocol. A sample of 12 homeland speakers/language is anticipated.
This multilingual and multi-level project will push Labovian variationist research beyond its monolingually biased core by synthesizing a method examining both intra- and interlanguage choices made by multilingual speakers (who comprise well over half the world's population).
Other goals include:
    building a large corpus of Heritage Language data available to other researchers
    developing a standardized framework for examining variation in different languages, which includes a quantification of "similarity," so that degrees of similarity between grammars can be compared.
    defining the types of changes that do and do not occur in Heritage Languages more fully.

Methods

Describe formal/informal procedures to be used

Note that the Methods section of this protocol does not specify the medium for with participants (e.g, face-to-face, phone, online). During the pandemic, we are only planning to work on aspects of the protocol that do not involve in-person components (i.e., online methods for all interactions with participants. If at some point in the future we opt to undertake in-person components, then I will submit a proposed amendment as appropriate.
This project involves data collection from speakers of Heritage Languages by trained students. We follow typical, standard practices for sociolinguistic research. Fieldwork began in 2009, and under this protocol, in April 2014, and will continue indefinitely (as more languages are added to the project). Fieldworkers are students who are fluent speakers of one of the languages. Student interviewers begin by requesting interviews with personal acquaintances in their own neighborhoods (see consent letter attached) and, to extend the sample, ask participants to suggest to other potential participants that they contact the research

team, until the sample distribution has been filled in each community.

Additionally, interviews of speakers of Faetar, an endangered language spoken in Italy, are conducted by the PI, sometimes assisted/accompanied by a student, following the same methods. The PI will rely on personal acquaintances and word of mouth (friend of a friend method) to continue recruiting.

In each language the goal is to interview at least 40 people. Participants are meant to be evenly distributed, as much as possible, between first generation (people who moved to Canada after the age of 18 or older and have been here for at least 20 years), 2nd generation (children of first generation), and 3rd generation (children of 2nd generation). Within each generation, in each community, participants from a range of ages (10-19, 20-38, 39-60, 60+), and balanced for sex, will be sought. We do not expect to find some of these cross-sections, e.g., 3rd generation Koreans older than 40, given how recently Korean immigration has taken place. Questions about generational status are included in the interview protocol. They will not be used to include/exclude participants. Rather, we will continue to interview people until the desired distribution has been achieved.

Data will be gathered via digitally-recorded sociolinguistic interviews in the Heritage Languages, eliciting casual conversational speech. Interviews will be about one hour in length. Participants may be invited to participate in a second interview if important research questions were not covered in the first hour. This would be done at a later date to avoid overtiring the interviewer and the participant. Participants will engage in a free-ranging discussion with the interviewers. However, the interviewers will also ask specific questions during the interview in order to elicit demographic information, information about language practice, social networks and participation in community activities. Content of the interviews is covered in Part 6 and the 2 questionnaires (Appendices B & C) are attached.

Anonymity will be offered to the speakers. For those who choose to remain anonymous, all content that would allow for identification of the speaker will be removed from recordings and transcripts prior to dissemination. In all cases, any mentions of information that would allow for identification of other people mentioned during the interviews will be removed from recordings and transcripts prior to dissemination.

For research purposes relating to the goals listed in the Rationale, no personal identifying information will be used. Pseudonyms will be used in place of names. However, another goal of the project is to make samples of the Toronto dialects of available to the public. Participants will be given the choice of whether to allow excerpts from their recordings to be used for this, and, if so, whether to be identified or anonymous (see attached consent letter). Such samples are posted at http://ngn.artsci.utoronto.ca/HLVC/4_1_map.php.

In addition to the conversational portion of the interview, several other tasks will be included. An Ethnic Orientation questionnaire will elicit the perceived degree of orientation to the relevant ethnic group (Walker & Hoffman 2008, attached). The Storybook Task, a picture-naming and story-telling task using a children's book (Amery & Cartwright 1987), will provide easily comparable samples of basic vocabulary and structures. Other more constrained tasks that elicit no personal information, such as word-list reading or translation of sentences, may be added for the investigation of specific linguistic patterns. Participants will be re-contacted (if they agree to this after the 1st interview) and asked to consent to the further elicitation.

Interviewers will transcribe the recordings in full, omitting any information that identifies individuals from the transcript and the recording. Transcribed interviews yield two complementary types of data. The first is what the speakers say: the demographic and background information about each speaker and the community in which they reside. The second is examples of pronunciation and grammatical structures that may vary across speakers. Patterns will be examined statistically and we will report trends across the various groups of speakers (by age, sex, generation, language, etc.). Sample variables identified for analysis are listed below.

Faetar and Italian
•   Word-initial gemination (related to raddoppiamento sintattico) (Nagy 2001)
•   Word-final segmental and syllable deletion (Nagy & Reynolds 1997)
•   Subject pronoun doubling and deletion (Heap & Nagy 1998)
•   Acoustic variation for <r> (Vietti & Spreafico 2008)
Russian
•   Palatalization assimilation (CCj --> CjCj) (Timberlake 2004, Zubritskaya 1997)
•   Final obstruent devoicing and voicing assimilation (Burton & Roblee 1997, Timberlake 2004)
•   Vowel reduction (Crosswhite 2004, Kochetov 2006, Padgett & Tabain 2005)
Korean
•   Treatment of borrowings with English /s/ (Kang 2008a,b)
•   usage of the pragmatically-sensitive markers
Polish
•   acoustic distinction among sibilants
•   word-final devoicing
In any language, the following will allow for comparison with the same community's English:
•   Voice Onset Time changes (Oh et al. 2003, Kang & Nagy 2013, Nagy & Kochetov 2013)
•   treatment of consonant clusters (Walker 2008)
•   Grammatical inflections that lose grammatical value and force reanalysis (Choi 2003)
•   use of high-rising terminals or "uptalk" (Shokeir 2007)
•   discourse markers borrowed from English (Sankoff et al. 1997, Tagliamonte 2005)
Once the analyses of these variables are complete, comparison across languages, and between the Toronto Heritage variety and the relevant Homeland variety, will begin.

Copies of questionnaires, interview guided and/or other instruments used

Document Title	Document Date
Interview protocol	2021-03-16
Questionnaire	2021-03-16

Clinical Trials

Is this a clinical trial?   ◯ Yes   ◉ No

6 - Participants and Data

Participants and/or Data

What is the anticipated sample size of number of participants in the study? 500

Describe the participants to be recruited, or the individuals about whom personally identifiable information will be collected. List the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Where the research involves extraction or collection personally identifiable information, please describe where the information will be obtained, what it will include, and how permission to access said information is being sought.

We will recruit participants who are either first generation immigrants from 9 specified countries, or are descendants of first generation immigrants, as well as "homeland" speakers living in those 9 countries. Speakers who are not fluent enough to participate in the interview in their Heritage Language will be excluded. Specific geographically-defined dialects will be selected based on the background of the interviewers, and only speakers from the same region will be included. Speakers who have speech or hearing impairments will be excluded, as we wish to focus on the transmission of language in the mainstream population at this point. All participants will be at least 10 years old.

The main focus of the sociolinguistic interview is to collect background information about the speakers themselves. All information will be based on speakers' self-reports, with one type of exception: in some cases, contrasts may be made between parents' reports of their child's linguistic fluency and the child's own report.

Speakers will be asked about their own background (where they have lived and traveled, type and amount of education, work experiences), social networks (which friends and family members they speak which language to, who they are closest to), and experiences with language (what languages they use where and with whom and how often, whether they feel their Heritage Language is an advantage or a deficit in different situations). We also include questions to learn about immigration history within the speaker's family and their sense of immigration trends in their neighborhood more generally. Questions about what aspects of the language seems to have changed (compared to grandparents, to the standard variety, etc.) will be asked as well. Other topics (such as childhood games, routines, and rituals) are included to provide opportunities to elicit natural, relaxed speech about topics of interest to the participants. Samples of linguistic features will be extracted from these sections, but the content will not be disseminated or analyzed.

All the interview questions have previously been used in similar projects in Toronto, approved by York University's REB. The questionnaire is adapted from Labov (1984), but will be translated. The questionnaires are attached as Appendices B and C.

Is there any group or individual-level vulnerability related to the research that needs to be mitigated (for example, difficulty understanding consent, history of exploitation by researchers, or power differential between the researcher and the potential participant)?   ○ Yes   ⦿ No

Recruitment

Is there recruitment of participant?   ⦿ Yes   ○ No

Recruitment details including how, from where, and by whom

Student researchers will approach their personal acquaintances in the relevant communities to request participation. They will ask these potential participants for suggestions of where to seek other potential participants and ask participants to suggest to other potential participants that they contact the research team. This may include attending organized neighborhood or cultural organization functions.

All potential participants will be asked if they are willing to participate in a research project about their Heritage Language. No fixed recruiting script or letter is anticipated. Interviewers will be instructed to refer to the consent letter if asked for more information.

Is participant observation used?   ○ Yes   ⦿ No

Will translation materials be used/required?   ⦿ Yes   ○ No

Description of translation materials

All RAs involved in recruitment are fluent speakers of the language of the participants. They oversee translation of the consent letter and instruments (this was completed some years ago).

Attach copies of all recruitment posters, flyers, letters, email text, or telephone scripts

Document Title	Document Date
recruiting poster	2021-03-16

Compensation

Will the participants receive compensation?   ○ Yes   ⦿ No

Non Compensation Description

not typical for sociolinguistic fieldwork. Participants are happy to volunteer to talk about themselves.

Is there a withdrawal clause in the research procedure?   ⦿ Yes   ○ No

Is compensation affected when a participant withdraws?

n/a

7 - Investigator Experience

Investigator Experience with this type of research

Please provide a brief description of the previous experience for this type of research by the applicant, the research team, and any persons who will have direct contact with the applicants. If there is no previous experience, how will the applicant and research team be prepared?

(1) The PI has been conducting sociolinguistic fieldwork, using a similar protocol, since 1992 in Canada, the USA and Italy.
(2) The research team includes students who are speakers of each heritage language investigated in this project. All students and research assistants who will have direct contact with the participants are directly trained by the PI. More experienced interviewers will be teamed with less experienced ones, when possible. Training of interviewers includes having them read Labov (1984), describing the process to them, having them listen to previously recorded interviews, staging mock interviews among the interviewers, and providing ongoing feedback and training during the project.
(3) I don't understand this: "contact with the applicants"?
The PI and over 50 students have been working on this project since 2009 with no adverse incidents.

Are community members collecting and/or analyzing data? ⦿ Yes   ◯ No

Please describe the community members research team status (eg. employees, volunteers, or participants). What training will they received?

Most data is collected by university students who are also community members. Occasionally non-student community members are hired as employees and trained in the same way as other fieldworkers.

8 - Possible Risks and Benefits

Possible Risks

Potential Risk Details:

Physical Risks	◯ Yes	⦿ No
Psychological/emotional Risks	◯ Yes	⦿ No
Social Risk	◯ Yes	⦿ No
Legal Risk	◯ Yes	⦿ No

Potential Benefits

Benefit Description

A public website (http://ngn.artsci.utoronto.ca/HLVC/) summarizes the project's goals and findings, and will be used to maintain connections to the fieldwork communities. We anticipate (pending funding) a blog section to which the public can post reactions and a Wiki dictionary where they can (anonymously) post

9 - Consent

Consent Process Details

Interviewers will ask potential participants if they are willing to help out with a research project about their own Heritage Language by participating in an interview. If they show preliminary interest, they will be told that it is optional and uncompensated, and takes about an hour. If they are still interested, an interview time will be scheduled. In all cases, potential participants will either be acquainted with the interviewer or with a previous participant.
In the discipline of sociolinguistics, the use of a written consent form is often waived. One reason is that some participants may be illiterate. Faetar is a spoken language with no written form, and it is possible that some participants will be monolingual and thus a written consent form could not be used. A second, more general, reason is that introducing such a document increases the degree of formality of the situation to such a degree such that it is difficult to elicit casual vernacular speech. Our target is precisely casual, vernacular speech, which has been shown to be the most systematic (Labov 1984: 29).
Therefore, interviewers will first obtain verbal consent by verbally confirm that participation is voluntary, that the participant is ok with the interview being recorded, and that all data will be used anonymously and in the aggregate, prior to beginning the interview. Because the entire sociolinguistic interview process is a two-way conversation, participants generally feel free to ask questions at any time, maintaining their status as informed consenters.
After the interview, 2 copies of the attached consent letter will be given to the potential participant, one for their records and one to sign and return for the PI's records. Participant will be verbally prompted to see if they have any remaining questions before being asked to sign and return 1 copy to the interviewer. In the possible instance of illiterate participants, the consent form will be read to them and they will verbally indicate whether they consent to each option and whether they choose to provide contact information. The interviewer will write down their preferences.
The PI of this project has conducted fieldwork of this type in Philadelphia, Montreal, and Italy since 1990. She will train the interviewers by having them read Labov (1984), describing the process, stage mock interviews among the interviewers, and give ongoing feedback and training during the interview process. More experienced interviewers will be teamed with less experienced ones, when possible.

Uploaded letter/consent form(s)

Document Title	Document Date

Document Title	Document Date
consent letter, amended	2021-03-16

Is there additional documentation regarding consent such as screening materials, introductory letters etc.: ○ Yes ● No

Uploaded letter/consent form(s)

Will any information collected in the screening process - prior to full informed consent to participate in the study - be retained for those who are later excluded or refuse to participate in the study? ○ Yes ● No

Is the research taking place within a community or organization which requires formal consent be sought prior to the involvement of the individual participants ○ Yes ● No

Are any participants not capable (e.g.: children) of giving competent consent? ○ Yes ● No

10 - Debriefing and Dissemination

DeBrief

Will deception or intentional non disclosure be used? ○ Yes ● No

Will a written debrief be used? ○ Yes ● No

Do participants/communities have the right to withdraw their data following the debrief? ○ Yes ● No

Information Feed Back Details following completion of a participants participation in the project

All participants will be invited to a presentation in their community about the findings of the study that are relevant to their neighborhood, as well as to local conference presentations.
They will also be invited to check the project's website for findings and announcements of presentations. This is indicated in the consent letter.

Procedural details which allow participants to withdraw from the project

Participants will be invited to participate and a mutually convenient time established if they are not immediately available. They will be asked to contact the interviewer if the agreed-upon time becomes problematic, giving them an opportunity to opt out. Both at the time of initial contact and at the outset of the interview, they will be reminded that they may end or interrupt the interview at any time, with no negative consequences. Interviewers will be instructed to be sensitive to signs that the participant does not wish to continue the interview and suggest finishing up quickly or continuing at another time of they become aware that the participant does not wish to continue. Thus, participants may stop providing data at any time.

☐ Not Applicable

What happens to a participants data and any known consequences related to the removal of said participant

Because our analysis relies on pooled data from a cross-sample of subjects, we prefer not to withdraw a participant's data after it has been analyzed. If a participant insists, however, we will do so. Their data will be deleted. There will be no consequences on the participant.

☐ Not Applicable

List reasons why a participant can not withdraw from the project (either at all or after a certain period of time)

At a participant's request, we will withdraw their data wherever possible, but we will not, of course, be able to change the content of anything already presented/published. This is noted in the consent letter.

☐ Not Applicable

11 - Confidentiality and Privacy

Confidentiality

Is the data confidential? ● Yes ○ No

Will the confidentiality of the participants and/or informants be protected? ● Yes ○ No

List confidentiality protection procedures

All participants will be assigned a pseudonym that indicates their age, sex, and language (e.g R1F26A for a Russian-speaking, first generation, female, 26 year old speaker; the final character distinguishes between multiple speakers within one sample cell). This will be used for all record-keeping and dissemination of findings in academic settings. The PI will keep a list of pseudonyms linked to real names and contact information in a separate secure location so that participants may be re-contacted if further information/clarification/data is desired and so that they can be contacted about presentations of the research. Student interviewers will be told of the importance of protecting the anonymity of all participants and not discussing the content of the interviews or the identity of the participants. In cases of dissemination within the communities, each participant will have an opportunity to decide whether to allow their data to be used and,

if so, whether they should be identified or anonymous. (See attached consent letter.)

Are there any limitations on the protection of participant confidentiality?   ◉ Yes   ◯ No

List Confidentiality Limitations

Yes, the ORE can request access to the data. This fact has been added to the consent letter.

Is participant anonymity/confidentiality not applicable to this research project?   ◯ Yes   ◉ No

Data Protection

Describe how the data (including written records, video/audio recordings, artifacts and questionnaires) will be protected during the conduct of the research and subsequent dissemination of results

In sociolinguistics, the standard is to keep recordings and transcriptions indefinitely in a secure archive. All material (except the pseudonym decoding list) will be secured in the HLVC Lab which is kept locked. Data will be stored on password-protected secure computer servers and back-up hard-drives, whether or not the participant requests anonymity. The pseudonym decoding list will be kept in the PI's office.
Newer versions of our transcription software allow researchers to work remotely with the data, obviating the need for storing copies elsewhere. However, some of the team still needs to temporarily copy audio and transcription files to home computers while we are not able to work in the lab due to the pandemic. They are instructed not to keep copies of these files on their own devices except during active work. All such work is on password-protected computers.

Explain for how long, where and what format (identifiable, de-identified) data will be retained. Provide details of their destruction and/or continued storage. Provide a justification if you intend to store identifiable data for an indefinite length of time. If regulatory requirements for data retention exists, please explain.

As is standard in sociolinguistic research, we intend to keep anonymized recordings indefinitely in a secure archive, because of value of longitudinal comparisons. Our data consists of audio recordings with all content containing personal identifiers (of the participant or anyone else) redacted and transcriptions of the audio recordings with all content containing personal identifiers (of the participant or anyone else) redacted. The transcriptions are anonymous. Some would say that the audio recordings are not because of the possiblity of identifying a speaker from their "voiceprint." Given the lack of endangering material likely to be recorded during these interviews (see interview protocol in Appendix B), this is an acceptable risk.
When face-to-face interviews are not possible, we are interviewing online. We use Zoom to establish a visual connection between interviewer and participant, but with audio disabled. We record the interview with Cleanfeed, which creates an audio .wav file on the interviewer's computer/device. Immediately after the interview, the .wav is moved to the HLVC server and the original is deleted from the interviewer's device.
Consent forms are shared using Zoom's file-share option in the chat. These are also moved to the HLVC server and the original is deleted from the interviewer's device immediately after the interview.

Will the data be shared with other researchers or users?   ◉ Yes   ◯ No

Please describe how and where the data will be stored and any restrictions that will be made regarding access.How will participant consent be obtained? If data is to be made open access, please describe how and where they will be maintained.

Faculty collaborators on the project will have full access to the raw data and permission to use it in the lab for linguistic research purposes. In anonymized form, the data will be made available to other researchers with relevant research interests, usually UofT students, if they agree to maintain the levels of anonymity and security that have been set. We ask all researchers to sign a Corpus Use Form indicating their intended use for the data and which data they request. The PI checks that they are only using it for academic linguistic research.
This use is indicated in the consent letter, and each participant may opt in or out of this option, and their data is treated accordingly.

12 - Level of Risk and Research Ethics Board

Level of Risk for the Project

Group Vulnerability | Low |

Research Risk | Low |

Risk Level | 1 |

Explanation/Justification

Explanation/Justification detail for the group vulnerabilty and research risk listed above

Adult participants volunteer to converse about topics of interest to them. They are not from at-risk populations and they are not engaging in harmful tasks. They are informed that they needn't answer any questions that they don't wish to. No unusual activities are included.
 Data is de-identified whenever presented: speakers are referred to by speaker-code. During conference presentations, either textual representations (transcriptions) or very short sound clips (less than a sentence, normally a word or two), selected with care that no identifying content is included, are used as examples of particular linguistic phenomena.

Research Ethics Board

REB Associated with this project | Social Sciences, Humanities & Education

13 - Application Documents Summary

Uploaded Documents

Document Title	Document Date
Interview protocol	2021-03-16
Questionnaire	2021-03-16
recruiting poster	2021-03-16
consent letter, amended	2021-03-16
cover letter responding to Reviewer Comments	2021-03-16

14 - Applicant Undertaking

I confirm that I am aware of, understand, and will comply with all relevant laws governing the collection and use of personal identifiable information is research. I understand that for research involving extraction or collection of personally identifiable information, provincial, federal, and/or international laws may apply and that any apparent mishandling of said personally identifiable information, must be reported to the office of research ethics.

As the Principal Investigator of the project, I confirm that I will ensure that all procedures performed in accordance with all relevant university, provincial, national, and/or international policies and regulations that govern research with human participants. I understand that if there is any significant deviation in the project as originally approved, I must submit an amendment to the Research Ethics Board for approval prior to implementing any change.

☒ I have read and agree to the above conditions

OFFICE OF RESEARCH ETHICS
McMurrich Building, 12 Queen's Park Crescent West, 2nd Floor, Toronto, ON M5S 1S8 Canada
Tel: +1 416 946-3273 ● Fax: +1 416 946-5763 ● ethics.review@utoronto.ca ● http://www.research.utoronto.ca/for-researchers-administrators/ethics

RIS Protocol
Number: 24041

Approval Date: 19-Mar-21

PI Name: Dr Naomi Nagy

Division Name:

Dear Dr Naomi Nagy:

Re: Your research protocol application entitled, "Heritage languages in Toronto and at home: Fieldwork"

The Social Sciences, Humanities & Education REB has conducted a Delegated review of your application and has granted approval to the attached protocol for the period 2021-03-19 to 2022-03-13.

Please note that this approval only applies to the use of human participants. Other approvals may be needed.

Please be reminded of the following points:

- An **Amendment** must be submitted to the REB for any proposed changes to the approved protocol. The amended protocol must be reviewed and approved by the REB prior to implementation of the changes.

- An annual **Renewal** must be submitted for ongoing research. Renewals should be submitted between 15 and 30 days prior to the current expiry date.

- A **Protocol Deviation Report** (PDR) should be submitted when there is any departure from the REB-approved ethics review application form that has occurred without prior approval from the REB (e.g., changes to the study procedures, consent process, data protection measures). The submission of this form does not necessarily indicate wrong-doing; however follow-up procedures may be required.

- An **Adverse Events Report (AER)** must be submitted when adverse or unanticipated events occur to participants in the course of the research process.

- A **Protocol Completion Report** (PCR) is required when research using the protocol has been completed. For ongoing research, a PCR on the protocol will be required after 7 years, (Original and 6 Renewals). A continuation of work beyond 7 years will require the creation of a new protocol.

- If your research is funded by a third party, please contact the assigned Research Funding Officer in Research Services to ensure that your funds are released.

Best wishes for the successful completion of your research.

Protocol #:25991

| Status:Delegated Review App | Version:0003 | Sub Version:0000 | Approved On:19-Mar-21 | Expires On:13-Mar-22 | Page 11 of 11 |