‘Why do we need another handbook?’ (p. ix). This is the first question posed in the recently published *Oxford Handbook of Language Policy and Planning* and indeed it is one question readers may ponder given the number of handbooks relevant for Language Policy and Planning (LPP) (e.g., Bailey, Cameron & Lucas 2013; Kachru, Kachru & Nelson 2006; Spolsky 2012). Yet the answer, as given by Tollefson and Pérez-Williams, is simple: this handbook does more than the previous handbooks. This is exactly what the *Oxford Handbook of Language Policy and Planning* does: it examines LPP within the “socioeconomic, institutional, and discursive processes of change taking place under the conditions of late modernity” (p. ix). The increasing speed of globalisation, the ubiquity of the media, the shift and uncertain sustainability surrounding the capitalist model are all having an impact on language use and thus LPP. This makes the handbook a timely and enriching addition to previous publications.

The handbook has been produced with the expertise of forty-six contributors and includes thirty-five chapters divided into four main parts. All parts go beyond some of the well-trodden routes and this handbook seeks to be as inclusive as possible, placing agency, reflexivity - and thus ethics - in the midst of LPP research throughout.

Part 1 (‘Conceptual Underpinnings of Language Policy and Planning: Theories and Methods in Dialogue’) comprises six chapters that examine epistemological issues and methods in LPP. Its originality resides in that it avoids the typical divides seen in LPP (like the macro and micro level divide or the typical critical discourse and ethnography divide). Instead, the chapters in this part seek to bridge divides. Martin-Jones and Da Costa Cabral in ’The Critical Ethnographic
Turn in Research on Language Policy and Planning’ explore how the ethnographic turn that started in the 1980s and 1990s in LPP can be used to move beyond the micro and macro levels of LPP research. Bridging such a divide allows researchers across disciplines to collaborate and make research advances, as is the case with the critical ethnography of language policy. Similarly, Wodak and Savski’s ‘Critical Discourse-Ethnographic Approached to Language Policy’ demonstrate that multidisciplinary collaboration can further advance LPP. Their chapter illustrates how the inclusion of critical discourse analysis and critical ethnography in LPP can lead to a more comprehensive analysis of language policy and practice in the European Union institutions.

Part 2 (‘Language Policy and Planning, Nation-States, and Communities’) offers new perspectives on the customary nation-state aspect of LPP. It is subdivided into three sections. The chapters in the first section look at themes that are not traditionally examined, such as the implications of some Western thinkers on LPP, or the state of LPP in Central Europe. The second section investigates LPP within the modern nation-state; in particular it addresses the implications recent socio-political developments can have on LPP. For instance, a chapter looks at language tests and citizenship. Part 2 finishes with a very welcome third section that investigates LPP in and through communities, such as communities in the Solomon Islands or Family Language Policy.

The third part of the handbook (‘Language Policy and Planning and Late Modernity’) is certainly the most innovative as it considers LPP in light of late modernity – which has not been done before in a handbook. Again, this part is further divided into three sections. Section one specifically focusses on neoliberalism with all it entails (like multinational corporations, the commodification of language, content and language integrated learning). Section two talks about diversity and social mobility while social engagement is left to section three.

The single chapter in Part 4 (‘Summary and Future Directions’) is dedicated to summing up the main ideas of the handbook and describing the future trends for LPP.

What really makes this handbook stand out from previous works is the fact that agency is given a prime place in the research carried out. This means that all the people who use
language – whether they are policy-makers or children, families or minority groups, politicians or students – are given due consideration and that all angles are taken into account.

This in turns comes with its own significance. If agency is given a more important focus, it is only normal that reflexivity should take a more prominent place in the handbook than in previous works. Given the socioeconomic and political uncertainty prevailing in the world at present, questioning LPP within its wider context and giving it due contemplation is surely needed.

It is no surprise either then that ethics and ethical issues rise to the fore in the handbook: why study LPP if it does not lead to questioning, advocacy and engagement?

Last but not least, the main strength of this book is to provide a constant description of new trends and horizons for LPP. While this is prevalent in Part 4, as a full chapter is dedicated to this, such trends and previsions appear throughout the book and allow the reader to further reflect on the findings of each chapter and envisage how these might evolve.

While the work included in the handbook is quite extensive (it includes research carried out in the Americas, Europe, and Asia), LPP in Africa only gets mentioned via decolonisation and in anecdotal ways. Further developed work on LPP in Africa would be a welcome addition and would ensure that the handbook is fully comprehensive.

Overall, the handbook offers solid groundings in LPP as well as developed conclusions on new aspects of LPP that are really needed in the current socioeconomic and political context. It is suited for all LPP researchers, be they undergraduate, postgraduate, doctoral, postdoctoral students or established researchers.

So, do we really need the *Oxford Handbook of Language Policy and Planning*? Yes we do!

**References:**
