14

How to do science as a woman and laugh? Insights and lessons from Hungary

Andrea Pető

It is difficult to write the closing chapter to this multifaceted yet coherent volume. It is multifaceted because the examples and case studies are drawn from many countries around the world and coherent because very similar patterns emerge about the position of women in science, engineering and medicine in the twentieth century. The contributions analyse trends in women's participation in STEMM, complicating our understanding of what it meant to be in/visible in these fields and documenting the challenges women encountered as well as the strategies they devised to overcome them. Many of these hurdles have changed little in character over the decades. In this final chapter, which also functions as an epilogue, I will add another case study to this impressive collection, that of Hungary, to illustrate continuities in the challenges women have faced and suggest ways forward, discussing and drawing inspiration from the strategies and tactics they have employed to overcome them.

Dilemmas of women's participation in science

I want to start with the photograph below (Figure 14.1), taken in a university lecture hall in Budapest, to argue that the frame within which we talk about women in science matters. When I first saw the image, I was struck by the year, 1929. There is much debate today about the Horthy era (1919–44), with some portraying it as a static, stagnant neo-baroque world built on discrimination against individual citizens. Others, like illiberal politicians, idealize it, imagining it as a time of social peace and progress.[1] Drawing on an excellent recent book by Balázs Sipos and Barbara Papp, which examines the history of women graduates during this period, we can say that a decisive change in the acceptance of modern womanhood took place in those years.[2] Let us take the example of Margit Techert, Zoltán Magyaryné (1900–45) who, as editor of *Magyar Női Szemle* (Hungarian Women's Review), played a decisive role in the widespread recognition of

Figure 14.1 Geographer Jenő Cholnoky (1870–1950) with his students in a classroom at Pázmány Péter University on Museum Boulevard, Budapest, 1929 (photograph donated by Tamás Cholnoky, Fortepan 29841, open access, https://fortepan.hu/hu/photos/?id=29841)

women as intellectuals and in paving the way for a change of the norm; and changing the norm undoubtedly achieved some degree of success.[3] In 1941, the University of Budapest supported her application for a private teaching post. At the time, debates centred on the question of whether women were suitable for university study at all. If so, what subjects should they study? Did women have aptitudes for study at all? If a woman's purpose and duty was to raise a family, was it not inconsistent to attend university? Could a degree and a family be reconciled? These questions may sound familiar to today's female students. My point is not 'how much would have to change here for nothing to change', as a well-known saying goes, but rather, that the questions that remain unanswered are still with us today.

To understand the origins of the dilemma, we must go back to the famous and much-quoted inaugural address of the great Hungarian writer Imre Madách (1823–64) to the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (*Magyar Tudományos Akadémia*, MTA), which illustrates the nineteenth-century point of view:

> The woman develops early, but never reaches full male maturity; she comprehends and learns more easily but lacks creative genius and does not rise to

> the leading spirits of mankind. She is always a sufferer, never the penetrating element, and therefore, although she supplies the kindest contingent of dilettantism, she has never substantially advanced art and science. This irrefutable fact cannot be attributed to a contrary education. Most men who have been possessed by genius have made their way to their calling even by the most contrary paths and have triumphed, because the spirit is stronger than any earthly obstacle.[4]

But this difference between men and women can also be interpreted differently. Who has not heard the argument that we need more women in politics because women are more peaceful and more willing to compromise, and therefore their participation is good for the competitive work environment? Some argue, as Sandra Harding does, that women's particular epistemological perspective – their greater empathy and intuitive insights – enrich the process of scientific cognition.[5]

To further probe this paradox of equality or difference, I would like to quote Ida Bobula, a forgotten pioneer of Hungarian women's historiography. Unfortunately, only her works on Sumerian–Hungarian kinship are cited, although Bobula did much to promote women's education. Following the family tradition, Bobula (1900–81), one of the first Hungarian women scholars, went to the United States in the 1920s, where she studied sociology for two years. In 1924, she was awarded a doctorate in history in Budapest and in 1939, she became a lecturer at Tisza István University in Debrecen. Between 1920 and 1924, she was president of the Women's Section of the National Association of Hungarian University and College Students, and later a member of the staff of the *Hungarian Women's Review*, a periodical of the Association of Hungarian Women Graduates of University and College. She did not have a research position in Hungary, but she worked for the Ministry of Religion and Public Education, and then directed a girls' college in Budapest until 1944. However, her work, including her monograph *Women in the Hungarian Society of the 18th Century* (1933), continues to be recognized in Hungarian historiography. In her words, we can already trace the change in the perception of the role of women in science and the fact that Madách's views were no longer tenable: 'I advise anyone who has a serious and sacrificial vocation to take up his cross and go to college, even if it is a woman. Being a woman is a difficult handicap in today's life – you have to know that! – but that's no reason to give up the fight.'[6] What is this 'handicap'? And what can be done about it? In this chapter, I argue that a triple start strategy is one way to try to overcome this obstacle: increasing the number of women, changing the institutions and changing knowledge.

To return to the picture at the beginning of this chapter, taken in 1929: if you look closely, there was an impressive number of women in the crowded lecture hall in Professor Cholnoky's Earth science class. They are clearly

visible in the photograph, even if they have not necessarily been so in historiography. This immediately raises questions, especially considering the data on women's participation in science today. First, how were women admitted to the Faculty of Geography in the first place? And second, what happened to them later?

In Hungary, certain areas of higher education were opened to women in 1895. Even before that, there were women scientists who were allowed to study because of their family situation or because they were 'girls brought up as boys', meaning that if the desired male child in the family turned out to be a girl, she was given the opportunity for an education, which was essential for social mobility. Some women had the opportunity to study science alongside their husbands. But women were not involved in the creation of institutional and institutionalized knowledge. This changed briefly with the establishment of the Hungarian People's Republic in 1918, which stipulated that the faculties of all universities (except the theological ones) had to admit deserving women. This seemed to settle the question of women's suitability for intellectual professions in general and for fields that required 'male intelligence' (skills) in particular: the advocates of the essentialist view – who, like Madách, believed that the biological-spiritual differences between women and men determined women's place in society – were 'defeated' by the supporters of the constructivist view, such as Ida Bobula a good half-century later. However, the term 'defeated' does not accurately describe the struggle that went on for many decades.

Various groups in the emancipation movements demanded equal rights for women – in politics, education and culture – in the name of equity. Not different, but equal rights. The question of women's education and access to science is a question of democracy. But if you look at the number of women in scientific research and higher education, women are not visible or do invisible work. They are assistants, secretaries and wives. For example, after Professor Cholnoky retired, his successor as the professorial chair in the department was also a man. Moreover, Barbara Papp and Balázs Sipos argue convincingly that the question of 'modern' women cannot be narrowed down only to those with a university degree, because then we would overlook the fundamental change that took place in Hungarian society in the period between the two world wars regarding the role of women.[7]

The canonical narrative of the history of women in science in Hungary states that women were allowed to study from 1895, many of them graduated and then, due to World War I, more and more professional opportunities were open to them. With the annexation of Bosnia, for example, Hungarian women doctors were given jobs there even before the war, as only women were allowed to examine the local female population. During World War I, however, not only women doctors, such as Vilma Hugonnai

(1847–1922), the first female doctor in Hungary, but also volunteer nurses learned the horrors of war and the material and psychological benefits of independence. Unfortunately, this was followed by the *numerus clausus* in 1921, the decree originally aimed at reducing the number of women in public life and in higher education, which later became the first political antisemitic law in Europe, limiting the number of Jewish students admitted to the university. As a result of this law, women were not admitted to universities for years. They were allowed only as private lecturers. Those women who had participated in the emancipation movement and thus played an active role in 1918 and 1919, such as Laura Polányi (1882–1959) or Irén Götz (1889–1941) – the first Hungarian chemistry professor and colleague of Marie Curie – left the country. None of them, however, obtained formal academic positions in universities in the countries to which they emigrated, the United States and the Soviet Union, respectively.

In 1946, the political space opened for women. Erzsébet Andics (1902–86) became the first woman to be elected a member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in 1950 and the massification of higher education began, followed only gradually by the rise of women to leadership positions. But from then on, women could also become civil servants. After 1989, not much changed; on the contrary, things turned worse.[8] The first reports of the Helsinki Group showed that, in the former socialist countries, more women were represented in the sciences due to equality policies imposed from above. Yet, they were less likely to be promoted to senior positions. After 1989, when the state no longer intervened, the number of women declined sharply, especially in senior positions. At the same time, there has been a steady drain of funds from higher education and women have been socially disadvantaged in the pursuit of excellence. As a member of the Horizon 2020 Advisory Board, I have repeatedly pointed out, to no avail, that EU research policies and frameworks structurally discriminate against Eastern European academics and researchers. Now that gender equality in society has unfortunately become a political battleground and many use this issue as a political hate card, the situation is even more complicated.[9]

The same sad chronology of the status of women in science can also be told as a success story. That is precisely what I want to propose in this epilogue. The lives of the women smiling at us in the 1929 photograph have certainly changed, even if they have not become deans or professors. I am sure many of them experienced bitterness because they could not join the university and pursue academic work. Is it possible to change that state of affairs, to eliminate the bitterness or 'handicap'? I believe so. I will discuss this in the last part of this chapter.

Changes in the narrative that are significant

Change is not easy when it comes to the position of women in STEMM. In the Horizon 2020 proposals, which I am most familiar with, gender equality is considered by focusing on three areas: the composition of research teams, the composition of decision-making teams (40 per cent from the under-represented gender should be present) and the integration of gender into the content of research. This is a new integrative approach that, as I mentioned earlier, can serve as a recipe for improving the situation. In short, we need to increase the number of women, change the institutions and change the knowledge itself. If we want to improve the current situation, we need concerted change in all these three areas. This reform process is not something we have just invented: it has a long history that goes back to figures like Vilma Hugonnai and Ida Bobula. This history also includes the women who smiled into the camera in the auditorium on Museum Boulevard in Budapest in 1929 and are now part of the Fortepan collection of photographs.[10]

Of course, this triple change – of numbers, institutions and knowledge – is not without its challenges. In 2004, for example, the Directorate General for Research and Innovation of the European Commission published a report on women and science in former socialist countries. The Hungarian contribution by Dóra Groó describes how, as a participant in the distribution of research funds, she increasingly noticed that male researchers were applying for grants, while the women who wrote the proposals were, at best, working their way into the successful male scientist's grant. This example illustrates why science is a particularly difficult area in which to implement gender equality in society. After all, the female researchers who wrote the successful proposals instead of their male bosses should be grateful: had they applied under their own names, the chances of securing the grants would have been smaller. Discrimination in science is both elusive, perhaps even intangible, and internalized.[11]

But why should it be a problem that there are very few women in Hungarian science, especially in STEMM, not to mention in leading positions in academia? Because gender equality is a core value of the European Union; this should be cause for cautious optimism for the future. The EU's core value is equality, which means that discrimination, whether direct or indirect, on the basis of gender is a violation of human rights. Excellence, which is another basis of EU science policy, cannot mean excellence of 'men' only.

There are three levels of faculty development where the problem arises: undergraduate education, PhD training and career development. Even though more women are entering universities today, fewer and fewer are getting opportunities throughout their careers. Earning a doctorate

and then starting a first job comes at a time when women are often left to fend for themselves under the pressure of family responsibilities. Another major watershed is the appointment as a university professor. How can we change the ever-shrinking pyramid-like academic selection system? When asked this question in an interview, Maria Ormos (1930–2019), a member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, stated half-jokingly that it is clear why fewer and fewer women are being appointed to socially prestigious and secure, but increasingly lower-paid, university positions: because women become frustrated over time. Or, irony aside, to continue Ida Bobula's thought, they cannot overcome this particular handicap. But let us call it what it is: a structural handicap.

There is another framework within which we can and should talk about the role of women in science, namely that of efficiency. Another fundamental principle of EU science policy, efficiency underlines that no economy can afford the luxury of not making the best use of women's skills for its economic interests. Put differently, the female geology students seen smiling in the Fortepan picture in 1929 should have been allowed to work in the profession they mastered as a result of long years of university education. I do not necessarily agree with the neoliberal argument that evaluates science based on 'what can be measured is what matters', but this can become an argument for those who seek to identify statistically demonstrable inequalities and change the situation. A regulated, quantified assessment system helps rather than hinders women's progress. At the same time, the quantified system of requirements for obtaining a PhD helps women and even encourages them to apply for it. Without such a clear set of requirements, there would be much more room for informal relationships, and this, we know from research, encourages male advocacy.

Research at Yale University, for example, found that university lecturers – both men and women – who served on an application committee consistently rated applications submitted by men higher than those submitted by women.[12] Researchers at Maastricht University found that female lecturers were rated three times lower by students than male lecturers.[13] They conclude, and I can only agree, that this is not conscious misogyny, probably not even conscious discrimination, but the result of stereotypes about the social roles expected of women, that is, the operation of the cultural unconscious, influenced by the hidden curricula of our socialization. Take, for example, meetings attended by both male and female academics. When it comes to deciding who takes the minutes – a person who is clearly unable to participate meaningfully in the meeting – or who pops out to make the coffee or looks up where the coffee is, there are often puzzled male glances in the direction of the attending women. From this perspective, however, it

is perhaps less clear that academic careers and promotions are based solely on principles of meritocracy.

Valéria Csépe is a former deputy secretary general of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, an academic and former leading Hungarian delegate to the expert forum of the Helsinki Group on Gender in Research and Innovation (now Standing Working Group on Gender in Research and Innovation, SWG GRI). A Helsinki Group's report shows that:

> the proportion of women in senior positions in scientific institutions in Hungary has almost doubled in four years, from 9 percent in 2010 to 17 percent in 2014. The number of research institutions in Hungary that have a gender equality plan is growing faster than the EU average and the proportion of women among PhDs is also increasing faster than that of men.[14]

Valeria Csépe played a key role in creating the Framework Program for Equal Opportunities, which was launched by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in 2009. The programme, based on the German model, extends the age limit for female researchers with children under the age of ten by two years per child for applications tied to age or date of scientific graduation. This was an important step in addressing the structural disadvantage of women through a key instrument.

The handicap mentioned by Ida Bobula is not only structural. There is also a supply without demand, meaning that more women want to go into academia, but do not have the opportunity. That is something this programme can improve. In addition, there is another factor to this handicap: it is internalized. To understand and improve this situation, we need to analyse women's life paths. Vilma Hugonnai, for example, had all the privileges a woman could have at the end of the nineteenth century: she came from a wealthy family, was healthy and had a supportive husband, if only initially. She pioneered the idea that when we say 'doctor', we do not just think of men. On the other hand, if we look at the photo from 1929, Professor Viktor Cholnoky fits the stereotype of the professor: he is old, wears a white beard and exudes confident scientific knowledge. While the image of the older man culturally suggests wisdom, knowledge and authority, the image of the older woman has no such associations – hopefully only for the moment. Wisdom, knowledge and authority are essential elements of the stereotypical image of the professor and it is this stereotype that still makes it difficult to recognize and accept older women professors.

This is not easy to live with or even survive, as I hope to show by drawing on my own personal experience. I worked for years as a mentor for the German Catholic foundation Cusanuswerk. The situation of women in German higher education is much worse than in Hungary, although the prestige and income of those working in higher education are considerably

higher. For this reason, the Cusanuswerk launched a programme inviting PhD candidates to apply each year and bring their doctoral supervisor with them. Every six months, the foundation organized training sessions for the doctoral students, where they learned how to deal with difficult issues and decisions, for example, if they felt they were not getting the institutional support they deserved at their university or if they had a different perspective on a professional topic than their mentor. As subject leaders, we engaged in communication exercises, such as how to communicate effectively with students when their research was not progressing well.

If we look at the smiling women in the 1929 photograph, we may understand that it is the joy, security and integrity of the individual in intellectual work that attracts women to study. When that is lost because a male professor, students or administrators do not evaluate them fairly, supportive institutions are needed. Long-term changes in gender equality in society can only be expected from the implementation of EU policies, although it is in this particular area that EU regulation has little impact. Optimists are right, however, when they say that, thanks to EU norms, we at least have statistics.

I would now like to return to the strategy for change I mentioned above, which could take three forms – all top-down, all requiring strong political intervention. It should also be noted that all three are subject to opposition and criticism, proving that there is no magic formula for changing inequalities and that solutions are always context-specific.

The first tool for change is the principle of equal treatment, which should be institutionalized to ensure that men and women are treated equally. This applies to direct discrimination, which has become rare thanks to the many achievements of women's movements over the last 150 years. It might be tempting to say that policymakers can sit back with satisfaction and claim that there is not much left to be done. However, the education system, teaching materials and textbooks play an extremely important role in instilling gender stereotypes in society. As long as textbooks feature girls cooking and boys reading, we cannot expect much to change. If mathematics teachers explain equations differently for girls than boys, implying that it is harder for girls to understand, nothing will really change.

The second tool, equality of opportunity, can exist in science only if the distribution of scarce resources, goods and social burdens – which are always, conceptually, necessarily scarce – is guided by considerations that are relevant in terms of the competition for the goods in question. Thus, there are relevant elements such as race, religion, class, gender, disability, sexual orientation, ethnicity or other extrinsic factors that may impair the chances of success of certain competitors. Achieving equal opportunity would require 'positive discrimination' or, to use the more common term today, 'affirmative action'. These are measures to prevent or eliminate

discrimination, or to compensate for disadvantages, targeting stigmatized groups at risk of discrimination. But the introduction of affirmative action is not accepted by either the conservative or the liberal part of the public, whether in Hungary or elsewhere. Who has not heard, 'I do not want to be a quota woman because I work hard' or 'We cannot do that to X and appoint her on the basis of a quota, they are all behind her saying she is a quota woman'?

But quotas only – and I stress this – give a chance to the candidate who is under-represented in that category if they have the same merits. There is also resistance because some people believe that the inequalities rooted in society cannot be eliminated by legal measures. Anti-discrimination laws, passed under pressure from the EU, declare that differences in opportunity at birth cannot be eliminated by legal means. This liberal interpretation of the law, by its very wording, calls into question the legitimacy of the entire law and precludes the use of supportive instruments, which historically have been shown to be the most effective method of addressing social inequalities. Equality in science policy is also opposed by those who view social inequality as merely a legal issue. These are those who consider the problem of inequality to be solved because it is already de facto regulated at the legal level and who do not recognize that 'women's rights' are distinct from human rights. However, legal measures alone cannot be expected to work miracles; they are no substitute for decisions at the institutional level, the level that most generates and legitimizes inequalities in public perception. This situation can be improved primarily through a gender-sensitive redesign of educational content. The main goal of such a redesign is gender equality in the content areas of education and research.

Another argument against the application of equal opportunity policies, especially in science, is that there are natural inequalities in talents and abilities among people, so the principle of equal opportunity, which builds on natural inequalities, does not eliminate them but increases them. Moreover, opponents of equal opportunity policies argue, support measures also imply that people in need of support are unable to perform well without help. This argument is also used by women researchers who express a visceral aversion to the so-called 'feminist' approach because they feel that their professional and scientific performance is compromised, and they are by no means supportive along the lines of women's solidarity. But 'natural' differences are relative, not self-evident, and therefore all inequalities arise from social institutions and practices, not 'by themselves', naturally. To take up the example of Dóra Groó mentioned earlier, the feudal, patriarchal nature of the institutional system of Hungarian research means that women researchers have a better chance of long-term scientific success if they choose the

invisible status of 'servant' rather than seeking individual, that is, institutionally recognized, laurels.

A third means of achieving gender equality in society is gender mainstreaming, which places gender equality at the heart of organizations, institutions, programmes, policies and practices. There is a separate body of literature on the critique of gender mainstreaming. Part of the critique is that those who want to transform everything are in fact transforming nothing. Thus, the desire to change is expressed only in rhetorical phrases. The other criticism concerns the extent to which the Western European policy strategy of gender mainstreaming can be used to change the post-communist situation in Eastern Europe. With its membership in the EU, Hungary, like the other former socialist countries, had to adopt the most advanced policy mechanism currently available for implementing gender equality. However, its effectiveness is undermined, limited and alienated by the way it is implemented, which is often top-down, without consulting civil society organizations or even considering the views of experts in the field.

As long as science policymakers, most of whom are men, perceive the 'female' presence as a loss and a threat to themselves, little change is likely. Even our great-grandmothers would not have been able to win women's suffrage, not so long ago, if it had not been for supportive men like those from the Men's League for Women's Suffrage. Vilma Hugonnai could not have gone to school if her husband had not let her.

Conclusions

Hungary's membership in the European Union only provides an opportunity to improve the disadvantaged position of women in the field of science, because in post-communist countries there is a strong culture of formal, alibi-type implementation at the level of rhetoric. Implementation of international values at the national level is only possible through networking, continuous lobbying and open advocacy of values. It seems that, in the short term, this can only be achieved through the pragmatic argument that science that does not discriminate based on gender is more effective and generates more money. In 2022, the Hungarian National Audit Office (Állami Számvevőszék) published the research report 'Pink Education', which showed the number of women higher-education graduates and concluded that women's higher education is a waste of money. We should ask ourselves: why are these nineteenth-century issues returning? Moreover, the recent initiative to introduce an oral entrance exam for medical schools is in fact an instrument of indirect discrimination, aimed at reducing the number of women admitted. In future, only a sense of shared profit and strong

economic arguments may be the key to change among scientific decision-makers, as a more democratic and efficient scientific life is in the long-term interest of all. Perhaps, then, women researchers will dare to apply for funding under their own names and in their own right, in the hope of success. The woman scientist will not be an eccentric freak or an exotic 'Other', but a simple working woman. Of course, that does not solve the problems, it just relegates them to a different place. The cheerfulness and sense of community that emanates from the 1929 photo with which I began this chapter should give us hope.

Notes

1 A. Pető, 'The illiberal memory politics in Hungary', *Journal of Genocide Research*, 24: 2 (2022), 241–49.
2 B. Papp and B. Sipos (eds), *A modern diplomás nő a Horthy korban* [*The Modern Graduate Women in the Horthy Era*] (Budapest: Napvilág, 2017).
3 Margit Techert was her name before marriage, to which her husband's name was then attached, in this case Zoltán Magyary.
4 I. Madách, 'A nőről, különösen esztétikai szempontból (Székfoglaló értekezés az Akadémián)' [About women, especially from an aesthetic point of view (Essay on the occasion of becoming a member of the Academy)], in I. Madách, *Válogatott művei* [*Selected Works*] (Budapest: Szépirodalmi Kiadó, 1958).
5 S. Harding, *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991).
6 I. Bobula, 'A nő és a hivatal' [The woman and the office], *Új Idők* [*New Times*], 4 (1937), 123.
7 Papp and Sipos, *The Modern Graduate Women in the Horthy Era*.
8 V. Paksi, 'Miért kevés a női hallgató a természet- és műszaki tudományi képzésekben? Nemzetközi kitekintés a "leaky pipeline" metaforájára' [Why are there few female students in natural and technical science courses? An international perspective on the "leaky pipeline" metaphor], *Replika*, 85–86 (2014), 1–2, 193–214; B. Nagy and V. Paksi, 'A munka-magánélet összehangolásának kérdései a magasan képzett nők körében' [Issues of work-life balance among highly educated women], in Z. Spéder (ed.), *A család vonzásában: Tanulmányok Pongrácz Tiborné tiszteletére* [In the gravitational pull of the family: Studies in honour of Tiborné Pongrácz] (Budapest: KSH Population Studies Research Institute, 2014), pp. 159–75.
9 E. Kováts and A. Pető, 'Anti-gender movements in Hungary: A discourse without a movement?' in R. Kuhar and D. Paternotte (eds), *Anti-Gender Campaign in Europe* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2017), pp. 117–33.
10 Fortepan is an open-access photo collection started by Szepessy Ákos and Tamási Miklós in 2010.

11 See also A. Pető, 'Miért marad továbbra is alacsony a nők aránya a magyar tudományban az EU csatlakozás után is?' [Why does the percentage of women in Hungarian science remain low even after joining the EU?], *Magyar Tudomány*, 8 (2006), 1014–17.
12 M. Cummings, 'Study shows gender bias persists in performance-driven industry', *Yale News* (24 October 2017), https://news.yale.edu/2017/10/24/study-shows-gender-bias-persists-performance-driven-industry (accessed 21 January 2025).
13 'Research suggests students are biased against female lecturers', *The Economist* (11 September 2017), www.economist.com/news/science-and-technology/21729426-how-long-does-prejudice-last-research-suggests-students-are-biased-against.
14 A. Lipinsky, *Gender Equality Policies in Public Research: Based on a Survey among Members of the Helsinki Group on Gender in Research and Innovation, 2013* (Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2014), https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2777/65956.