DIW BERLIN

Gender Studies

BEgender@DIW 2015

Symposium on Behavioral Economics with an Emphasis on Gender

July 4, 2015

Program, Abstracts, Participants

Table of Contents

Welcome

Women are making enormous strides in closing the gender gap in the labor market. Nevertheless, there are still significant concerns about the gender gap in terms of participation rates, in pay, in forms and positions of employment as well as in occupational segregation (e.g.”pink-collar jobs”, glass ceiling, etc.). The literature on gender differences in behavior makes important attempts in explaining the persistence of these gender specific labor market differences. There is a growing interest in this issue, with scholars finding women to be more risk averse, at least in field experiments, and to shy away from competition.

However, is there is a much bigger overlap between women and men e.g. in terms of risk aversion, than the literature suggests? Statements stressing the “difference” view between women and men emphasize and resurge the debate about supposedly biological or evolutionary explanations for the gender gaps in the labor market. Clearly, this research deals with gender issues in the economics discipline that would otherwise be treated as a marginal issue. However, there is a danger that this “difference” view on women and men will reproduce the still existing gender stereotypes.

Gender Studies at DIW Berlin, dedicated to foster the understanding of gender aspects in the economy, is therefore pleased to host the first symposium on *Behavioral Economics with an Emphasis on Gender Issues*, **BEgender@DIW 2015**.

It is particularly a great pleasure to have Julie A. Nelson, Professor of Economics at University of Massachusetts Boston, USA, as our keynote speaker. She will focus on her research on challenging the “difference” view and its “robust” findings of women’s greater risk aversion compared to men and to combine this with presentations by other researchers in this area.

The primary goal of this symposium is, on the one hand, to provide a forum for exchanging knowledge and ideas about behavioral economics research on the patterns of gender differences. On the other, it also seeks to sensitize researchers to the potential bias of presenting results on overstretched between-gender differences. This symposium exemplifies the combination of research and policy relevance that DIW Berlin stands for.

We are deeply grateful to have the opportunity to bring together doctoral students, postdoctoral researchers, and professors from a variety of international research institutions. Designed as such, the symposium aims to inspire research collaborations and to identify further research paths.

We welcome you to be part of the symposium and to join an inspiring debate.

Norma Schmitt & Elke Holst

Gender Studies at DIW Berlin

Program

09:00	Registration
09:30-09:45	Welcome Address Elke Holst & Norma Schmitt
09:45-10:45	Keynote Speech Julie A. Nelson
10:45-11:15	Coffee Break
11:15-12:45	**Session 1** *Gender, Risk Aversion and Framing:* Peter Katuščák *Social Comparison and Gender Differences in Risk Taking:* Katharina Lima de Miranda *Risk Gender Differences under Social Responsibility and Social Ranking in a Small Scale Society in Papua New Guinea:* Andreas Friedl
12:45-14:00	Lunch (on-site)
14:00-15:00	**Session 2** *Effects of Gender Identity Priming on Selection into Incentive Schemes – Evidence from an Online Choice Experiment:* Melanie Schröder *Gender Differences in Incentive Effects after Compensation Scheme Changes:* Holger A., Rau
15:00-15:30	Coffee Break + **Poster 1** *Gender Differences in the Effect of Positive Feedback on Performance – a Computer Game-Based Experiment* Andrea Kiss

15:30-16:30	**Session 3** *Why Do Women Favor In-group Competition? Evidence from an Incentivized Choice Experiment* Norma Schmitt *Gender Differences in Competitive Choices: Risk preferences, Confidence, or Competition Preferences?* Roel van Veldhuizen
16:30-17:00	Coffee Break + **Poster 2** *Career success and managerial effectiveness of female and male managers in Germany* Caprice Weissenrieder
17:00-18:00	**Session 4** *Too Smart to Stereotype?* Elina Khachatryan *Beyond the veil: Discrimination against female migrants wearing a headscarf in Germany* Doris Weichselbaumer
19:00	Social Dinner (t.b.a.)

Keynote Speech

Julie A. Nelson (Professor of Economics at University of Massachusetts Boston, USA, leading writer of feminist economic thoughts, (co-)author of famous books like “Beyond Economic Man” and “Feminism, Objectivity, and Economics”.), will present her research on the “difference” view with regard to the “robust” findings of women’s greater risk aversion compared to men. This originates from the perspective that behavioral research is simplifying results to the extent that it risks reinforcing pre-existing gender stereotypes as between-gender differences in behavior are overgeneralized and the underlying preferences are referred to sex-linked traits. In fact, digging into the data reveals that men and women are more alike than meets the eye with large between-gender similarities.

Abstracts Contributed Sessions

Paper Presentations, Session 1

Gender, Risk Aversion and Framing

Peter Katuščák (University of Arkansas and University of Economics in Prague)

Women have been documented to be more risk averse on average in financial decisions than men (Eckel and Grossman 2008; Croson and Gneezy 2009). This evidence is robust in the gain domain, but much more mixed in the loss domain. I revisit this question by conducting a simple lottery choice experiment a’la Kahneman and Tversky (1979). When, on the background of a smaller initial endowment, the choice is framed as a sure gain vs. a fifty---fifty lottery of zero or a double gain, women are much more risk averse than men, confirming the existing findings. However, when, on the background of a larger initial endowment, the lottery is framed as a sure loss vs. a fifty---fifty lottery of zero or a double loss, men and women are equally risk averse. This difference is accounted for by women choosing the risky option much more often under the loss framing in comparison to the gain framing. Men on average behave similarly under both framing types.

Social Comparison and Gender Differences in Risk Taking

Ulrich Schmidt, Andreas Friedl, **Katharina Lima de Miranda** (University of Kiel)

The existences and magnitude of gender differences in risk taking remain intensively discussed issues in the economics literature. While some studies find rather robust evidence that women display higher degrees of risk aversion than men (Charness and Gneezy, 2012; Croson and Gneezy, 2009) others argue that gender differences are small and context-specific (Schubert et al.,1999; Fillipin and Crosetto, 2013). The present paper analyzes the impact of social

comparison as one factor which may have contributed to the conflicting results of previous studies. The motivation for our theory is founded in evolutionary biology. Given that it was more important for men to be relatively better off than their peers, while women due to the higher parental investment were more concerned about the absolute outcome, we argue that the influence of social comparison on a risky decision should be higher for men than for women.

We believe that the mixed evidence regarding gender differences in risk taking found by previous studies might be, at least partly, explained by the salience of social comparison in the single experiments as well as by differences in the correlation structure of risks. Our experiment aims to investigate the impact of correlation of risks more systematically, i.e. in a design where the salience of social comparison is identical for different correlation structures. Thereby we try to answer the question whether the correlation structure of risks can explain gender differences in risk taking. The goal of the present study is thus to obtain a clearer picture about how social comparison impacts on risk taking and in particular whether this effect is gender-specific.

We develop a model of decision making under risk which depends both on the consumption value of outcomes as well as on social comparison. For this purpose we build upon the model of Köszegi and Rabin (2006, 2007) and introduce a social reference point which depends on the payoffs of peers. Our model implies that risk taking should be higher for correlated risks than for uncorrelated risks and that this effect is stronger for men than for women. We then present a simple experiment which tests these implications. In the experiment subjects receive a monetary endowment which they can (partly) invest in a risky activity. In one treatment risks are uncorrelated, while in the other risks are perfectly correlated. We find that male participants are significantly more risk seeking in the correlated than in the uncorrelated treatment, while this effect was not significant for female participants. This suggests that men react more sensitive to their relative position and direct comparison, while women are rather concerned with their absolute outcome.

Risk Gender Differences under Social Responsibility and Social Ranking in a Small Scale Society in Papua New Guinea

Friedl, Andreas (Kiel Institute for the World Economy), Ulrich Schmidt and Katharina Lima de Miranda

This Paper studies the effect of social comparison on risk taking behavior. In a field study in Papua New Guinea, decision makers are anonymously paired with another villager. The decision maker has to decide between risky lotteries while we exogenously manipulate the passive peer's earnings. We vary the earnings between two dimensions. In the social ranking part, the peer earns a fixed amount higher or lower than the decision maker which translates to a social loss or social gain situation. In the social responsibility part, the peer earns the same lottery with positive or negative risk correlation between the peer and the decision maker. Decision makers are informed about the peer’s gender and we are specifically interested in the effect of the peer's gender on both, social ranking and social responsibility over different gender compositions in pairs. Under social responsibility we find similarly to the literature that aggregated the risk correlation structure does not matter when choosing risks not only for one self but for another peer as well. But, disaggregating into gender and especially peer's gender we find a significant effect of the correlation structure on risk taking and sizable differences between genders. In the social ranking domain we again find similar results as the previous literature. Subject engage in higher risk taking in a social loss domain while no or only week risk increases can be observed in the social gain domain. Again, disaggregating the data by gender and peers gender shows that the results are mainly driven by women no matter if paired with another woman or men. Contrary, but still similar to the results of the social responsibility part, men behave very differently when paired with a women than with a men. This suggests that men are very sensitive to a social comparison environment and especially to the peer’s gender.

Paper Presentations, Session 2

Effects of Gender Identity Priming on Selection into Incentive Schemes – Evidence from an Online Choice Experiment

Melanie Schröder (Universität Hamburg), Miriam Beblo, Denis Beninger, Norma Schmitt

Gender differences in sorting into different payment schemes have far reaching implications for the labor market. They serve as an explanation for the gendered composition of the labor force, namely vertical and horizontal segregation, and the gender wage gap. Apart from the debate around biological reasons, social identities in particular gender identities are assumed to be accountable for these gender differences.

Our paper aims at identifying the role of gender identity on selection into incentive schemes of women and men in a framed-field experiment. For this purpose, we conducted an online choice experiment that we combined with a real effort task and applied a subtle but standard priming technique to half of our 883 non- standard participants. We observed their decision behavior in multiple binary choice sets with options ruling the compensation scheme, the presence and type of competition and risk as well as the task's difficulty level. Unlike other experimental studies that implicitly assume a certain gendered behavioral prescription to exist, and thus to be activated by a gender identity priming, we are able to disentangle the priming effect on a person’s revealed preferences conditional on their stated behavioral prescriptions (2 weeks before the experiment).

Preliminary results suggest that men on average are more risk loving than women in our sample. Men more frequently than women choose a “performance based bonus payment” (payment with performance threshold) as well as a “competition based payment scheme” (among the top 30%) compared to a “basic performance based payment” (linear). We demonstrate that these gender differences are driven by subjects who hold traditional gender norms. However, we cannot find any robust treatment effects even conditioning on subject's stated behavioral prescriptions. It seems as if the subtle but standard priming stimulus did not activate subject's behavioral prescription in the expected way.

Gender Differences in Incentive Effects after Compensation Scheme Changes

Volker Benndorf, **Holger A. Rau** (University of Göttingen), Christian Sölch

This paper studies the impact of prior financial incentives on subjects' future performance when compensation schemes are changed. We focus on a within-subjects experiment with real effort where participants first work under a piece rate and afterwards receive a flat payment. The results reveal extensive gender differences after the compensation-scheme change. Male workers drastically reduce their effort after the change to a flat payment, whereas women are not affected at all. Our control treatments show that prior financial incentives presumably lead to a motivational crowd-out for male workers. When men never experienced prior financial incentives, they achieve a significantly higher flat-payment performance as compared to the case where money rewards forego.

Paper Presentations, Session 3

Why Do Women Favor In-group Competition? Evidence From an Incentivized Choice Experiment

Norma Schmitt (DIW Berlin), Miriam Beblo, Denis Beninger, Melanie Schröder

This paper is an attempt to disentangle the mechanisms that drive women's typically observed higher competition willingness in same-gender compared to mixed-gender settings. We conduct an incentivized online choice experiment with 883 non-standard subjects, 442 of them female, with varying compensation schemes that ruled inter alia the gender-mix of the competitors group. Our framed field experiment replicates the finding that women are on average more eager to engage in same-gender than mixed-gender competition. We can show that, while the mechanisms discussed in the literature (such as self-confidence, risk aversion, ability) are related to a woman's general willingness to compete, they do not contribute to explaining the preference for same-gender competition. We therefore advocate this preference to women's stereotypical beliefs about their own gender group's abilities.

Gender Differences in Competitive Choices: Risk preferences, Confidence, or Competition Preferences?

Roel van Veldhuizen (WZB)

Even in 2015, there is still a large gender gap in labor market outcomes. Women earn lower wages for similar positions, and are strongly underrepresented in positions of leadership. Traditional explanations posit that women may simply not enjoy being in a managerial position, or that discrimination may cause women and men of similar ability to hold different occupations.

However, in recent years a series of studies in economics have emphasized that women may be less competitive than men, and that this could explain the existing gender gap in labor market outcomes. In particular, in a carefully controlled laboratory experiment, Niederle and Vesterlund (2007) show that when given the choice between piece rate incentives and a tournament, men overwhelmingly prefer the tournament, whereas women prefer the piece rate. Importantly, the laboratory experiment allows the authors to rule out several alternative explanations, including discrimination and differences in ability.

An important open question is what causes women to select out of the tournament. One explanation is that women dislike competition per se, and therefore avoid the competitive environment. Women may also be less confident in their ability to do well in the tournament. In addition, they may be more risk averse, which could induce them to choose the 'safer' piece rate.

In this paper, I use a novel experimental approach to non-parametrically disentangle between these explanations. This is important, because the three explanations have very different policy implications. Participants in the experiment first choose between piece rate and tournament, as in Niederle and Vesterlund (2007). This choice is then directly compared with choices from alternative environments where risk preferences and/or competition preferences cannot explain behavior.

The results are striking. When participants choose between a piece rate and tournament, men are 32 percentage points more likely to choose the tournament. Crucially, the gender gap remains constant when competition preferences are removed as an alternative explanation. Indeed, the results suggest that of the total gender gap, approximately 40% is due to gender differences in risk preferences, 40% is due to differences in confidence, and the remaining 20% is due to the confidenceXrisk preference interaction.

Importantly, none of the gender gap is explained by competition preferences. This stands in stark contrast to earlier studies that have attempted to control for risk preferences and overconfidence using standard econometric techniques. To explain this difference, I directly compare the results of the experimental approach and the standard econometric approach in my data. The results suggest that the standard econometric approach leads to a substantial attenuation bias, downplaying the importance of risk preferences and overconfidence and overemphasizing competition preferences.

Overall, the results highlight the importance of risk preferences and overconfidence in explaining the gender gap in labor market outcomes, and suggest that competition preferences may not be as important as has been suggested by previous research.

Paper Presentations, Session 4

Too Smart to Stereotype?

Elina Khachatryan (University of Kassel)

Our study explores whether stereotypes are just a form of a cognitive “default” in that they provide a person with a default opinion when evaluating others. Altmann and Falk (2010) show that subjects with lower cognitive reflection levels (Frederick, 2005) are more likely to rely on the provided default contribution level (both high and low) rather than make an active choice in a public good game experiment. Our hypothesis is that one’s tendency to stereotype might also depend on one’s cognitive reflection level. We utilizes a common gender stereotype of women being less skilled in mathematical tasks for our study. Reuben et al. (2014) show overwhelming existence of sexist beliefs concerning other people’s math abilities, regardless of agent’s own gender or performance. Respondents must choose either a male or a female problem solver, whose performance on a basic mathematical task (summing four two-digit numbers) would determine the respondent’s payoff. Prior to their selection of the problem-solver, respondents are given an opportunity to pose several open-ended questions to the problem-solvers and utilize the information from the responses for their selection process. We expect that subjects with lower cognitive reflection level would be more likely to abstain from the cognitively-straining possibility of “interviewing” the problem-solvers and would instead rely on the well-established stereotype of women under-performing in math as their selection criteria. (Although women tend to perform equally well on this particular task (Reuben, et al, 2010; Niederle and Vesterlund, 2007)). Preliminary results from our pretest show indeed that subjects with higher cognitive abilities express more curiosity regarding the problem-solvers and are more likely to ask the additional questions. Many also report that they would have been willing to ask the open-ended questions, even if this option has had been costly.

Our preliminary results also point to other interesting characteristics that seem to be related to one’s preference for a male problem-solver. For example, more religious subjects seem to prefer a male-problem solver. This is consistent with the finding of some of the classic studies of prejudice in psychology (Adorno, et al., 1950; Allport and Kramer, 1946). In contrast subjects with more agreeable personality (Big Five model by McCrae and Costa, 1987) tend to have a preference for female subjects, which is also consistent with previous studies (Gerow and Bordens, 2005; Ekehammar and Akrami, 2003). And possibly the most interesting and counter-intuitive preliminary result of our study is that subjects with higher levels of benevolent sexism (a construct from the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory by Glick and Fiske, 1996) are more likely to prefer a female contender. Hence subjects that agree with the statement “Women should be cherished and protected by men.” and similar statements are more likely to “hire” a female problem-solver.

Beyond the veil: Discrimination against female migrants wearing a headscarf in Germany

Doris Weichselbaumer (Universität Linz)

In this paper, a correspondence testing experiment is conducted to examine the employment opportunities of women with Turkish migration background. Furthermore it is examined how job opportunities of migrant women are affected if they wear a headscarf. Written applications for office jobs are constructed for three fictional female characters. One applicant has a German sounding name (“Bauer”), one applicant has a Turkish sounding name (“Öztürk”) and one applicant has a Turkish sounding name and wears a headscarf (“Öztürk with headscarf”). The applications only differ with respect to the names and the photograph attached. Note that the attachment of photos is obligatory in Germany. Randomized applications have been sent out in response to 1500 job advertisements in major German cities.

In total, 18% of the applicants with a German name received an invitation to an interview, while only 13% with a Turkish name (but without a headscarf) received a positive callback. Those migrant women who wear a headscarf were only successful with 3% of all firms applied to. This illustrates significant discrimination against migrant women – with and without headscarves. If we consider that the applicants have applied to similar but somewhat different firms the employment gap even increases: Öztürk (without headscarf) is treated less favourably than Bauer by 4-12 percentage points and if Öztürk also wears a headscarf this increases her disadvantage in comparison to Bauer to 13-16 percentage points.

We investigate a number of factors that may mitigate discrimination. Previous studies suggested that larger firms discriminated less, however, there is no significant effect for firm size in the current study. Also the hypothesis that firms who act more internationally treat migrant women more favourably has not been confirmed. Interestingly, firms that required a neat appearance in their job advertisement also did not treat the woman wearing a headscarf less favourably than others. This indicates that it is not conventional beauty concerns that drive discrimination against applicants with a headscarf. Firms may also hesitate to hire migrant women because they fear these may be less proficient in German. However, results show that the negative results for migrants are not driven by companies which emphasise the necessity of German proficiency in their job ad.

Another reason for unfavourable treatment of minorities may be that firms fear that minority workers may not be fully accepted by customers or team members and therefore cannot become fully productive. In the current study we do not find that firms with vacancies that require customer or team contact invite migrant workers less often. In our experiment we also included Vocational Training Reports for a fraction of our applications. These reports were constructed to give a positive but not an extraordinarily good impression. Despite the fact that the inclusion of a Vocational Training Report is often considered mandatory in Germany, the results show that the attachment does not lead to a generally positive effect. Only the migrant woman without a headscarf benefits when including the document (on a marginally significant level). Finally, some firms ask for cross-cultural competence in their job advertisements. If they do so, this significantly helps migrant women (irrespective of wearing a headscarf), while it hurts the “German” applicant.

As these results show, there is substantial discrimination against women with Turkish names in the German labour market, which is even stronger if the women wear a headscarf. This unfavourable treatment cannot be explained for example by concerns for language skills or professional looks. A dislike of employers to work with migrant women therefore appears a likely reason for their unfavourable treatment.

Poster Presentation 1

Gender Differences in the Effect of Positive Feedback on Performance – a Computer Game- Based Experiment

Ewa Cukrowska-Torzewska, Anna Lovász, **Andrea Kiss** (CEU, Duke University), Mariann Rigó, Ágnes Szabó-Morvai

The main question of our research project is whether the effect of positive feedback on performance differs by gender. We test this by developing computer games, during which players are randomly chosen to be given either no feedback or positive feedback, irrespective of actual performance. We then compare the relative difference in the performance of those who received no feedback and those who received positive feedback by gender. The effect will be analyzed over different age groups and countries, revealing age and culture-related aspects.

Gender differences are well documented in the experimental literature. For example, men are usually found to be less risk averse (e.g. Croson and Gneezy 2009), they behave differently in competitive situations (Gneezy et al 2003), they are more overconfident in the area of finance (Berber and Odean 2001), and they react differently to news and feedback on their performance (e.g. Ertac 2011, Mobius et al 2011). Our project aims to explore further the latter topic of how feedback generates different behavioral outcomes by gender. While previous literature on feedback focused on how revealing the relative performance ranking of players impacts their behaviour (e.g. Lenney et al 1983, Azmat and Iriberri 2010), we are testing a different pathway where the feedback is not based on the player’s performance. The idea of such an effect is founded in literature from the fields of psychology and pedagogy (e.g. Lenney 1977), but has not been previously tested directly or quantified.

Our experiment will be based on computerized games. The games will be available on a website, and data will be collected in two ways: in classroom experiments run in various countries, and via online users. In the baseline version, we plan to use a non-gender specific game requiring the completion of simple tasks (e.g. labeling bananas in a 'Banana Factory', where they roll on a factory line from the left of the screen to the right). Performance in the games is measured by the number of tasks completed in a given timeframe, and positive feedback is given at specific points in the game (e.g. quarter, halfway), in the form of simple words (Great! Keep it up! Good job! etc.).

Important characteristics of the feedback are that: a) it is given no matter how well the player is performing, and b) it is given randomly. Based on basic anonymous demographic data, we will compare the mean difference in the overall performance of players without feedback and those who received positive feedback by gender (age, location). The results have the potential for practical impact in education and HR management: identifying a different gender impact may be key to achieving greater equality in the labor market by highlighting that girls in schools and female workers in general need more encouragement to perform better (relative to their own potential and to males).

Planned future extensions of our analysis include: varying the task type, the skill requirement (concentration/aim/speed/etc.), and the difficulty level of the game; altering when and how much positive feedback is given to test the effect of timing; including random negative feedback, performance-based and relative performance-based feedback, and unjust feedback.

Poster Presentation 2

Career success and managerial effectiveness of female and male managers in Germany

Caprice O. Weissenrieder (Frankfurt University of Applied Sciences)

Current literature of success factors of leadership does not distinguish between career success of a managers and her or his managerial effectiveness. Therefore, career success and effectiveness is often used as a synonym. However, there are some researchers who make differences between career advancement and managerial effectiveness (Kotter, 1982; Luthans, 1988; Luthans, Welsh, & Taylor, 1988), which is the leading idea for the following planned study.

There is a majority consensus that career success relates to the progressing process within a company. Furthermore, career success could be seen as an objective and subjective part (Luthans, 1988; Judge et al., 1995; Kirchmeyer, 1998; Jansen & Vinkenburg, 2006). Objective career success factors include visible determinants such as income and number of promotion (Gattiker & Larwood, 1990, 1988; Ng et al., 2005); the subjective career success factor predominantly obtains the perceived career success of each manager (Gattiker & Larwood, 1989; Judge et al., 1995; Kirchmeyer, 2002).

In contrary, managerial effectiveness is often seen as “…outcome of leaders´ behaviour rather than a particular type of behaviour…” (Eagly et al., 1995). As a result, managerial effectiveness could be perceived as a communication process between the manager and several stakeholders.

By following this approach my main research questions are:

- Are there differences between female and male managers with regards to her/ his career success?
- Are there differences between female and male managers with regards to her/ his managerial effectiveness?
- Are there different relations between female and male managers with regards to career success and managerial effectiveness?

To examine the research questions, a survey within a German company is planned. However, it is important to avoid selection bias, which means a) self-selection bias and b) survivorship bias. In order to avoid the bias, it is suggested to conduct a quantitative longitudinal approach.

It is expected, that the findings would show differences between female and male managers regarding their career success and managerial effectiveness. It is also assumed that female manager have a different understanding of the perceived career success than their male counterparts. Furthermore, career success factors show different impacts on women´s and men´s career success. In addition, female and male manager will receive different results in their managerial effectiveness, rated by superiors, peers and subordinates.

Venue, Contact & Arrival

Venue A

DIW Berlin,
Mohrenstr. 58,
10117 Berlin,

Schumpeter Hall
(1st floor)

Contact

Tel.: +49-39-897 89-0
Email: BEgender@diw.de

Arrival by Public Transport

DIW Berlin is located in the immediate vicinity of the underground station 'Stadtmitte'. The underground lines U2 and U6 run here frequently.

Arrival by Train

Take Train S5, S9, or S75 to 'Friedrichstraße' . Please change here to underground line U6 (direction 'Alt-Mariendorf'), go two stations and get off at 'Stadtmitte'.

Arrival by Bus

Take Bus No. M48 to 'Stadtmitte/ Leipziger Str.' Bus M48 stops at 'Potsdamer Platz', 'Rathaus Steglitz' and 'Innsbrucker Platz'.

From Tegel Airport, please take Express Bus No. X9 or bus No. 109 to 'Zoologischer Garten'. Change here to underground line U2 (direction 'Pankow'), go by train to 'Stadtmitte'.

From Schönefeld Airport, please take city train S45 to 'Tempelhof'. At Tempelhof, take underground line U6 (direction 'Alt-Tegel') to 'Stadtmitte'

Notes