High School Math and Science Preparation and Postsecondary STEM Participation for Students with an Autism Spectrum Disorder

Xin Wei, PhD[1], Jennifer W. Yu, ScD[1], Paul Shattuck PhD[2], and Jose Blackorby, PhD[1]

[1] Center for Education and Human Services, SRI International, 333 Ravenswood Ave., Menlo Park, CA 94205

[2] Washington University, Campus Box 1196, 1 Brookings Dr, St Louis, MO 63130.

Corresponding author information

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Xin Wei, SRI International, 333 Ravenswood Avenue, BS169, Menlo Park, CA 94025-3493. E-mail: xin.wei@sri.com. Phone: (650) 859-5318. Fax: (650)859-3092.

Author Note

This research was supported by Grant HRD -1130088 from the National Science Foundation, Grant R324A120012 from the U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, and Grant R01 MH086489 from the National Institute of Mental Health. However, any opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not represent the positions or polices of the funding agency.

Citation:
Wei, X., Yu, J.W., Shattuck, P., & Blackorby, J. (2017). High school math and science preparation and postsecondary STEM participation for Students with an autism spectrum disorder. *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabiliies, 32*(2), 83-92.

Abstract

Previous studies suggest that individuals with an Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) are more likely than other disability groups and the general population to gravitate toward science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields. However, the field knows little about which factors influenced the STEM pipeline between high school and postsecondary STEM major. This study analyzed data from the National Longitudinal Transition Study-2, a nationally representative sample of students with an ASD in special education in the United States. Findings suggest that students with an ASD who took more classes in advanced math in a general education setting were more likely to declare a STEM major after controlling for background characteristics and previous achievement level. Educational policy implications are discussed.

Key words: Autism Spectrum Disorder, postsecondary major, college, science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM), high school coursework, standardized test scores

Introduction

Increasing evidence suggests a higher prevalence of participation in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) among individuals with an Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD). Baron-Cohen, Wheelwright, Burtenshaw, and Hobson (2007) used a convenience sample of college students in the U.K. to show a higher prevalence of ASD among mathematics majors compared with students in medicine, law, or social science. Wei, Yu, Shattuck, McCracken, and Blackorby (2012) analyzed a national sample of students in special education in the U.S. and found that students with an ASD had the highest STEM participation rates (34%) among 11 disability categories and students in the general population. Such empirical evidence aligns well with the Empathizing–Systemizing (E-S) theory suggesting that individuals with an ASD may have an innate tendency to gravitate toward STEM fields (Baron-Cohen et al., 2007; Baron-Cohen, 2009). The E-S theory suggests that individuals with an ASD tend to have a disproportionately greater aptitude toward systemizing relative to empathizing. “Systemize” refers to analyzing or constructing rule-based systems to explain the world around them, whereas “empathize” refers to social and emotional reactions to other people’s thoughts and feelings (Baron-Cohen 2006; 2009). The E-S theory suggests that individuals with an ASD are average or above on systemizing but below average on empathy (Baron-Cohen 2009). Systemizing often requires the thinking or skills needed to analyze and construct systems, which also are necessary to perform successfully in many STEM-related fields (Baron-Cohen et al. 2007).

Recent studies also indicate that the prevalence of autism is increasing in the United States, with current estimates suggesting that 1 in 50 children are diagnosed with an ASD (Blumberg, Bramlett, Kogan, Schieve, Jones, & Lu, 2013). Much of this increase is a result of a higher prevalence of ASD among those at the high-functioning end of the intellectual spectrum

(Keyes et al., 2012), that is, among youth most capable of advancing their STEM interests through postsecondary education.

However, despite the high STEM participation rate and potential to succeed in STEM fields among students with an ASD, low college enrollment rates persist (Wei et al., 2012). Poor nonverbal communication, a limited ability to understand and use social rules, and difficulty maintaining the reciprocal interaction and joint attention essential to learning create significant barriers to college enrollment and persistence for students with an ASD (Hendricks & Wehman, 2009). Indeed, the study by Wei and colleagues (2012) revealed that only 32% of individuals with an ASD were enrolled in college, making it one of the lowest rates of postsecondary attendance among students with disabilities and the general population.

With the globalization of the economy and continued technological advances, the skills and knowledge needed for any particular job are constantly evolving (U.S. Department of Labor, 2007). The demand for STEM workforce increased by 175 percent between 1980 to 2008 as compared to 40 percent increase in the U.S. labor force (Carnevale, Smith, & Mellon, 2011). There will be 2.4 million job vacancies for STEM workers between 2008 and 2018. However, the U.S. education system is not producing enough STEM-capable individuals to fill these positions (Carnevale et al., 2011). As the U.S. strives to promote a "world-class science and engineering workforce" in order to remain a leader in a technologically advancing global economy (Nagle, Marder, & Schiller, 2009), it appears that individuals with an ASD have the potential to play an important role in contributing to this important societal goal.

Considering the substantial contributions that individuals with an ASD could potentially make within the STEM fields, it becomes imperative to think critically about the factors that encourage students with an ASD to fulfill their potential and enable them to access and pursue

STEM majors in postsecondary settings. However, very few empirical studies exist that consider the participation of individuals with an ASD in STEM careers, and the few articles that are available assume that STEM-related academic and occupational pursuits are primarily related to their innate interests in the STEM field (Baron-Cohen et al., 2007; Baron-Cohen, 2009; Wei et al., 2012, 2013). To date, no studies have considered mutable environmental factors that can alleviate the obstacles that gender, race, and socioeconomic status may pose in pursuing STEM careers among individuals with an ASD. The NLTS2 data provide a unique opportunity to investigate the influences of high school experiences on STEM academic and career choice for students with an ASD.

Theoretical Framework

Derived primarily from Bandura's (1986) general social cognitive theory, Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT; Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994) uses a unified approach to understand the interrelationship among individual, environmental, and behavior variables on academic and career choice. Career development is achieved through a focus of three primary tenets: self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and goals (Lent et al., 1994). Key factors that influence individuals with disabilities selecting science and technology careers include individual motivation and personal determination, family support and advocacy, and positive STEM learning and training experiences (Alston & Hampton, 2000; Lindstrom & Benz, 2011; Mastropieri & Scruggs, 1992; Wang, 2013). SCCT highlights the role of environmental factors in strengthening or weakening one’s vocational behavior (Lent et al., 1994). Although researchers have applied SSCT to understand career choice and development for youth in the general population, very few studies use SCCT framework to understand career development for youth with an ASD. To account for the increasingly important role of vocational decision-making in the transition from high school to early adulthood among adolescents with an ASD, this study applied the SCCT framework to explore how high school STEM learning experiences and individual background characteristics jointly contribute to postsecondary STEM majoring.

Linking High School Experiences and College STEM major among Students with an ASD

Studies that have explored postsecondary participation among students with an ASD have found that high school experiences play a significant role in a student's successful enrollment and participation in postsecondary education. For instance, academic performance in high school coursework and participation in transition planning during high school were associated with participation in postsecondary education for students with an ASD (Chiang, Cheung, Hickson, Xiang, & Tsai, 2011; Roberts, 2010; Stodden & Mruzek, 2010; Wang, 2013). Among students with different types of disabilities, including ASD, attendance in regular high schools and inclusion in the general education classes appear to increase the likelihood of postsecondary participation (Baer, Flexer, Beck, Amstutz, Hoffman, Brothers, et al., 2003; Test, Mazzotti, Mustian, Fowler, Kortering, & Kohler, 2009).

When considering factors that contribute specifically to the pursuit of STEM majors in college, studies involving the general population once again draw a link to high school academic factors. In fact, it appears that one of the strongest predictors of majoring in STEM during college is high school academic preparation in math and science courses (Tai, Liu, Maltese, & Fan, 2006; Wai, Lubinski, Benbow, & Steiger, 2010; Wang, 2013). A study by Tyson, Lee, Borman, & Hanson (2007) used descriptive statistics and logistic regression analyses to determine how science and mathematics course-taking in high school predicted STEM degree attainment among baccalaureate degree recipients. In this study, Tyson et al. found that students taking high level science courses (such as Chemistry II and Physics II) obtained a STEM degree from a Florida university more often than students taking lower level science courses. In addition, the researchers found that students who successfully completed Calculus in high school were more likely to obtain a STEM degree from a Florida public university as opposed to students who did not complete a Calculus course in high school.

Similarly, a study by Robinson (2003) examined the background of Advanced Placement science and mathematics classes and their impact on STEM career choices of college students. After looking at the results of surveys distributed to 315 students in AP science and math classes across eight different high schools, Robinson found that the likelihood of selecting a STEM career choice such as engineering, science, mathematics, and the medical field was significantly associated with students taking AP classes in calculus and the sciences. About 28% of STEM majors took AP Calculus in high school as compared with 25% of non-STEM majors. The results also confirmed that both minority and nonminority students who were taking AP calculus and/or science courses in high school selected STEM careers at a higher rate than other careers, findings that have been confirmed by other studies of minority students (Crisp, Nora, & Taggart, 2009; Simpson, 2001).

While advanced level course-taking—particularly in science and mathematics— and academic success in high school play a major role in moving students in the general population through the STEM pipeline, strong performance on standardized tests are also associated with the persistence of undergraduate studies in STEM fields (Bonous-Hammarth, 2000; Sahin, Morgan, & Erdogan, 2012). In addition, high school grade point average and class rank appear to have an impact on the pursuit of college STEM degrees among students in the general population. Two studies involving engineering students revealed that persistence within an engineering major was positively associated with prior academic attainments, including high school rank and high school GPA (French, Immekus, and Oakes, 2005; Zhang, Anderson, Ohland, and Thorndyke, 2004).

In summary, there are a variety of high school academic factors proven to be particularly effective in moving students through the STEM pipeline from high school to college STEM degree programs, ranging from science and math course-taking to high school academic achievement. However, to our knowledge, no studies to date have investigated the effectiveness of these factors in promoting STEM participation for students with an ASD in the U.S. In addition, sociodemographic differences are of critical importance in STEM-related research (Crisp et al., 2009; Wang. 2013), and persistent underrepresentation in STEM participation by gender, race, and disability status remain (National Science Foundation, 2013; Wang, 2013; Zhang et al., 2004). This warrants the need for STEM-related research to take such background differences into consideration. This study includes a rich set of high school experiences variables, including general education inclusion, math and science coursework, standardized test scores in math and science, as well as individual background characteristics. This study is the first to consider the STEM pipeline for students with an ASD by examining the association between high school STEM preparation factors and majoring in STEM in college using a large, nationally representative U.S. sample of students with an ASD.

Methods

Data

National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (NLTS2) was conducted by SRI International for the U.S. Department of Education and is the largest and richest dataset available to study transition experiences from high schools to postsecondary education and postsecondary outcomes of students with disabilities in the U.S. Data were collected from parents and/or youth in five waves, two years apart, from 2001 to 2009. The initial sample included more than 11,000 high school students receiving special education, ages 13 through 16. About 1,100 of them received special education services in the ASD category by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 2004. Each student's eligibility for special education services was determined by the school district from which the student roster was sampled. Although the criteria for autism identification in schools may differ from the criteria found in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (Fourth Edition) (DSM-IV, 1994), more than 95% of children with a school designation of autism also meet DSM-IV-based case criteria in public health surveillance studies – suggesting the school label of autism is very specific (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2012; Blumberg et al., 2013).

The NLTS2 two-stage sampling plan first randomly sampled local educational agencies (LEAs) and state-supported special schools stratified by region, district enrollment, and wealth; then students receiving special education from rosters of LEAs or special schools were randomly selected in order to yield nationally representative estimates that would generalize to all students receiving special education services. Appropriate analysis weights for each instrument and each wave of data collection were used to produce estimates that can be generalized to the cohort of youth receiving special education services at the study's start in a given age range and disability type.

Participants

NLTS2 includes data about students with an ASD as well as students in other special education disability categories from multiple sources on a wide range of topics using parent telephone interviews and mail surveys; school, teacher, and school program surveys; transcript data; and in-person student assessments and interviews. This paper used the following data from multiple resources for students with an ASD: postsecondary data from wave 5 parent and young adult telephone interviews and mail surveys collected in 2009, high school transcript data collected from high school from 2002 to 2009, wave 1 parent survey, and wave 1 or wave 2 student direct assessments. The estimates in this report used appropriate weights from corresponding instrument when the data were collected (Wagner, Kutash, Duchnowski, & Epstein, 2005). Unweighted sample sizes were rounded to the nearest ten, as required by the U.S. Department of Education.

Measures

The primary measures used for this study are described below and also in Table 1.

<Table 1>

College STEM major. Postsecondary enrollment in a two-year or a four-year college was measured at wave 5 by survey items that asked if the youth ever attended a postsecondary institution (e.g., 2-year community college, 4-year college) since leaving high school. Parents and young adults also answered questions about the course of study at a 2-year community college or a 4-year college. This study limited the sample of students with an ASD to those who reported a college major in a 2-year community college or a 4-year college. This study used the NSF definition of STEM: “all fields of fundamental science and engineering” (National Science Foundation, 2006, p. 1). An indicator for majoring in STEM fields was coded affirmatively if the youth or parent reported a college major that aligned with this definition, including majors such as computer science, programming, information technologies, engineering, mathematics and statistics, science, biology, earth science, geology, physics, chemistry, and environmental science. Social, behavioral and economic sciences were not included as STEM fields because the NLTS2 questionnaires combined psychology, economics, political science, sociology (NSF

STEM majors), with non-STEM majors such as history, women's studies, American studies, ethnic studies in one category. Majoring in STEM fields was coded affirmatively if the youth or parent reported a college major in the fields of computer science, programming, information technologies, engineering, mathematics and statistics, science, biology, earth science, geology, physics, chemistry, and environmental science. Students with an ASD reported other majors were coded as non-STEM majors.

General education inclusion. Percent of units earned in general education settings was extracted from the high school transcript data to measure the degree of inclusion of students with an ASD in general education classes.

High school math and science coursework. NLTS2 transcript data provides high school math and science course-taking patterns in the general setting. NLTS2 defines general, basic, consumer, integrated, remedial math, up to and pre-algebra as basic mathematics; algebra I, algebra II, and geometry as mid-level mathematics; and trigonometry, pre-calculus, statistics and probability, and calculus as advanced mathematics (Newman et al., 2011). Science course-taking was extracted from NLTS2 transcript data. Six science categories ranging from "life science or basic science classes" to "physics" were dichotomized into basic or advanced science courses. Basic science classes included life skills, environmental, earth, geology, physical, astronomy, marine, aerospace, biology, anatomy, and physiology. Advanced science classes included chemistry, physics, and integrated physics and chemistry. Average GPAs in general education math and science were also extracted from NLTS2 high school transcript dataset.

High school math and science standardized test scores. Math and science achievement were assessed with research editions of the Woodcock-Johnson III (WJ III; Woodcock, McGrew, & Mather, 2001) at wave 1 or 2. The two math WJ III subtests used were: (1) applied problems, which measures comprehension and ability to identify useful information, conduct simple calculations, and solve math problems; and (2) calculation, which measures computation skills ranging in difficulty from elementary computations to calculus. The WJ III science subtest measures academic knowledge in science by having factual science questions read to the students along with text and pictures. Test-retest reliabilities are reported to range from 0.76 to .93 across subtests of WJ III (Woodcock et al., 2001). The analysis of the WJ III subtests was based on standard scores, which measure the relative ranking of a student among his or her peers of the same age or grade level. The standard score for each subtest is centered on a mean of 100 with a standard deviation of 15 (Jaffe, 2009).

Background characteristics variables. Demographic variables included young adults' gender, age, race/ethnicity, and family income, all of which were measured at wave 5. Parents rated a child's conversation ability at wave 1 from "1=converse just as well as others, 2=has a little trouble carry conversation, 3=has a lot of trouble carrying conversation or does not carry a conversation at all."

Analysis

All analyses were performed on SAS 9.2 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC). SAS PROC SURVEY Taylor Series Linearization method was used to account for the complex sampling design and provide the exact estimate of the standard errors. In addition to descriptive analysis, weighted chi-square tests or t-tests were used to test the difference between STEM major vs. non-STEM majors in background characteristics and high school STEM preparation factors. Logistic regression models were used to explore the adjusted associations between high school STEM preparation and college STEM major after controlling for background characteristics. The rate of missing data was 16% for the postsecondary major variable, resulting in a sample size of 150. The missing data on demographic and high school factor correlates for the 150 college students ranged from 0% to 22%. Missing data (33% of the n = 150) were list-wise deleted in the logistic regression models.

Results

The background characteristics and high school STEM preparation of students with an ASD who declared a college major are described below.

Descriptive Analyses

Table 2 provides the background characteristics of the young adults with an ASD in two groups (college STEM major vs. non-STEM major) weighted to represent the population nationwide at Wave 5. Compared with students with an ASD who were non-STEM majors, those who declared a STEM major had a higher proportion of male students (97.30% vs. 79.40%), were about half a year older (23.61 vs. 23.12 years old), and reported a lower proportion having lots of trouble or cannot carry a conversation at all (7.00% vs. 30.25%).

<Table 2>

When focusing on the difference between STEM and non-STEM majors in their high school STEM preparation (Table 3), STEM majors had a lower percentage of units taken in general education settings (74.96% vs. 83.20%); however, a higher proportion of STEM majors took advanced math courses in a general education setting (41.62% vs. 22.32%) and scored higher on the WJ III science test (98.67 vs. 96.72; effect size = 0.13) than their peers who declared a non-STEM major.

<Table 3>

Table 4 reveals findings from weighted logistic regression models predicting the odds of declaring a college STEM major (Table 2). White students with an ASD had significantly higher odds of majoring in STEM fields than minority students with an ASD. Older students with an ASD had higher odds of majoring in STEM than their younger peers. Students with an ASD who had “no trouble” or “little trouble” conversing had higher odds of majoring in STEM than their peers who had “lots of trouble” or “cannot converse at all.” Students with an ASD who took advanced math classes in general education settings had significantly higher odds of majoring in STEM than those who did not take advanced math classes in general education settings.

<Table 4>

Discussion

By taking advantage of a rich national longitudinal dataset of students with an ASD, this study reveals the first national picture of how high school preparation factors and individual background characteristics are associated with entrance into STEM majors. While the existing covariates in the NLTS2 dataset preclude any in-depth investigation into STEM self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and goals that may influence STEM academics and career choice, these findings still align well with SCCT, which stipulates that an individual’s intention to engage in a certain activity (in this case choosing a major in STEM fields) is influenced by environmental (exposure to advanced math classes) and individual factors (conversation ability and race/ethnicity).

Math and science achievement scores in high school were deemed to be one of the strongest predictors of college STEM participation in research studies focused on students in the general population (Bonous-Hammarth, 2000; Crisp et al., 2009; Porter & Umbach, 2006; Sahin et al., 2012). However, a recent study by Wang (2013) suggested that the effect of students’ exposure to math and science courses is stronger than that of math achievement on STEM entrance. Echoing Wang’s findings, this study emphasizes the critical role of taking advanced math classes within an inclusive high school setting in developing students' predispositions toward choosing a STEM major in college. Furthermore, as compared to the smaller difference in proportion of STEM vs. non-STEM majors who take advanced math classes in the general population (28% [Robinson, 2003] vs. 25% [Crip, Nora, & Taggart, 2009]), this study shows that the difference between STEM and non-STEM majors among students with an ASD is more striking (42% vs. 22%). The very high rates of STEM majors with an ASD taking advanced math classes in high school emphasize the importance of exposure to high level math classes on STEM enrollment for this population.

The number of STEM jobs is projected to grow by 17 percent between 2008 and 2018 as compared to 10 percent for non-STEM jobs (Carnevale et al., 2011). Broadening participation of underrepresented groups is an issue of concern to STEM educators and researchers and policy makers. The U.S. government has recognized that encouraging and supporting underrepresented groups such as women, minorities, and persons with disabilities to enter the fields of science and engineering is crucial to strengthening America's science and engineering workforce (National Science Foundation, 2013). Students with an ASD represent one of the untapped STEM talent pools in the United States (Wei et al., 2012; 2013). Despite their potential to succeed in STEM fields, interest and ability alone may not be sufficient enough to enable a student with an ASD to pursue a STEM major in college. This finding implies that an earlier introduction and exposure to advanced math courses could be a particularly effective intervention to increase STEM enrollment rates among students with an ASD.

This finding is particularly relevant to practitioners dedicated to advancing the careers of individuals with an ASD. In the past, students with an ASD were typically segregated from their peers in the general education setting (McDonnell, 1998; McCurdy & Cole, 2013). However, recent research has shown that including students with disabilities in the general education setting is associated with high socio-behavioral and academic outcomes (Hunt & McDonnell, 2007; McCurdy & Cole, 2013). This study adds to the inclusion literature by suggesting that including students with ASD in advanced math classes in a general education setting is imperative to supporting their future STEM major declaration. These findings imply that high school counselors and teachers should encourage more students with an ASD to take challenging math courses. Such opportunities to enroll in advanced math classes will prepare students with an ASD to pursue STEM-related career tracks in college. However, more studies need to occur to advance the understanding of how to include students with an ASD in advanced math classes given the diversity of intellectual and behavior functioning of this group. Research that distinguishes strategies for facilitating inclusion of students with an ASD by functioning level would be welcomed by the educational community (Harrower & Dunlap, 2001).

Another factor that was significantly correlated with STEM majoring in college, conversation ability, also has the potential to be influenced through effective educational interventions and supports. The association between conversation ability and the odds of declaring a STEM major suggests that appropriate communication skills are important in STEM classes. Previous studies found that poor communication skills in young adults with an ASD may limit their ability to understand and use the rules of social behavior, resulting in more difficulties transitioning from high school to college (Hendricks, & Wehman, 2009; VanBergeijk, Klin, & Volkmar, 2008), and in maintaining the reciprocal interaction essential to college learning (Banda & Kubina, 2010; Donaldson & Zagler, 2010). Although speech/communication therapy is the most common special education service provided to secondary-school students with an ASD (Wei, Wagner, Christiano, Shattuck, & Yu, 2013), parents identified a lack of information about these supports and services and their unavailability as the most common barriers in meeting their children's needs (NLTS2, 2007b). Furthermore, provision of speech/communication services after high school fell short of the identified need for them (Wei, Wagner, Hudson, Yu, & Shattuck, 2014). High school transition plans of 23.3% of students with ASDs identified a post-high school need for speech/communication services (Cameto et al., 2004), yet only 13.6% had received such services up to 6 years after leaving high school (NLTS2, 2007a). These findings add to the literature by emphasizing the importance of conversation skills for college students with an ASD majoring in STEM fields and suggest that high schools and colleges need to provide greater communication skills support in order for students with an ASD to enter and succeed in STEM fields.

This study also found a very large race/ethnicity gap in majoring in STEM-related fields among young adults with an ASD: white students were six times more likely to major in STEM than minority students. In contrast, a report from the National Science Foundation (2013) indicated no racial gap in intent to major in STEM among the general population, with 37% of White, 37% of Black, 41% of Hispanic, 49% of Asian, and 28% of American Indian college freshmen expressing their intent to major in STEM. This study suggests that increasing the STEM participation rate among minority students is an urgent issue for those with developmental disabilities compared to the general population. Recognizing the amplified disparities that exist among racial/ethnic minorities with an ASD is an important first step in providing appropriate services to cultivate and encourage STEM interest in this particular population. For instance, these findings may provide the impetus for Offices of Minority Affairs and Offices of Disability Services in colleges to initiate dialogue and develop action steps aimed at reducing barriers to STEM participation among students who come from more than one underrepresented population.

This study has several limitations. First, the NLTS2 study did not measure student interest and goals in math and science in high school nor in postsecondary education institutions. Consequently, this study does not provide insights on the interrelationship between STEM interest and goals and STEM career decision-making. Second, the analyses were correlational and do not allow causal inferences. Future studies should replicate the findings of this study using experimental or quasi-experimental study design. Third, conversation ability was reported by parents, which may be subject to bias and cannot be equated with the results of formal evaluations conducted by trained professionals. Future studies should validate parent reporting of conversation ability by comparing it with other reporting methods, such as medical or school records. Fourth, the postsecondary enrollment and major data were collected by NLTS2 using parent or young adult survey instead of college registration records, which may have resulted in potential reporting biases. Future research should validate the results of this study through other data sources, e.g. enrollment data from the university disability support office.

In sum, the findings from this study lay the groundwork to better understand the association between high school STEM preparation factors and college majoring in STEM among young adults with an ASD. Future research should aim to replicate these findings using original data that are not constrained by the limitations of secondary data analysis in order to strengthen the evidence base and help increase the likelihood of postsecondary STEM participation among the growing population of young adults with an ASD.

References

Alston, R. J. & Hampton, J. L. (2000). Science and engineering as viable career choices for students with disabilities: A survey of parents and teachers. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 43* (3), 158-164. doi: 10.1177/003435520004300306

American Psychiatric Association. (1994). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders*, *DSM-IV* (4th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Astin, A. W., & Astin, H. S. (1992). *Undergraduate science education: The impact of different college environments on the educational pipeline in the sciences*. Final Report to the National Science Foundation (Grant Number SPA-8955365). Los Angeles: The Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.

Baer, R.M., Flexer, R.W., Beck, S., Amstutz, N., Hoffman, L., Brothers, J., Stelzer, D., & Zechman, C. (2003). A collaboration followup study on transition service utilization and post-school outcomes. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals, 26*(1), 7-25.

Banda, D. R., & Kubina, R. M. (2010). Increasing academic compliance to math tasks using the high-preference strategy in a student with autism. *Preventing School Failure, 54*, 81–85.

Bandura, A. (1986).Social foundation of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Baron-Cohen, S. (2009). Autism: The Empathizing-Systemizing (E-S) Theory. *Annals of the New York Academy of Science, 1156*, 68-80. doi:10.1111/j.1749-6632.2009.04467.x

Baron-Cohen, S., Wheelwright, S., Burtenshaw, A., & Hobson, E. (2007). Mathematical talent is linked to autism. *Human Nature, 18*(2), 125–131. doi:10.1007/s12110-007-9014-0

Barton, P. E. (2003). *Hispanics in science and engineering: A matter of assistance and persistence*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Bertrand, J., Mars, A., Boyle, C., Bove, F., Yeargin-Allsopp, M., & Decoufle, P. (2001). Prevalence of Autism in a United States Population: The Brick Township, New Jersey, Investigation. *Pediatrics, 108*, 1155–1162. doi:10.1542/peds.108.5.1155

Blumberg, S.J., Bramlett, M.D., Kogan, M.D., Schiee, L.A., Jones, J.R., & Lu, M.C. (2013). *Changes in prevalence of parent-reported Autism Spectrum Disorder in school-aged U.S. children: 2007 to 2011-2012. National Health Statistics Reports, no. 65*. Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics.

Bonous-Hammarth, M. (2000). Pathways to success: Affirming opportunities for science, mathematics, and engineering majors. *Journal of Negro Education, 69*(1/2), 92–111.

Burkam, D. T., & Lee, V. E. (2003). *Mathematics, foreign language, and science coursetaking and the NELS:88 transcript data* (NCES 2003–01). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

Cameto, R., Levine, P., & Wagner, M. (2004). *Transition planning for students with disabilities. A special topic report from the National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (NLTS2)*. Menlo Park, CA.

Carnevale, A. P., Smith, N., & Melton, M. (2011). *STEM*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2012). Prevalence of autism spectrum disorders—Autism and developmental disabilities monitoring network, 14 sites, United States. *Morbidity and mortality weekly report Surveillance summaries, 61*(No.SS-03), 1–19.

Chiang, H-M, Cheung, Y.K., Hickson, L., Xiang, R., & Tsai, L.Y. (2012). Predictive factors of participation in postsecondary education for high school leavers with autism. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders, 42*, 685-696. doi : 10.1007/s10803-011-1297-7

Crisp, G., Nora, A, & Taggart, A. (2009). Student characteristics, pre-college, college, and environmental factors as predictors of majoring in and earning a STEM degree: An analysis of students attending a Hispanic serving institution. *The American Educational Research Journal*, *46*, 924–942. doi :10.3102/0002831209349460

Donaldson, J. B., & Zagler, D. (2010). Mathematics interventions for students with high-functioning autism/Asperger's Syndrome. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, *42*(6), 40–46.

French, B. F., Immekus, J. C., & Oakes, W. C. (2005). An examination of indicators of engineering students' success and persistence. *Journal of Engineering Education*, *94*(4), 419-425. doi:10.1002/j.2168-9830.2005.tb00869.x

Harrower, J. K., & Dunlap, G. (2001). Including children with autism in general education settings: A review of effective strategies. *Behavior Modification*, *25*, 762-784.

Hendricks, D. R., & Wehman, P. (2009). Transition from school to adulthood for youth with autism spectrum disorders. *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities*, *24*(2), 77–88. doi:10.1177/1088357608329827

Hunt, P., & McDonnell, J. (2007). Inclusive education. In S. Odom, R. H. Horner, M. E. Snell, & J. Blacher (Eds.), *Handbook of developmental disabilities* (pp. 269–291). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act, 20 U.S.C. § 1400 *et seq*. (2004).

Jaffe, L. E. (2009). Development, interpretation, and application of the W score and the relative proficiency index (Woodcock-Johnson III Assessment Service Bulletin No. 11). Rolling Meadows, IL: Riverside Publishing.

Keyes, K. M., Susser, E., Cheslack-Postava, K., Fountain, C., Liu, K., & Bearman, P. S. (2012). Cohort effects explain the increase in autism diagnosis among children born from 1992 to 2003 in California. *International Journal of Epidemiology, 41* (2): 495-503.

Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., & Hackett, G. (1994). Toward a unifying social cognitive theory of career and academic interest, choice, and performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 45*, 79-122. doi: 10.1006/jvbe.1994.1027

Lindstrom, L. E. & Benz, M. R. (2002). Phases of career development: Case studies of young women with learning disabilities. *Exceptional Children, 69* (1), 67-83.

Mastropieri, M. A., & Scruggs, T. E. (1992). Science for students with disabilities. *Review of Educational Research, 62*, 377-411. doi: 10.3102/00346543062004377

McCurdy, E. E. & Cole, C. L. (2013). Use of a peer support intervention for promoting academic engagement of students with autism in general education eettings. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*. doi: 10.1007/s10803-013-1941-5

McDonnell, J. (1998). Instruction for students with severe disabilities in general education settings. *Education and Training in Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities, 33*, 199-215.

Nagle, K., Marder, C., & Schiller, E. (2009). *Research in disabilities education program evaluation: Study 1 methods and results.* Arlington, VA: SRI International. Retrieved from http://www.sri.com/policy/csted/reports/university/documents/NSF-RDE_Study1_Methods-ResultsReport_04-09.pdf.

National Science Foundation. (2006). *Investing in America's future: Strategic plan FY 2006-2011*. Washington, DC: National Science Foundation. Retrieved from http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2006/nsf0648/NSF-06-48.pdf.

National Science Foundation. (2013). *Women, minorities, and persons with disabilities in science and engineering: 2013*. Washington, DC: National Science Foundation.

National Science Foundation. (2008). *Broadening participation at the National Science Foundation: A framework for action*. Washington, DC: National Science Foundation. Retrieved from http://www.nsf.gov/od/broadeningparticipation/nsf_frameworkforaction_0808.pdf

Newman, L., Wagner, M., Huang, T., Shaver, D., Knokey, A.-M., Yu, J., Contreras, E., Ferguson, K., Greene, S., Nagle, K., & Cameto, R. (2011). *Secondary school programs and performance of students with disabilities. A special topic report of findings from the National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (NLTS2) (NCSER 2012-3000).* U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Special Education Research.

NLTS2. (2007a). Table 116. *Services ever reported receiving in current or prior wave since leaving secondary school by youth out of school a year or more*. Menlo Park, CA. Retrieved from http://nlts2.org/data_tables/tables/13/np4F14a_everfrm.html

NLTS2. (2007b). Table 125. *Problems youth out of school a year or more experienced with getting or using services in the last year*. Menlo Park, CA. Retrieved from http://nlts2.org/data_tables/tables/13/np4F15cfrm.html

Riegle-Crumb, C., Farkas, G., & Muller, C. (2006). The role of gender and friendship in advanced course-taking. *Sociology of Education 79*(3), 206-228. doi:10.1177/003804070607900302

Roberts, K.D. (2010). Topic areas to consider when planning transition from high school to postsecondary education for students with autism spectrum disorders. *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities, 25,* 158-162. doi: 10.1177/1088357610371476

Robinson, M. (2003). Student enrollment in high school AP sciences and calculus: How does it correlate with STEM careers? *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society, 23*(4), 265-273. doi:10.1177/0270467603256090

Sahin, A., Morgan, J. R., Erdogan, N. (2012). Do high school computer and AP courses and SAT test scores help students choose STEM majors in college? Paper presented at American Society for Engineering Education Annual Conference, San Antonio, TX.

Simpson, J. C. (2001). Segregated by subject: Racial differences in the factors influencing academic major between European Americans, Asian Americans, and African, Hispanic, and Native Americans. *Journal of Higher Education, 72*(1), 63-100. doi:10.2307/2649134

Stodden, R.A., & Mruzek, D.W. (2010). An introduction to postsecondary education and employment of persons with autism and developmental disabilities. *Focus on Autism and other Developmental Disabilities, 25,* 131-133. doi:10.1177/1088357610371637

Tai, R., Liu, C. Q., Maltese, A. V., & Fan, X. (2006). Planning early for careers in science. *Science, 312*, 1143–1144. doi:10.1126/science.1128690

Test, D.W., Mazzotti, V.L., Mustian, A.L., Fowler, C.D., Kortering, L., & Hohler, P. (2009). Evidence-based secondary transition predictors for improving postschool outcomes for students with disabilities. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals, 32*(3), 160-181. doi: 10.1177/0885728809346960

Tyson, W., Lee, R., Borman, K. M., & Hanson, M. A. (2007). Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) pathways: High school science and math coursework and postsecondary degree attainment. *Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk*, *2*(3), 243–270. doi:10.1080/10824660701601266

U.S. Department of Labor. (2007). The STEM workforce challenge: The role of the Public Workforce System in a National Solution for a Competitive Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Workforce. Retrieved from http://www.doleta.gov/youth_services/pdf/STEM_Report_4%2007.pdf

VanBergeijk, E., Klin, A., & Volkmar, F. (2008). Supporting more able students on the autism spectrum: College and beyond. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders, 38*, 1359–1370. doi:10.1007/s10803-007-0524-8

Wagner M., Kutash K., Duchnowski A. J., & Epstein M. H. (2005) The Special Education Elementary Longitudinal Study and the National Longitudinal Transition Study: Study designs and implications for children and youth with emotional disturbance. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorder, 13*, 25–41. doi:10.1177/10634266050130010301

Wai, J., Lubinski, D., Benbow, C. P., & Steiger, J. H. (2010). Accomplishment in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) and its relation to STEM educational dose: A 25-year longitudinal study. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *102*(4), 860–871. doi:10.1037/a0019454

Wei, X., Yu, J. W., Shattuck, P., McCracken, M., & Blackorby, J. (2012). *Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) participation among college students with an Autism Spectrum Disorder*. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders.* doi: 10.1007/s10803-012-1700-z

Wei, X., Christiano, E., Yu, J., Blackorby, J., Shattuck, P., & Newman, L. (2013). Postsecondary pathways and persistence for STEM versus Non-STEM majors among college students with an Autism Spectrum Disorder. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*. doi: 10.1007/s10803-013-1978-5

Wei, X., Wagner, M., Christiano, E. R. A., Shattuck, P., & Yu, J. W. (2013). Special education services received by students with Autism Spectrum Disorders from preschool through high school. *The Journal of Special Education*. doi: 10.1177/0022466913483576

Wei, X., Wagner, M., Hudson, L., Yu, J. W., & Shattuck, P. (2014). Transition to adulthood: Employment, education, and disengagement in individuals with Autism Spectrum Disorders. *Emerging Adulthood*. doi: 10.1177/2167696814534417

Woodcock, R. W., McGrew, K. S., & Mather, N. (2001). *Examiner's manual. Woodcock-Johnson III Tests of Cognitive Ability.* Itasca, IL: Riverside.

Zhang, G., Anderson, T. J., Ohland, M. W., & Thorndyke, B. R. (2004). Identifying factors influencing engineering student graduation: A longitudinal and cross-institutional study. *Journal of Engineering Education, 93*(4), 313-320. doi:10.1002/j.2168-9830.2004.tb00820.x

Table 1

Outcome Variables and Predicting Variables from NLTS2 data sources

Measures	Description
Outcomes	
College STEM major	Parents and young adults were asked their course of study at postsecondary schools[5]. The following four majors were coded as STEM major.
	Computer science, programming, information technology (np5s3hs5g_k6fk8e_07)
	Engineering, electrical, mechanical, chemical (np5s3hs5g_k6fk8e_09)
	Mathematics and statistics (np5s3hs5g_k6fk8e_16)
	Science, biology, earth science, geology, physics, chemistry, environmental science (np5s3hs5g_k6fk8e_19)
Non-STEM major	The rest of the college majors reported by parents and young adults.
Predictors	
GE inclusion[T]	Percent of units earned in GE (ntsPctgUnits_GPl_ZF)
High school math and science coursework and achievement [T]	Had basic Math classes (general, basic, consumer, integrated, remedial math, up to and pre-algebra) in GE (ntsHad_MaBas_GPl)
	Had mid-level Math classes (algebra I, algebra II, and geometry) in GE (ntsHad_MaMid_GPl)
	Had advanced Math classes (trigonometry, pre-calculus, statistics and probability, and calculus) in GE (ntsHad_MaAdv_GPl)
	Had basic science classes (life science, environmental science, earth science, geology, physical science, astronomy, marine science, aerospace science, biology, anatomy, or physiology, in GE (ntscourse=1700, 1701, or 1711)
	Had advanced science classes (chemistry, physics, or integrated physics and chemistry) in GE (ntscourse=1721, 1731, or 1732)
	Math GPA in GE (ntsGPA_math_GPL_zf)
	Science GPA in GE (ntsGPA_sci_GPL_zf)
	WJ III standardized test scores in calculation, applied problems, and science (ndaCalc_ss, ndaAP_ss, ndaSci_ss)
Background characteristics predictors	Gender[5] (w5_GendHdr2009)
	Age at wave 5[5] (W5_Age2009)
	Race/ethnicity[5](w5_EthHdr2009)
	Family income[5] (W5_IncomeHdr2009_detail)
	Conversation ability [1] (np1B_4i_5d)

Source: NLTS2, waves 1 and 5, and transcript data. Summary statistics were weighted to population levels using Wave 5 weights. Unweighted N was rounded to the nearest 10.

NLTS2 variable names are in brackets. [1] indicates this variable is from wave 1. [5] indicates this variable is from wave 5. [T] indicates this variable is from high school transcript.

GE=general education setting

Table 2

Weighted Percent or Weighted Mean (s.e.) of Background Characteristics of Students with an ASD Who Declared a College STEM Major vs. Non-STEM Major

Measures	STEM Major	Non-STEM Major
Male	97.30***	79.40
Black	11.79	16.40
Hispanic	3.05	[a]
White	85.16	81.19
Other ethnicity	[a]	[a]
Age at wave 5	23.61***	23.12
	(0.20)	(0.23)
Income		
<$25,000	5.03	10.07
$25,001-50,000	26.23	18.20
$50,001-75,000	33.52	29.05
>$75,000	35.21	42.68
Conversation ability		
No trouble	21.68	19.48
Little trouble	71.31	50.27
Lots of trouble or cannot converse at all	7.00***	30.25
Unweighted N	40	110
Weighted N	1,080	2,060

Source: NLTS2, waves 1 and 5. Summary statistics were weighted to population levels using Wave 5 weights. All cell weighted estimates represent underlying counts greater or equal to 3. Unweighted N was rounded to the nearest 10. Other ethnicity includes Asian/Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaska Native, and multiracial students.

[a] Point estimate not reported because of low cell count (less than 3) for this category as required by the data use agreement with the US Department of Education.

$*p < .05$, $**p < .01$, $***p < .001$ for comparison between those who declared a STEM major vs. those who declared a non-STEM major

Table 3

Weighted Percent or Weighted Mean (s.e.) of High School Academic Preparation Variables for Students with an ASD

Measures	STEM Major	Non-STEM Major
General education inclusion		
Percent of units earned in GE	74.96*** (5.67)	83.20 (2.61)
Math and science coursework		
Had basic Math classes in GE	51.42	51.03
Had mid-level Math classes in GE	64.75	58.11
Had advanced Math classes in GE	41.62*	22.32
Had basic science classes in GE	98.58	96.91
Had advanced science classes in GE	51.05	51.37
Math GPA in GE	2.71 (0.11)	2.63 (0.23)
Science GPA in GE	2.78 (0.20)	2.55 (0.14)
Math and science standardized test scores		
WJ III Calculation	102.77 (1.64)	104.02 (1.79)
WJ III Applied problems	94.43 (2.30)	94.77 (1.53)
WJ III Science	98.67*** (2.05)	96.72 (2.17)
Unweighted N	40	110

Source: NLTS2, waves 1 or 2 direct assessment and high school transcript data. Summary statistics for variables from the transcript data were weighted to population levels using transcript weights. Summary statistics for WJ III variables were weighted to population levels using student direct assessment weights. Unweighted N was rounded to the nearest 10.

GE=general education setting

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001 for comparison between STEM major vs. non-STEM major

Table 4

Logistic Regression Using Background Characteristics and High School STEM Preparation to Predict the Odds Ratios and Confidence Intervals of College STEM Major

Predictors	College STEM Major
Male	3.01 [0.78, 11.67]
White	5.84** [1.54, 22.23]
Age at wave 5	2.40** [1.26, 4.57]
Family income	0.90 [0.69, 1.16]
No or little trouble conversing	15.08*** [4.46, 50.99]
Percent of units earned in GE	0.94 [0.88, 1.00]
Had mid-level math classes in GE	0.43 [0.10, 1.91]
Had advanced math classes in GE	4.08* [1.31, 12.68]
Had advanced science classes in GE	1.05 [0.21, 5.31]
Math GPA in GE	0.45 [0.14, 1.43]
Science GPA in GE	2.49 [0.72, 8.63]
WJ III Calculation	1.02 [0.98, 1.07]
WJ III Applied Problems	1.02 [0.96, 1.14]
WJ III Science	0.98 [0.93, 1.04]
Unweighted N	100

Source: NLTS2, waves 1 and 5 parent/youth interview, waves 1 or 2 direct assessment, and high school transcript data. Unweighted N was rounded to the nearest 10.

GE=general education setting

*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$.