A Systematic Review of Aviation English Training Programs and Their Role in Bridging Communication Gaps

MA. THERESA DUMDUMAYA
Philippine State College of Aeronautics
Fernando Air Base, Lipa City, Batangas
PHILIPPINES

Abstract: Effective communication between pilots and air traffic controllers (ATCOs) is critical for aviation safety and efficiency, especially in multilingual and high-pressure environments, where English is a global lingua franca. This literature review systematically examines the current state of Aviation English (AE) training programs, focusing on the persistent challenges in assessing Aviation English (AE) proficiency, the variability in training methodologies, and the emerging role of simulation and technology in enhancing communication competence. Drawing from scholarly sources published between 2010 and 2023, this study employed a systematic narrative review approach to identify thematic insights from peer-reviewed literature found in databases, such as Google Scholar, PubMed, IEEE Xplore, ResearchGate, and ScienceDirect. This review highlights the inadequacy of traditional paper-based assessments, inconsistent integration of linguistic and non-linguistic competencies, and promise of simulation-based learning and virtual reality in providing authentic, high-fidelity training environments. Furthermore, the analysis underscores the importance of understanding power dynamics, team communication, and technological ethics in Aviation English (AE) instruction. These findings demonstrate that a more standardized, research-informed, and technology-enhanced approach to Aviation English (AE) training is essential for mitigating miscommunication risks and fostering safer aviation operations. The study concludes with recommendations for future research directions and innovations in assessment and pedagogy for Aviation English (AE) programs.

Keywords: Aviation English, Pilot–Controller Communication, Language Proficiency Assessment, Simulation-Based Training, Communication Safety in Aviation

Received: May 25, 2024. Revised: March 12, 2025. Accepted: April 13, 2025. Published: August 4, 2025.

1 Introduction

Effective communication is paramount in the aviation industry, as it directly impacts safety and operational efficiency. Misunderstandings between pilots and air traffic controllers (ATCOs), particularly in international contexts where English serves as a lingua franca, can have catastrophic consequences [1]. This review examines the current state of Aviation English (AE) training programs and analyzes their effectiveness in bridging communication gaps and identifying areas for improvement. This analysis focuses on the challenges inherent in assessing Aviation English (AE) proficiency, the design and implementation of effective training programs, and the role of technology in enhancing communication skills.

Despite global efforts to standardize Aviation English (AE) through initiatives such as the ICAO Language Proficiency Requirements, persistent challenges remain in ensuring that both native and non-native English speakers meet the communicative demands of real-time aviation environments [3]. Traditional Aviation English (AE) assessment methods, such as paper-based tests, have been criticized for their lack of authenticity and failure to simulate real-world radiotelephony tasks [2]. These limitations hinder the accurate evaluation of communication competencies and affect the design and effectiveness of training programs.

Notably, the nature of Aviation English (AE) as a highly contextual and task-specific register presents pedagogical and assessment challenges. Definitions and instructional approaches vary widely, contributing to inconsistencies in how Aviation English (AE) is taught and measured [4]. Training programs often struggle to balance linguistic proficiency with non-linguistic competencies, such as situational awareness, teamwork, and

assertiveness in hierarchical settings and skills that are essential for safe and effective communication [8], [9].

In response to these challenges, many Aviation English (AE) training programs have increasingly incorporated simulation-based and technology-driven approaches. Virtual reality (VR), natural language processing (NLP), and immersive simulations are promising alternatives for creating authentic learning experiences that closely mirror real-life operations [6],[11],[12]. However, questions remain regarding their accessibility, scalability, and effectiveness in diverse training contexts.

This review examines the current landscape of Aviation English (AE) training programs, focusing on key challenges in assessing proficiency, evaluating training methodologies, and exploring the role of emerging technologies. By analyzing recent studies and evidence-based practices, this review aims to identify critical gaps and propose future directions for enhancing aviation communication through more rigorous and context-sensitive Aviation English (AE) training frameworks.

2 Methodology

This literature review used a systematic narrative approach to examine the current state of Aviation English (AE) training programs and their effectiveness in addressing communication gaps between pilots and air traffic controllers (ATCOs). To ensure comprehensive exploration, scholarly and peer-reviewed sources were identified using academic databases such as Google Scholar, PubMed, IEEE Xplore, ResearchGate and ScienceDirect. The search focused on materials published primarily between 2010 and 2023, using keywords such as “Aviation English,” “pilot-controller communication,” “radiotelephony,” “simulation-based learning,” “virtual reality training in aviation,” “communication errors in aviation,” and “assessment of aviation English proficiency.”

Studies were included if they focused on Aviation English (AE) training, assessment practices, communication strategies, simulation-based learning, or technology-enhanced instruction in the aviation context. Priority was given to empirical studies and critical reviews that presented findings or evaluations relevant to pilot and air traffic controller (ATCO) interactions. Articles were excluded if they lacked direct relevance to Aviation English (AE), were opinion-based without analytical content, or did not provide methodological transparency.

Once selected, the articles were carefully reviewed and relevant data were extracted to identify recurring themes, innovations, and gaps. Thematic categories included the challenges of assessing Aviation English (AE) proficiency, the variability and effectiveness of training methodologies, the integration of technology and simulation-based tools, the analysis of real-world miscommunication incidents, and the consideration of non-technical skills and ethical implications. Through thematic synthesis, this review aimed to critically evaluate the literature and provide insights into best practices and future directions for improving communication in aviation through more effective Aviation English (AE) training programs.

3 Literature Review

3.1 The Challenges of Assessing Aviation English Proficiency

Traditional paper-based assessment methods for Aviation English (AE) proficiency have been criticized for their lack of authenticity and validity [2]. These methods fail to capture the dynamic and complex nature of real-world communication in aviation environments, where clear, concise, and unambiguous language is crucial [3]. The assessments often lack the interactive elements and simulated scenarios that would allow for a more realistic evaluation of a candidate's ability to handle unexpected situations or stressful conditions [2]. This inadequacy in assessment methodologies is a significant barrier to developing effective training programs, as it makes it difficult to accurately identify areas in which individuals need improvement [3]. The lack of fit between current testing policies and the real-life communicative needs of pilots and traffic controllers (ATCOs) is a persistent concern that impacts both native and non-native speakers [3]. The need for interactive online

testing that simulates authentic tasks and situation performance is widely recognized [2].

The specific nature of aeronautical English likewise poses challenges for assessment. The influence of perceptions and definitions of aeronautical terms on teaching and assessment methods is significant [4]. Unresolved issues in the current understanding of Aviation English (AE) highlight gaps in training programs that could impact safety and communication effectiveness [4]. This underscores the need for a more comprehensive understanding of the linguistic features and communicative demands specific to the aviation context to develop more effective assessment tools.

3.2 Current Approaches to Aviation English Training

Current Aviation English (AE) training programs vary widely in terms of their approach and effectiveness. Some programs focus primarily on linguistic competence, emphasizing grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation [4]. Others have incorporated a more communicative approach, focusing on the development of interactive skills and strategic competence [2]. The effectiveness of these approaches is not always clear, with mixed results reported in various studies [5]. The integration of non-linguistic competencies, such as awareness, knowledge, skills, and attitudes, is crucial for effective radiotelephony communication [3]; however, the extent to which these are addressed in training programs varies considerably.

Moreover, the effectiveness of training programs is often hampered by a lack of standardized methodologies and assessment tools [5]. The absence of a widely accepted framework for evaluating training outcomes makes it difficult to compare the effectiveness of different programs and identify the best practices [3]. This lack of standardization also makes it challenging to demonstrate the return on investment in training programs, potentially hindering their adoption and implementation in the future. The poor quality of many studies, particularly problems with blinding and subjective measures, further complicates the evaluation of training effectiveness [5]. A more rigorous approach to research and evaluation is needed to provide a clearer understanding of what works and what does not in Aviation English (AE) training.

3.3 The Role of Simulation-Based Learning

Simulation-based learning offers a promising approach to enhancing Aviation English (AE) training by providing immersive experiences similar to real-life situations [6], [2]. Simulated environments allow trainees to practice communication skills in a safe and controlled setting, receive immediate feedback, and identify areas for improvement [6]. The use of immersive interfaces and simulated tasks in a virtual world can provide more authentic opportunities for language learners to perform target tasks and promote strategic and linguistic competence [2]. Simulation-based training can be structured to target specific competencies relevant to aviation communication, bridging communication gaps by enabling real-time practice and feedback [6].

However, the effectiveness of simulation-based training depends on several factors, including the fidelity of the simulation, quality of instruction, and assessment methods used [7]. High-fidelity simulations offer a more realistic training experience; however, they can be expensive and resource-intensive to implement [7]. The design of effective simulation scenarios requires careful consideration of the specific communication challenges faced by pilots and traffic controllers (ATCOs) to ensure that the scenarios are both realistic and relevant to their training needs [3]. While simulation is effective in improving certain aspects of communication, such as teamwork in simulated contexts, it is important to consider the limitations and whether it translates to improved performance in real-world operations [6]. Additionally, the role of non-technical skills in crisis management and how to integrate these into simulation training need to be further explored [8].

3.4 Addressing Miscommunication: Insights from Incident Analysis

Analyzing instances of miscommunication in pilot-controller interactions can provide valuable insights into the areas where Aviation English (AE) training programs must be strengthened [1]. Studies examining actual pilot-controller audio have

revealed common causes of miscommunication, including procedural deviations and unclear instructions [1]. These findings highlight the importance of adherence to standard communication protocols and the maintenance of proper radio discipline [1]. In addition, the analysis revealed that miscommunication is often due to a lack of understanding or misinterpretation of messages, emphasizing the need for training programs to focus on developing clear and unambiguous communication skills [1].

The impact of status asymmetry between team members on communication failures also requires attention [9]. Trainees' inability to effectively challenge authority figures, even when incorrect clinical decisions are made, can lead to critical communication gaps [9]. This highlights the need to design training programs that address power dynamics within teams and encourage open communication, even in hierarchical settings. Also, the analysis of mishaps in aviation highlights external factors influencing decision-making processes, such as the technological environment, misperceptions, mental awareness, and basic skills [10]. Addressing these factors in training programs can further improve safety and communication.

3.5 The Potential of Technology in Enhancing Communication

Technological advancements offer opportunities to enhance Aviation English (AE) training and improve communication in the aviation industry. Virtual reality (VR) and simulation-based training provide immersive learning experiences [11], [2]. However, challenges remain in creating realistic and engaging VR training programs that accurately reflect the complex and dynamic nature of aviation communication [11]. The use of natural language processing (NLP) in analyzing air traffic control communications could help identify patterns of miscommunication and inform the development of targeted training programs [12]. However, challenges such as ambiguity in communication, limited training data, and lack of multilingual support must be addressed [12].

Also, integrating technology into assessment methodologies can enhance the authenticity and validity of Aviation English (AE) proficiency tests [2]. Interactive online testing allows for a more dynamic and realistic assessment of communication skills, providing more in-depth insights into a candidate's strengths and weaknesses [2]. However, the development and implementation of effective technology-based assessment tools require careful consideration of factors such as accessibility, usability and security [13]. The use of technology in training and assessment must also consider ethical implications such as data privacy and security [12].

3.6 Integrating Best Practices and Future Directions

Effective Aviation English (AE) training programs should integrate best practices from various fields, including language education, communication skills training, and human factors engineering [5] [3]. A comprehensive approach is needed to address both linguistic and non-linguistic competencies, ensuring that trainees develop the necessary skills and attitudes for effective communication in aviation environments [3]. The use of simulation-based learning, coupled with rigorous assessment methodologies, can enhance the effectiveness of training programs [2], [6]. The integration of technology can further enhance training and assessment, providing more realistic and engaging learning experiences [11], [12].

Future research should focus on several key aspects. This includes developing more robust and valid assessment tools that accurately measure Aviation English (AE) proficiency in authentic contexts [2], [3]. Further investigation is also needed into the effectiveness of different training methodologies, including the optimal use of simulation-based learning [5], [7]. The role of non-technical skills in aviation communication and how they can be effectively integrated into training programs requires further exploration [8]. Finally, research should examine the ethical implications of integrating technology into Aviation English (AE) training and assessment to ensure that these technologies are used responsibly and equitably [12].

4 Results and Discussion

The literature review revealed several key findings regarding the current state of Aviation English (AE) training programs and the broader challenges affecting communication in aviation. The findings were grouped into five major themes: (1) limitations of current assessment methods, (2) variability and gaps in training design, (3) benefits and constraints of simulation-based learning, (4) patterns of miscommunication in real-world interactions, and (5) the emerging role of technology in Aviation English (AE) training and assessment.

4. 1 Limitations of Current AE Assessment Methods

Traditional Aviation English (AE) assessments, particularly paper-based or decontextualized tests, are insufficient for evaluating communicative competence in authentic aviation scenarios. These methods lack the interactive and dynamic components necessary to assess how pilots and traffic controllers (ATCOs) respond to real-time, high-stress situations [2], [3]. As the assessment of oral communication continues to evolve, incorporating both traditional and innovative approaches is essential to accurately capture communicative competence in real-world contexts [13]. Without valid and realistic assessments, it is difficult to identify areas for improvement or to measure training effectiveness. Additionally, existing testing practices often fail to incorporate non-linguistic competencies, such as situational awareness and assertiveness, which are crucial in radiotelephony communication [3], [8].

4.2 Variability and Gaps in Aviation English (AE) Training Programs

Aviation English (AE) training programs differ significantly in terms of content, focus, and pedagogical design. Some emphasize grammatical and phonological accuracy, whereas others prioritize communicative tasks and strategic competence (Tosqui-Lucks & Silva, 2020). The absence of a unified framework or set of standards has led to uneven implementation and uncertain outcomes (McCulloch et al., 2011). Another concern is that many programs underrepresent critical non-technical skills, such as decision-making, leadership, and teamwork, which are essential for managing complex flight operations and emergency scenarios.

4.3 Simulation-Based Learning: Potential and Limitations

Simulation-based training has been widely recognized as a powerful tool for enhancing the instruction of Aviation English (AE). It enables learners to engage with realistic scenarios in a controlled, risk-free environment, promoting both linguistic and strategic competence [4]. High-fidelity simulations foster experiential learning and immediate feedback, thereby improving trainees' ability to respond under pressure. However, the success of simulation training depends on multiple factors, including scenario realism, instructor expertise and resource availability. High implementation costs and limited access in some regions may hinder their widespread adoption [8].

4.4 Insights from Miscommunication Analysis

Several studies have highlighted the recurring nature of miscommunications between pilots and traffic controllers (ATCOs), especially in high-stakes or ambiguous scenarios. Common issues include unclear phraseology, deviation from standard procedures, and hesitance to challenge authority [1], [9]. These incidents underscore the need for Aviation English (AE) programs to go beyond language proficiency and focus on building communicative confidence and clarity, particularly in hierarchical or multicultural teams. Training must also incorporate strategies to overcome power imbalances and promote assertive, yet respectful, communication [9].

4.5 Technological Integration and Innovation in Aviation English (AE) Training

Emerging technologies, such as virtual reality (VR) and natural language processing (NLP), show great promise in transforming Aviation English (AE) training. VR enables immersive learning, whereas NLP tools can analyze real-world communication patterns and provide automated feedback [11],[12]. These technologies have the potential to enhance instruction and assessment by offering more

engaging, personalized, and data-informed training experiences. However, technological solutions also raise concerns about accessibility, data privacy, and the need for instructor training and curriculum alignment [12].

5 Conclusion

Bridging communication gaps in the skies requires an integrated approach that addresses the challenges of assessing Aviation English (AE) proficiency, designing effective training programs, and leveraging technology to enhance communication skills in the cockpit. Although significant progress has been made in developing Aviation English (AE) training programs, continued research and development are needed to ensure that these programs are effective in preventing miscommunication and promoting safety in the aviation industry. A more standardized, research-based, and technology-enhanced approach to Aviation English (AE) training is crucial for ensuring clear and effective communication between pilots and traffic controllers (ATCOs) worldwide, ultimately contributing to safer air travel. The continued development of robust assessment tools, investigation of diverse training methodologies, and responsible integration of technology are vital steps towards achieving this goal. Addionally, a thorough understanding of the specific linguistic and non-linguistic competencies required for effective aviation communication will be instrumental in designing and implementing training programs that meet the demands of this high-stakes profession in the future.

Acknowledgment:

I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to Jonah Gonzalo, a true friend and mentor, whose guidance, encouragement, and insights were instrumental in the completion of this paper. I also extend my sincere thanks to my partner, Nico, for his unwavering support and understanding throughout this journey. Above all, I give thanks to God, whose grace, wisdom, and strength sustained me every step of the way.

References:

[1] Hamzah, Haryani & Fei, Wong. (2018). Miscommunication in Pilot-controller Interaction. 24. 10.17576/3L-2018-2404-15.

[2] Park, Moonyoung. (2018). Innovative assessment of aviation English in a virtual world: Windows into cognitive and metacognitive strategies. ReCALL. 30. 1-18. 10.1017/S0958344017000362.

[3] Monteiro, A. L. T. (2021). Reconsidering the measurement of proficiency in pilot and air traffic controller radiotelephony communication: From construct definition to task design. In *8th GEIA Seminar* [Conference-proceeding]. https://geia.icea.decea.mil.br/geia/viiiseminariogeia/arquivo/HandoutAnaLu%CC%81ciaGEIA2021.pdf

[4] Tosqui-Lucks, P., & Silva, A. L. B. de C. e. (2020). Aeronautical English: Investigating the nature of this specific language in search of new heights. *The ESPecialist*, *41*(3). https://doi.org/10.23925/2318-7115.2020v41i3a2

[5] McCulloch P, Rathbone J, Catchpole K. Interventions to improve teamwork and communications among healthcare staff. Br J Surg. 2011 Apr;98(4):469-79. doi: 10.1002/bjs.7434. Epub 2011 Feb 8. PMID: 21305537.

[6] Lateef F. Simulation-based learning: Just like the real thing. J Emerg Trauma Shock. 2010 Oct;3(4):348-52. doi: 10.4103/0974-2700.70743. PMID: 21063557; PMCID: PMC2966567.

[7] Lewis R, Strachan A, Smith MM. Is high fidelity simulation the most effective method for the development of non-technical skills in nursing? A review of the current evidence. Open Nurs J. 2012;6:82-9. doi: 10.2174/1874434601206010082. Epub 2012 Jul 27. PMID: 22893783; PMCID: PMC3415625.

[8] Glavin RJ. Skills, training, and education. Simul Healthc. 2011 Feb;6(1):4-7. doi: 10.1097/SIH.0b013e31820aa1ee. PMID: 21330844.

[9] Friedman, Z., Hayter, M. A., Everett, T. C., Matava, C. T., Noble, L. M. K., & Bould, M. D.

(2015). Power and conflict: the effect of a superior's interpersonal behaviour on trainees' ability to challenge authority during a simulated airway emergency. *Anaesthesia*, *70*(10), 1119–1129. https://doi.org/10.1111/anae.13191

[10] Miranda, A. T. (2018). Understanding Human Error in Naval Aviation Mishaps. *Human Factors*, *60*(6), 763-777. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018720818771904 (Original work published 2018)

[11] Xie, B., Liu, H., Alghofaili, R., Zhang, Y., Jiang, Y., Lobo, F. D., Li, C., Li, W., Huang, H., Akdere, M., Mousas, C., & Yu, L. (2021). A review on virtual Reality skill training applications. *Frontiers in Virtual Reality*, *2*. https://doi.org/10.3389/frvir.2021.645153

[12] Yang, C., & Huang, C. (2023). Natural Language Processing (NLP) in Aviation Safety: Systematic Review of Research and Outlook into the Future. *Aerospace*, *10*(7), 600. https://doi.org/10.3390/aerospace10070600

[13] Ockey, G. J., & Li, Z. (2016). New and not so new methods for assessing oral communication. Language Value, 7(1). https://doi.org/10.6035/languagev.2015.7.2