"Exploring data literacy and human-AI collaboration skills in Predictive Maintenance Training."

Manyanga David Victor Vanessa[1], Wu Honglan[2]
[1,2](Dept. of Civil Aviation Nanjing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Nanjing 210016, China)

ABSTRACT: *The aviation industry's shift toward Predictive Maintenance (PdM), powered by Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Big Data, is transforming the role of maintenance technicians from manual troubleshooters to data-driven decision-makers. While PdM systems can forecast component degradation and optimize maintenance schedules, their success ultimately depends on the technician's ability to interpret and act upon probabilistic information. Current research has concentrated on the technical development of PdM algorithms and traditional human error, leaving a significant gap in understanding the cognitive and collaborative skills required in this emerging digital environment.*

This paper explores the competencies of data literacy and human AI collaboration as critical enablers for effective PdM implementation. It argues that existing Maintenance Resource Management (MRM) training does not adequately prepare technicians for decision-making under uncertainty, thereby increasing the risks of automation bias and data misinterpretation.

Using a conceptual qualitative synthesis, the study develops a structured competency framework that integrates two key domains: (1) data literacy emphasizing the evaluation of data quality and probabilistic Remaining Useful Life (RUL) outputs and (2) human AI collaboration focusing on calibrated trust, interpretability, and feedback mechanisms in AI-assisted maintenance environments. By shifting the emphasis from manual proficiency to cognitive readiness, this framework supports a safer, human centered integration of AI into aircraft maintenance practice and establishes the foundation for future curriculum design and regulatory guidance in predictive maintenance training.

KEYWORDS *- Predictive Maintenance (PdM); Data Literacy; Human–AI Collaboration; Aviation Maintenance Training; Cognitive Readiness; Automation Bias.*

I. INTRODUCTION

1.The Paradigm Shift: From Reactive to Predictive Maintenance

High-reliability industries particularly commercial aviation are undergoing a profound transformation in maintenance philosophy, driven by the convergence of the Internet of Things (IoT), big-data analytics, and artificial intelligence (AI) (ICAO, 2023). [1]Traditional approaches relied primarily on reactive maintenance (repairing components after failure) or time-based preventive maintenance (servicing components at fixed intervals).

Modern aircraft now generate vast quantities of operational data, enabling a shift toward predictive maintenance (PdM) and prognostics and health management (PHM) (Al-Jumaili et al., 2012). [2]

These data-driven methods use machine-learning algorithms to estimate the remaining useful life (RUL) of critical components, allowing maintenance to be scheduled precisely when needed reducing costs, minimizing unscheduled downtime, and improving aircraft availability (Patibandla, 2023).[3]

1. Problem Statement: The Human–AI Interpretation Gap

While AI-based PdM systems have demonstrated strong predictive capability, their success ultimately depends on the human interpreter: the maintenance technician.

The technician's role is evolving from that of a hands-on fault-remedier to a data-centric decision-maker (Jasper, 2023). [6]This cognitive shift introduces a new class of human-factors hazards that existing Maintenance Resource Management (MRM) training programs fail to address (Reason & Hobbs, 2003).[4]

In the PdM environment, failures are no longer purely mechanical they increasingly result from cognitive errors and digital-literacy gaps. Two recurring issues illustrate this challenge:

Data Misinterpretation: The inability to evaluate the quality, context, and probabilistic nature of an RUL prediction can lead to either missed safety events or unnecessary component replacements (TU Delft Repository, 2022).[5]

Uncalibrated Reliance: Technicians may exhibit automation bias over-trusting AI outputs and neglecting verification or, conversely, algorithmic distrust, rejecting valid predictions (ICAO, 2023).[1]

Consequently, the enormous investment in PdM infrastructure is constrained by a shortage of technicians trained to make sound, data-informed judgments.

2.Aims of the Paper

To address these emerging safety and operational challenges, this paper pursues two primary aims:

To define core competencies: conceptually identify and categorize the data-literacy and human–AI collaboration skills essential for maintenance professionals operating in PdM environments.

To propose a training framework: outline a structured model for integrating these competencies into existing maintenance-training curricula (e.g., EASA Part 147 or FAA-approved programs) to support effective, safe, and efficient human AI teamwork.

3. Research Gap and Contribution

Most existing research on PdM in aviation emphasizes the technical performance of AI and machine-learning models (Patibandla, 2023)[3] or explores regulatory and ethical aspects of automation (Henneberry et al., 2023)[14]. Limited attention has been paid to the human competencies required to interpret and apply predictive outputs in real maintenance contexts.

Recent reviews also show that current aviation-training curricula underemphasize AI, data analytics, and machine-learning concepts, creating a misalignment between workforce preparation and industry needs (Transport and Telecommunication Institute, 2023).

This study contributes by moving beyond technology to address the human dimension of PdM adoption. It proposes a structured, data-centric competency model grounded in human-factors and cognitive-science theory that links the demands of prognostic data to measurable technician skills.

The resulting framework provides aviation-maintenance organizations and training institutions with a foundation for developing the digitally proficient maintenance workforce required for the next generation of predictive maintenance systems.

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK DEVELOPMENT

Core Competency Framework for Predictive Maintenance (PdM) Technicians

1. Overview

The transition to Predictive Maintenance (PdM) requires more than the adoption of new technologies it demands a fundamental transformation of technician competencies. Traditional maintenance training emphasizes procedural compliance and mechanical skill; however, PdM environments require technicians to engage in data interpretation, probabilistic reasoning, and collaborative decision-making with AI systems.

To address this shift, a three-pillar PdM Competency Model is proposed. The framework defines the cognitive and behavioral skills necessary for technicians to operate effectively in data-driven maintenance environments.

The three core competency domains are:

Data Literacy – interpreting, validating, and applying probabilistic data.

Human–AI Collaboration (HAIC) and Trust – calibrating reliance on AI systems and engaging in explainable decision-making.

Organizational and Ethical Awareness – understanding accountability, feedback, and safety implications in AI-supported operations.

Each domain integrates targeted training interventions grounded in established human-factors and cognitive-learning principles.

2.Core Competency Framework for Predictive Maintenance (PdM) Technicians

Building on the aims outlined in Section 1, this paper develops a conceptual framework that identifies and organizes the essential human competencies required for effective Predictive Maintenance (PdM) in aviation.

While existing literature has primarily emphasized algorithmic accuracy and system reliability, there is limited attention to the human cognitive and organizational capabilities that determine the success of PdM implementation.

To address this gap, the following framework defines three integrated domains of technician competence: Data Literacy, Human–AI Collaboration and Trust, and Organizational and Ethical Awareness. Each domain is supported by a structured set of skills, cognitive challenges, and training interventions designed to enhance safety, interpretability, and human oversight in AI-driven maintenance environments.

A: Data Literacy

Definition: Data Literacy in the context of Predictive Maintenance (PdM) refers to the technician's ability to understand, interpret, and critically evaluate maintenance data generated by AI systems, particularly probabilistic indicators such as Remaining Useful Life (RUL).

It extends beyond technical data handling it represents a cognitive competency that integrates analytical reasoning, contextual understanding, and safety-centered judgment.

In traditional maintenance, technicians relied on deterministic indicators such as fixed inspection intervals or binary fault codes ("OK"/"Not OK"). PdM, however, introduces probabilistic information a component may have a 70% chance of failure within 100 flight hours, or a predicted RUL of 50 hours ±10%.

These outputs demand interpretive reasoning, where the technician must assess data reliability, consider operational context, and decide whether to act immediately or continue operation safely.

Developing data literacy is therefore fundamental to avoiding two new hazards in predictive environments:

False confidence in misleading data (e.g., acting on noise or faulty sensors), and

Complacency toward uncertain predictions (e.g., ignoring early failure warnings).

A data-literate technician becomes a critical thinker rather than a passive receiver of AI information, ensuring maintenance decisions remain grounded in both analytical evidence and operational context.

Table I. Data Literacy Competency Framework

Skill Focus	Application in Maintenance	Cognitive Challenge	Training Intervention
Data Quality and Context	In PdM systems, technicians must validate whether a sensor's alert or prediction reflects a real physical condition or a data anomaly. For example, a compressor temperature spike may signal true mechanical degradation or a transient sensor fault caused by calibration drift or flight conditions. Technicians must cross-check data sources, operational parameters, and environmental conditions before trusting AI outputs.	The main cognitive challenge lies in distinguishing signal from noise, recognizing when patterns in the data represent genuine faults versus random or spurious fluctuations. This requires both analytical reasoning and contextual awareness.	Scenario-Based Training (SBT): Simulated PdM dashboards present data sets with deliberate errors (e.g., corrupted signals, incomplete data). Trainees must justify whether to act on or disregard AI alerts, explaining their reasoning. Post-simulation debriefs help them identify confirmation bias and improve diagnostic accuracy.
Uncertainty Interpretation	PdM systems present outputs such as a 70% probability of bearing failure within 80 flight hours. The technician must translate this statistical uncertainty into a maintenance decision: whether to schedule early replacement, continue operation, or escalate for engineering analysis.	The cognitive demand is in probabilistic reasoning, interpreting confidence intervals and balancing safety versus operational cost. Many technicians are accustomed to binary thresholds, so learning to interpret "shades of risk" requires cognitive flexibility.	Simulation Exercises: Using varying RUL probabilities (e.g., 60%, 80%, 95%), trainees decide and justify go/no-go actions. Instructors analyze how probability tolerance affects decision bias and safety outcomes. Over time, technicians build intuitive understanding of uncertainty, leading to more balanced, evidence-based maintenance planning.

Core Competency Domain A: Data Literacy skills, cognitive challenges, and training interventions for effective interpretation of predictive maintenance data.

Through these activities, data literacy evolves from a purely technical skill to a cognitive competency, supporting safer and more cost-effective maintenance planning.

Data Quality and Context Awareness

In PdM, the accuracy of predictions depends on the quality of sensor inputs and contextual factors (e.g., temperature, pressure, aircraft utilization rate). Poor data quality can mislead even the most advanced algorithms. A technician must therefore develop an analytical habit of cross-verification checking sensor health, comparing multiple parameters, and understanding the operational history of each component.

This competency relates to the situation awareness model proposed by Endsley (1995)[15], where technicians must perceive data accurately, comprehend its meaning in context, and project its implications for maintenance outcomes. A lack of contextual evaluation can cause "automation-induced complacency," where technicians accept AI outputs without question, undermining safety.

Uncertainty Interpretation and Probabilistic Thinking

Unlike deterministic maintenance systems, PdM outputs rarely provide absolute answers. Instead, technicians receive confidence intervals or probabilistic predictions. For instance, an AI tool may suggest that "the hydraulic pump is 80% likely to fail within 60 flight hours."

Understanding this information requires technicians to develop statistical literacy the ability to interpret probability as a decision-support tool rather than a prediction of certainty.

This demands higher-order cognitive processing, as technicians must integrate uncertainty with operational judgment, risk tolerance, and safety margins. Inadequate probabilistic understanding can lead to automation bias, where technicians defer decisions to AI without assessing underlying reliability, or to algorithmic distrust, where valid warnings are ignored.

Cognitive Training Outcomes

Through structured, simulation-based interventions, data literacy training transforms technicians from procedural operators into analytical evaluators.

It equips them to:

Critically assess data reliability and AI output consistency.

Balance risk decisions under uncertainty with confidence.

Communicate data-driven reasoning clearly during team decision-making.

Ultimately, data literacy evolves from being a technical proficiency (e.g., "reading system outputs") to a core cognitive competency one that underpins every decision in AI-assisted maintenance environments. This transformation supports both safety assurance and cost efficiency, ensuring technicians remain the intelligent interpreters of predictive systems, not their passive executors.

2.Core Competency Domain

B: Human–AI Collaboration (HAIC) and Trust

Definition: Human–AI Collaboration (HAIC) in Predictive Maintenance (PdM) refers to a technician's ability to work effectively and safely alongside AI systems, treating them as analytical partners rather than infallible authorities.

The goal is to maintain calibrated trust a balance between reliance and skepticism so that technicians neither over-trust AI outputs (automation bias) nor dismiss accurate predictions due to distrust or misunderstanding (algorithmic distrust).

In PdM contexts, AI algorithms generate probabilistic predictions about equipment health. For example, an AI system may forecast that a bleed air valve has an 85% chance of failure within 40 flight hours. A technician with calibrated trust uses this information to inform, not replace, their judgment cross-checking system parameters, consulting maintenance logs, and validating sensor consistency before acting.

Developing effective HAIC skills ensures that AI serves as a decision-support tool, not a decision-maker, preserving human accountability and situational awareness.

Table II. Human–AI Collaboration (HAIC) Competency Framework

Table II. Human–AI Collaboration (HAIC) Competency Framework

Skill Focus	Application in Maintenance	Cognitive Challenge	Training Intervention
Calibrated Trust	In PdM, AI systems provide diagnostic recommendations based on large-scale data analysis. Technicians must decide when to accept, question, or override these outputs. For example, an AI system may flag a compressor as "healthy," yet the technician observes unusual vibration trends. Appropriate calibration involves recognizing when human insight outweighs algorithmic confidence.	The challenge lies in managing trust asymmetry the natural human tendency to either over-rely on automation (automation bias) or under-rely due to skepticism. Both extremes reduce system safety. The technician must learn to dynamically assess AI reliability in real time.	Trust Calibration Exercises: Trainees interact with AI tools programmed with varying reliability levels (e.g., 98%, 90%, 75%). As reliability shifts unpredictably, trainees record and justify their trust level in each scenario. Post-exercise debriefs highlight patterns of over-trust or distrust, promoting self-awareness and adaptive reliance behavior.
Explainable AI (XAI) Utilization	Modern PdM systems are increasingly equipped with explainable AI (XAI) interfaces that visualize why certain predictions are made for example, displaying feature importance graphs showing that compressor temperature, not vibration, triggered the fault alert. Technicians must interpret this logic and connect it to physical systems to ensure the prediction is plausible.	The cognitive demand is in linking abstract algorithmic reasoning to concrete mechanical understanding. Technicians must comprehend how input features influence outcomes and validate whether these relationships are physically meaningful or spurious.	Root-Cause Analysis (RCA) via XAI Logs: Trainees analyze AI outputs using visualization tools (e.g., SHAP values or feature-weighting charts) and identify which sensor parameters contributed most to the prediction. They then correlate these with actual maintenance records to confirm or reject the AI's reasoning. This builds both analytical confidence and interpretive accountability.

Core Competency Domain B: Human–AI Collaboration and Trust skills, challenges, and training interventions supporting calibrated trust and explainable-AI utilization.

Developing these skills ensures technicians become informed supervisors of AI, capable of interpreting model reasoning rather than deferring blindly to its outputs.

Understanding Calibrated Trust

The relationship between humans and intelligent systems has long been described through the "appropriate reliance" framework proposed by Lee and See (2004), which emphasizes that optimal performance occurs when human trust aligns with system reliability. In PdM, this means technicians must learn to adjust their level of reliance dynamically trusting AI outputs when data is consistent and questioning them when anomalies appear.

Uncalibrated trust can manifest as:

Automation Bias: unquestioning acceptance of AI outputs, leading to overlooked faults or deferred maintenance actions.

Algorithmic Distrust: premature rejection of valid AI alerts, often due to lack of understanding of how predictions are generated.

Trust calibration training develops metacognition awareness of one's thought process enabling technicians to monitor and adjust their confidence in AI over time. By practicing in simulated environments with intentionally varying AI reliability, trainees build the habit of continuous evaluation rather than blind acceptance.

Explainable AI (XAI) and Cognitive Transparency

Explainable AI (XAI) is critical for fostering human interpretability and accountability in PdM. Traditional AI systems operate as "black boxes," offering predictions without showing how those conclusions were reached. This opacity undermines trust and limits human learning.

By exposing internal reasoning such as showing that a specific temperature anomaly contributed 45% to a predicted failure XAI allows technicians to understand why the AI reached its decision. This fosters cognitive transparency, aligning algorithmic reasoning with physical intuition.

Training technicians to use XAI interfaces also develops cross-domain literacy: they learn to bridge data-science concepts (e.g., feature weighting) with engineering knowledge (e.g., thermodynamic relationships). Over time, this interdisciplinary awareness leads to better fault interpretation, faster root-cause identification, and improved maintenance efficiency.

Cognitive and Behavioral Transformation

Human–AI collaboration training moves technicians from being system users to system supervisors.

After targeted HAIC training, technicians:

Learn to challenge AI predictions constructively, not emotionally.

Understand confidence thresholds and model limitations.

Maintain accountability by documenting the rationale for AI acceptance or override.

Communicate AI findings effectively within maintenance teams and across departments (engineering, data analytics, operations).

These behaviors foster a culture of shared situational awareness, where human insight and machine intelligence complement each other rather than compete.

Ultimately, HAIC training creates resilient decision-makers who can adapt to both system uncertainty and AI evolution ensuring safety remains human-centered in increasingly automated environments.

3.Core Competency Domain

C: Organizational and Ethical Awareness

Definition: Organizational and Ethical Awareness in Predictive Maintenance (PdM) refers to the technician's understanding of their role within a larger socio-technical system how individual actions, decisions, and data inputs influence organizational safety, accountability, and learning.

In AI-assisted maintenance environments, technicians are no longer just executors of scheduled tasks; they are data contributors, interpreters, and decision influencers whose choices directly impact predictive model reliability and overall airworthiness.

This domain emphasizes two interconnected dimensions:

Organizational Accountability – recognizing one's responsibility within safety management structures and communication channels.

Ethical Responsibility – understanding the moral and professional duty to ensure AI outputs are used safely, transparently, and fairly.

Developing awareness in these areas ensures that predictive maintenance does not become a technically efficient but ethically fragile system, but rather a resilient, learning-oriented ecosystem grounded in human judgment and organizational trust

Table III. Proposed Three-Stage Validation Framework

Table III. Proposed Three-Stage Validation Framework

Skill Focus	Application in Maintenance	Cognitive Challenge	Training Intervention
Accountability and Safety	Technicians must document and justify decisions to accept or override AI-generated recommendations. For instance, if the AI predicts a low failure probability but the technician detects physical anomalies, a decision to ground the aircraft must be supported with a clear rationale.	The challenge lies in defining who is accountable when human and AI judgments diverge. Ambiguity about responsibility can lead to blame-shifting or hesitation in safety-critical decisions.	Just-Culture Workshops: Case studies explore incidents involving conflicting human-AI decisions. Trainees discuss reasoning, outcomes, and accountability within a "blame-free" learning environment. The focus is on decision quality, not error punishment.
Feedback Loop Engagement	PDM systems rely on continuous feedback to improve algorithm accuracy. When technicians record post-maintenance findings (e.g., confirming whether an AI prediction was correct), they close the data loop and enhance system learning.	The main challenge is organizational inertia technicians often see data reporting as secondary to "hands-on" work. Without consistent feedback, AI models degrade in accuracy over time.	Post-Maintenance Reporting Simulations: Trainees document inspection outcomes, system states, and maintenance actions in simulated Pd M databases. Structured debriefs emphasize how data completeness and accuracy directly improve AI reliability and maintenance planning efficiency.

equential stages for validating the PdM Competency Model, detailing objectives, methods, and expected outcomes across expert evaluation, simulation, and curriculum-integration pilots.

These competencies reinforce the human's role as the final authority on airworthiness decisions while fostering a culture of continuous organizational learning.

Accountability and Ethical Decision-Making

In traditional maintenance, accountability was clear-cut: technicians followed procedures, and errors were traced to human performance.

In PdM, accountability becomes more complex decisions are shared between human and AI systems. A technician may decide to act or not act based on an AI-generated probability, blurring the boundary between mechanical reliability and cognitive judgment.

This raises key ethical questions:

Who is responsible when an AI recommendation leads to a maintenance oversight?

How should technicians balance organizational pressure for operational efficiency against the duty to prioritize safety?

Training must therefore emphasize ethical discernment the ability to make and justify decisions that align with both technical evidence and moral responsibility. The "Just Culture" framework (Reason, 1997) provides the ideal foundation, promoting accountability without punishment and encouraging honest reporting of AI-related errors.

When technicians feel psychologically safe to report near-misses or data misinterpretations, organizations gain invaluable learning opportunities that strengthen the predictive system.

Feedback Loop Engagement and Continuous Learning

Predictive maintenance systems are inherently data-dependent their predictive accuracy relies on feedback from real-world outcomes. If a technician replaces a component early but fails to record the actual failure status, the AI model cannot learn whether its prediction was correct. Over time, this lack of feedback erodes model reliability.

Technicians must therefore see themselves not only as maintenance executors but also as co-creators of data integrity. By systematically entering maintenance outcomes, they participate in a continuous improvement loop that enhances both the AI system and the organization's operational intelligence.

This feedback engagement aligns with the principles of Safety Management Systems (SMS) and Organizational Learning Theory, where each maintenance action contributes to collective knowledge. Proper training reinforces that accurate data entry and reflection are not administrative burdens but safety-critical tasks that uphold the long-term effectiveness of PdM programs.

Organizational Culture and Ethical Climate

The development of organizational and ethical awareness also depends on a supportive culture.

Organizations that prioritize transparency, fairness, and communication are more likely to succeed in implementing PdM safely.

When leaders frame AI not as a tool for surveillance but as an enabler of learning, technicians feel empowered to question predictions and share observations without fear of blame.

Training programs should therefore include organizational-level interventions such as:

Leadership workshops on managing AI accountability.

Cross-departmental discussions between data scientists, engineers, and technicians.

Reflective exercises where teams analyze how their collective decisions influence safety metrics.

By cultivating an ethical climate rooted in trust, transparency, and learning, organizations can ensure that AI-driven maintenance complements not replaces human judgment and moral responsibility.

Cognitive and Behavioral Outcomes

Training in this domain transforms technicians into ethically aware system participants who:

Take ownership of their maintenance decisions and document justifications clearly.

Actively contribute feedback to AI systems, improving predictive accuracy.

Engage in transparent discussions about AI performance and model reliability.

Demonstrate ethical integrity by prioritizing safety even under operational pressure.

Such outcomes contribute to a culture of informed accountability, where human and AI collaboration is reinforced by ethical consistency and organizational trust.

Organizational and Ethical Awareness completes the PdM competency model by linking technical decision-making with organizational learning and moral responsibility. It ensures that as AI transforms aviation maintenance, humans remain the ethical anchors and quality guardians of predictive systems.

III. CURRICULUM INTEGRATION AND EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

1. Integration and Curriculum Implications

The proposed Predictive Maintenance Competency Model can be effectively embedded into existing EASA Part 147 and FAA-approved Maintenance Training Organization (MTO) curricula by expanding beyond procedural skill instruction to include cognitive, analytical, and ethical competencies.

Integration can occur through the following three instructional modifications:

Digital-Simulation Environments

The use of high-fidelity digital twin environments and virtual maintenance simulators provides a controlled yet realistic platform for experiential learning. These systems replicate actual aircraft systems and PdM dashboards, allowing trainees to interact with synthetic or historical maintenance data safely and repeatedly.

Through simulated fault conditions and AI-generated Remaining Useful Life (RUL) predictions, technicians can practice data validation, uncertainty interpretation, and AI collaboration without operational risk.

This approach supports experiential cognition, enabling learners to visualize system behaviors, understand probabilistic patterns, and develop decision confidence in predictive contexts.

According to Boeing (2023)[12], digital twin training environments not only improve knowledge retention but also shorten skill acquisition time by enabling immediate feedback and iterative learning.

Incorporating digital simulation into Part 147 programs thus redefines the "hands-on" component from purely mechanical manipulation to data-driven scenario management, aligning maintenance education with the realities of intelligent maintenance systems.

Scenario-Based and Experiential Learning

Traditional maintenance training often emphasizes procedural compliance—performing checklists and routine tasks by rote. In a PdM context, however, technicians must navigate uncertainty and probabilistic risk, requiring flexible and adaptive thinking.

Scenario-Based Training (SBT) immerses learners in dynamic, data-rich situations where no single correct answer exists. For example, trainees may face conflicting AI outputs and physical observations, forcing them to balance risk, reliability, and safety priorities.

This form of cognitive simulation encourages decision-making under ambiguity, reflective reasoning, and the development of critical thinking under pressure.

According to TU Delft Repository (2022)[5], scenario-based learning promotes transfer of knowledge to real operational settings by engaging higher-order cognitive processes rather than procedural memory. Embedding SBT in aviation maintenance curricula ensures that trainees can interpret AI information, justify decisions transparently, and respond confidently to uncertain or conflicting system feedback.

Interdisciplinary Collaboration Modules

Predictive Maintenance is inherently cross-disciplinary requiring interaction among maintenance technicians, data scientists, reliability engineers, and AI specialists.

Current maintenance programs rarely address this collaborative interface, leading to communication barriers that hinder the practical use of PdM systems.

Structured interdisciplinary collaboration modules can bridge this gap by fostering mutual understanding between human and algorithmic reasoning.

For example, trainees could participate in joint workshops where data scientists explain how AI models interpret sensor data, while technicians provide operational insights on physical system behavior.

These exchanges cultivate shared mental models, ensuring both groups interpret PdM outputs consistently and communicate effectively across technical boundaries.

ICAO (2023)[16] highlights that such collaboration improves not only technical integration but also organizational resilience, as cross-functional literacy enables teams to identify potential system errors earlier and implement corrective strategies proactively.

Educational Impact

Collectively, these curricular adaptations reposition aviation maintenance training from a compliance-oriented paradigm toward a cognition-oriented paradigm.

Trainees transition from "following procedures" to analyzing systems, from "reacting to faults" to anticipating failures, and from "executing commands" to collaborating with intelligent systems.

This reorientation aligns with the broader aviation goal of developing human-AI synergy, where cognitive readiness, ethical accountability, and technical skill operate in tandem to sustain safety and efficiency.

Summary of the Model's Value

The proposed PdM Competency Model bridges the critical gap between technological innovation and human capability in modern aviation maintenance.

By explicitly integrating cognitive, behavioral, and ethical skills into the technical training pipeline, it ensures that the human workforce remains adaptable, informed, and ethically grounded as AI technologies evolve.

Theoretical Contribution

From a theoretical perspective, the model expands traditional Maintenance Resource Management (MRM) and Human Factors frameworks by introducing data literacy, calibrated trust, and ethical awareness as measurable competencies.

This reconceptualization supports the development of Human-Centered AI systems, emphasizing interpretability and shared control rather than automation dominance.

It provides aviation educators and policymakers with a conceptual structure to align regulatory training standards with the data-driven realities of predictive maintenance environments.

Practical Contribution

Practically, the model serves as a blueprint for designing curricula, training modules, and assessment tools that prepare technicians for data-intensive maintenance roles.

It connects theoretical understanding with applied decision-making by embedding simulation, scenario-based learning, and cross-functional collaboration into the training process.

This integration produces technicians who are not only technically proficient but also cognitively adaptable and ethically responsible capable of interpreting AI reasoning, recognizing data quality issues, and upholding safety accountability in complex operational contexts.

Pathways for Empirical Validation

While this study presents a conceptual model, it establishes a foundation for future empirical validation.

The model's impact can be measured through:

Scenario-based performance assessments, evaluating how technicians respond to uncertainty and AI-generated alerts.

Trust calibration metrics, measuring changes in appropriate reliance and self-awareness when interacting with AI systems.

Maintenance performance indicators, such as fault detection accuracy, data-reporting quality, and communication effectiveness during interdisciplinary tasks.

Such validation will provide evidence-based refinement, allowing the competency model to evolve into a standardized framework for PdM training across global aviation institutions.

By merging technological progress with human cognitive development, this model ensures that the future of aviation maintenance remains human-centered, ethically grounded, and operationally intelligent.

It equips technicians not just to use AI but to understand, question, and improve it, safeguarding the balance between innovation, accountability, and safety.

IV. METHODOLOGICAL DESIGN AND VALIDATION PLAN

Proposed Validation Framework and Methodological Design

Overview

As this study is conceptual and exploratory in nature, it does not involve direct experimentation or field implementation. Instead, it proposes a qualitative validation framework designed to guide future empirical testing of the Predictive Maintenance (PdM) Competency Model.

This framework outlines structured stages through which the effectiveness, relevance, and instructional viability of the identified competencies Data Literacy, Human–AI Collaboration, and Organizational and Ethical Awareness can be systematically evaluated within aviation maintenance training contexts.

The proposed methodology follows the Design Science Research (DSR) and qualitative synthesis traditions (Gregor & Hevner, 2013)[10]. In this paradigm, conceptual artifacts such as frameworks, models, or training systems are first designed based on theoretical and empirical literature, and subsequently validated through iterative feedback, simulation, and expert review.

This approach ensures both conceptual soundness and practical relevance, enabling the PdM Competency Model to evolve into a robust foundation for future data-driven aviation training design.

Research Design

The proposed validation process consists of three sequential stages, each addressing a distinct layer of validation conceptual, behavioral, and instructional.

This staged approach ensures the model is examined progressively, from expert conceptual scrutiny to practical training feasibility.

Table IV. Validation Framework for the PdM Competency Model

Stage	Objective	Method	Expected Outcome
Stage 1: Expert Evaluation	Establish content validity of the competency framework.	Conduct structured interviews or Delphi-style feedback sessions with subject matter experts (e.g., senior maintenance instructors, Part 147 training managers, human-factors specialists).	Consensus on the completeness and realism of the identified competencies.
Stage 2: Scenario-Based Simulation	Assess the behavioral expression of target competencies in simulated PDM environments.	Develop training scenarios using AI-supported maintenance case studies where participants interpret probabilistic RUL data and AI recommendations.	Observation of technician decision-making strategies, trust calibration, and data interpretation accuracy.
Stage 3: Curriculum Integration Pilot	Evaluate feasibility of embedding the competency model into existing maintenance training.	Apply selected modules (e.g., data-interpretation labs or trust calibration exercises) in a small-scale pilot within a training organization. Collect instructor and trainee feedback.	Identification of instructional gaps, assessment metrics, and refinements to the competency model.

Sequential stages outlining objectives, methods, and expected outcomes for validating the PdM Competency Model through expert review, simulation, and pilot integration.

This staged design ensures progressive validation without requiring extensive field deployment, making it feasible within a conceptual study context.

Validation Rationale and Process Flow

Each stage contributes a distinct dimension of evidence:

Stage 1 (Conceptual Validation): Ensures that the competency domains and subskills are theoretically grounded and relevant to industry needs. Expert feedback establishes content validity and eliminates conceptual overlap or redundancy.

Stage 2 (Behavioral Validation): Links theory to practice by observing how technicians apply competencies under simulated predictive conditions. Behavioral markers (e.g., confidence calibration, ethical reasoning under uncertainty) provide construct validity.

Stage 3 (Instructional Validation): Tests the model's real-world feasibility within existing regulatory structures, verifying its pedagogical validity—the degree to which it can be taught, assessed, and sustained in actual training environments.

The process is iterative, allowing insights from each stage to inform subsequent revisions.

For example, feedback from expert reviews may refine the competency taxonomy, which then shapes simulation design; simulation findings, in turn, inform the pilot curriculum design.

This feedback loop reflects the cyclical logic of design-science research, where understanding and artifact co-evolve through evaluation.

Data Collection and Analysis Approach

Although empirical data are not collected in this conceptual phase, future validation can employ qualitative thematic analysis of expert interviews and simulation observations.

This method allows researchers to identify patterns of competency manifestation (e.g., evidence of data reasoning, trust calibration, or ethical justification).

Triangulation across multiple data sources expert input, simulation logs, and trainee reflections would ensure credibility and robustness of findings.

Ethical considerations should also be incorporated, including informed consent, participant anonymity, and transparency in data handling, aligning with aviation training ethics and human-subject research standards.

Evaluation Metrics

While the framework is qualitative, it proposes measurable evaluation criteria aligned with established human-factors principles:

This staged validation framework provides a scalable pathway for testing and refining the PdM Competency Model.

It allows for:

Early detection of conceptual and instructional weaknesses before full-scale deployment.

Continuous alignment with evolving AI technologies and maintenance regulations.

Evidence-based improvement of training design and assessment criteria.

By linking expert knowledge, simulation evidence, and curriculum feedback, this framework establishes a rigorous foundation for the long-term integration of cognitive, technical, and ethical competencies into predictive maintenance education.

Table V. Summary of Theoretical and Practical Contributions

Table V. Summary of Theoretical and Practical Contributions

Evaluation Dimension	Description	Example Metric
Data Literacy Proficiency	Accuracy and confidence in interpreting PDM output data.	Number of correct maintenance decisions based on RUL probabilities.
Trust Calibration	Degree of alignment between AI reliability and technician reliance.	Trust score deviation (Lee & See, 2004).
Decision-Making Under Uncertainty	Ability to justify actions based on probabilistic data.	Frequency of documented rationale in decision logs.
Collaborative Communication	Effectiveness of team discussions involving data scientists and technicians.	Qualitative ratings from observer checklists.
Ethical Accountability	Awareness of safety implications when overriding or following AI outputs.	Self-reported reflection or just-culture survey responses.

Overview of how the PdM Competency Model extends existing human-factors theory and supports applied aviation-maintenance training.

These metrics would form the basis for a future empirical study, providing both qualitative richness and quantitative alignment with aviation safety assessment practices.

Reliability, Validity, and Ethical Considerations

To ensure methodological rigor in future empirical applications of this framework, four key principles should guide data collection and evaluation:

Triangulation: Combine multiple data sources expert reviews, trainee observations, and instructor feedback to cross-validate findings and minimize bias.

Expert Consensus: Apply Delphi techniques or structured feedback rounds to achieve intersubjective agreement on the framework's completeness and relevance.

Transferability: Document training scenarios, decision variables, and simulation parameters in sufficient detail to support replication across different aviation organizations and regulatory environments.

Ethical Compliance: Adhere to aviation training research ethics, ensuring informed consent, participant confidentiality, and alignment with ICAO (2023) ethical standards for educational research.

V. DISCUSSION,

Positioning the Competency Model within Existing Literature

The proposed Predictive Maintenance (PdM) Competency Model extends the human-factors discourse in aviation by reframing maintenance competence for the AI-driven era.

Traditional Maintenance Resource Management (MRM) frameworks (Reason & Hobbs, 2003)[4] have focused primarily on teamwork, error management, and communication. However, they were developed during an era dominated by manual diagnostics and procedural maintenance, not algorithmic prediction.

This study bridges that temporal and technological gap by introducing three interdependent cognitive domains Data Literacy, Human AI Collaboration (HAIC), and Organizational & Ethical Awareness that collectively redefine what constitutes technical proficiency in predictive maintenance.

While prior research (e.g., Al-Jumaili, 2012[2]; ICAO, 2023[16]) has highlighted the growing presence of AI and Big Data in aviation systems, few studies have articulated a structured human competency model capable of aligning human judgment with predictive analytics.

This framework, therefore, advances the literature by operationalizing abstract human factors (such as trust calibration, probabilistic reasoning, and ethical accountability) into trainable and observable competencies.

Cognitive and Behavioral Implications

At its core, the model recognizes that the success of AI-enabled maintenance depends as much on human cognition as on algorithmic accuracy.

Technicians must interpret uncertainty, challenge automated outputs, and make risk-informed judgments under dynamic operational conditions.

The Data Literacy domain strengthens technicians' analytical reasoning, enabling them to differentiate valid signals from noise and translate probabilistic Remaining Useful Life (RUL) values into actionable maintenance schedules.

The Human–AI Collaboration domain enhances adaptive trust behavior, helping technicians maintain calibrated reliance on AI systems while retaining accountability.

Finally, the Organizational and Ethical Awareness domain anchors these skills within a culture of responsibility, transparency, and feedback ensuring that PdM implementation remains aligned with aviation's core safety values.

Together, these competencies mark a cognitive transformation in the aviation workforce, transitioning technicians from procedural operators to analytical collaborators in hybrid human–AI maintenance ecosystems.

Educational and Institutional Implications

For training organizations, this framework offers a strategic blueprint for curriculum modernization.

By embedding simulation-based, scenario-driven, and interdisciplinary learning modules within EASA Part 147 and FAA-approved programs, maintenance education can evolve from rote procedural instruction to cognitive readiness training.

Digital twin simulations enable trainees to experience AI-generated predictive outputs in realistic contexts, while interdisciplinary collaboration fosters shared understanding between engineers, data scientists, and maintenance personnel.

Such training paradigms enhance not only individual technician performance but also organizational safety culture, ensuring that PdM integration occurs with human oversight, transparency, and ethical awareness.

This curricular realignment aligns with broader industry initiatives such as ICAO's "Next Generation Aviation Professionals" framework (2023[16]) which advocate for future-oriented training that blends technical expertise with data-driven decision-making and ethical accountability.

Theoretical Implications

From a theoretical standpoint, the PdM Competency Model contributes to Design Science Research (DSR) by exemplifying how conceptual models can bridge technological systems and human factors theory.

It extends cognitive systems engineering principles by emphasizing trust calibration, data reasoning, and organizational learning as integrated competencies within AI-human collaboration.

Moreover, by incorporating ethical reasoning and accountability into the core model, this research advances the emerging domain of Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence (HCAI) in aviation.

It provides a conceptual framework for balancing automation efficiency with human interpretability, supporting the idea that true system intelligence is distributed across both human and algorithmic agents.

VI. LIMITATION

As a conceptual study, this research does not provide empirical data to test the model's validity or its direct impact on technician performance.

The current findings are based on qualitative synthesis and theoretical inference rather than field trials.

Additionally, while the model is designed for commercial aviation, its generalizability to other high-consequence industries (e.g., rail, nuclear, maritime) requires further adaptation and validation.

Nevertheless, this limitation is methodological rather than conceptual: the model provides a robust foundation for empirical exploration, simulation-based validation, and longitudinal performance assessment in future research.

VII. FUTURE RESEARCH

Future studies should operationalize the proposed competencies into measurable performance indicators.

Potential research pathways include:

Empirical testing of technician decision-making accuracy and trust behavior using scenario-based simulations and eye-tracking metrics.

Longitudinal studies assessing how competency-based PdM training affects maintenance reliability, fault detection rates, and safety outcomes.

Cross-cultural analysis comparing how technicians from different regulatory regions interpret probabilistic data and AI outputs.

Algorithmic explainability research exploring how XAI interfaces influence technician trust, learning retention, and diagnostic precision.

By progressively validating and refining the framework, these future studies can transform the proposed model from a conceptual blueprint into an industry-standard training and certification framework for predictive maintenance professionals.

In summary, this discussion underscores that the integration of AI into aviation maintenance is not merely a technical evolution but a cognitive and organizational transformation.

The PdM Competency Model addresses this shift by identifying the essential human capabilities analytical reasoning, calibrated trust, and ethical accountability required to sustain safety and reliability in data-driven maintenance systems.

It repositions the human technician as a strategic collaborator in intelligent maintenance ecosystems, ensuring that as machines predict, humans still decide.

VIII. CONCLUSION

The aviation industry's rapid adoption of Predictive Maintenance (PdM) technologies powered by Artificial Intelligence (AI), Big Data, and digital connectivity demands an equally transformative evolution in human competencies. This study responds to that need by developing a conceptual PdM Competency Model that redefines the technician's role for the data-driven era.

The model identifies three interdependent domains Data Literacy, Human AI Collaboration and Trust, and Organizational & Ethical Awareness that collectively form the cognitive foundation for effective human performance in predictive maintenance environments.

Each domain captures a vital dimension of the modern maintenance task: understanding probabilistic data, managing trust in AI outputs, and ensuring ethical accountability within complex operational systems.

By embedding these competencies into existing EASA Part 147 and FAA-approved training curricula, maintenance organizations can shift from procedural compliance to cognitive readiness equipping technicians to think critically, collaborate intelligently with AI, and uphold safety through informed judgment. This integration ensures that human expertise remains the final safeguard in increasingly automated systems, maintaining the balance between efficiency, transparency, and trust.

Conceptually, this study contributes to the growing body of Human-Centered AI and Human Factors in Aviation Maintenance literature by articulating how data-driven decision-making intersects with human cognition and ethics. Practically, it offers a structured pathway for training institutions to modernize maintenance education in alignment with emerging predictive technologies.

While this work is conceptual, its proposed validation framework provides a clear roadmap for empirical testing through expert evaluation, simulation-based analysis, and pilot curriculum integration. Future research will transform this framework into an evidence-based standard for PdM workforce development, ensuring that as predictive technologies evolve, human capability evolves with them.

Ultimately, this study affirms that the strength of predictive maintenance lies not only in algorithms but in the humans who interpret, question, and apply them. The future of aviation maintenance will not be defined by automation alone, but by the collaboration between intelligent systems and intelligent humans, working together to sustain safety, reliability, and ethical responsibility in the skies.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by the Fundamental Research Fund for the Civil Aviation Administration of China (Security Fund No.: 2025-104)."

REFERENCES

[1] International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), Human Factors in the Age of Artificial Intelligence, Montreal, Canada: ICAO Publications, 2023.

[2] M. Al-Jumaili, "Prognostics and Health Management (PHM) Applications in Aviation Maintenance," Journal of Aircraft Engineering and Aerospace Technology, vol. 84, no. 5, pp. 412–421, 2012.

[3] R. Patibandla, "Machine Learning Approaches in Aviation Maintenance Systems," Journal of Aerospace Engineering, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 155–169, 2023.

[4] J. Reason and A. Hobbs, Managing Maintenance Error: A Practical Guide, Aldershot, U.K.: Ashgate Publishing, 2003.

[5] TU Delft Repository, "Assessing the Impact of Metrics on Prognostic Methodologies in

Predictive Maintenance," Delft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands, 2022.

[6] T. Jasper, "Human Factors and Data-Centric Decision Making in Predictive Maintenance," International Journal of Aviation Technology and Management, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 85–97, 2023.

[7] J. D. Lee and K. A. See, "Trust in Automation: Designing for Appropriate Reliance," Human Factors, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 50–80, 2004.

[8] J. Reason, Managing the Risks of Organizational Accidents, Aldershot, U.K.: Ashgate Publishing, 1997.

[9] J. Parasuraman and V. Riley, "Humans and Automation: Use, Misuse, Disuse, Abuse," Human Factors, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 230–253, 1997.

[10] S. Gregor and A. Hevner, "Positioning and Presenting Design Science Research for Maximum Impact," MIS Quarterly, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 337–355, 2013.

[11] V. Braun and V. Clarke, "Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology," Qualitative Research in Psychology, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 77–101, 2006.

[12] Boeing Global Services, Maintenance Synthetic Trainer Documentation, Seattle, WA, USA: Boeing, 2023.

[13] Transport and Telecommunication Institute, "Integration of Artificial Intelligence Competencies in Aviation Education," Riga, Latvia, 2023.

[14] A. Henneberry, D. Zhao, and M. Lin, "Regulatory Oversight of Artificial Intelligence in Predictive Maintenance Systems," Aerospace Policy Review, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 211–225, 2023.

[15] M. R. Endsley, "Toward a Theory of Situation Awareness in Dynamic Systems," Human Factors, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 32–64, 1995, doi: 10.1518/001872095779049543.

[16] International Civil Aviation Organization, Next Generation of Aviation Professionals (NGAP) Strategy, Montréal, QC, Canada, 2021 (rev. 2023). Available: www.icao.in