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*Every member of a society is a consumer of discourse. Purpose of discourse is to enable processes of formation, preservation, conversion of information, cross-language transformations for communication.*

*The research paper is determinated and motivated by necessity of students' education of knowledge, competences and skills of discourse creation in a foreign language.*

*The most important problems are coding (creation) and decoding (transcoding) of information in interlingual communication practice.*

*Incorrect formation of a vector of informational accordance (VIA) of an acoustico-graphic code (AGC) (word) selecting leads to misrepresentation and perversion of information.*

*The aim of the article is to show the variant of solution of the problem and the technique of achievement of the identical information on “ins and outs” in practice.*

*Scientific novelty lies in the specific approach to the process of teaching that consists of the development of VIA formation skills and authentic conversion of discourse from one language into another.*

*The main teacher's aims:*

*-to use knowledge about analytical and theoretical discourse models, about process of discourse formation and expertness in laws and peculiarities of brain's physiology;*

*-to teach students to use knowledge, competences and skills at the lexical, grammar, orthographic, phonetic, syntactic levels for coding (creation) of information (discourse creation) and decoding (transcoding) as a creation of inverse process for authentic interlingual translations.*

**1. Introduction**

The most important aim for authentically foreign text transformations and communication is teaching and learning to create and to use discourse structures as native speakers do. It is person`s language competence.

The article deals with the problem of students' teaching of effective models creating that is impossible today without creating of optimal forms of discourse formation in the target language. It requires consideration of all ideas and trends of the new concept of the XXI century specialists training.

**2. Communication is one of the basic forms of human's activities**

The basisof any communication is the desire to achieve understanding and searching of “shared code” between the participants of communication withdifferent “motherly” informational codes.

The process of information formation has to inform someone about something (cognitive, heuristic communication).

The aims are to influence on the addressee, to force him to do or not to do any verbal and non-verbal actions (regulatory communication), to express the states and emotional relationships (expressive communication), to establish or to maintain contact, to end the conversation (phatic communication).

**3. Problems of information formation**

The contradictions in the process of cross-cultural communication:

1) between the cognitive bases of different cultures;

2) between the individual cognitive spaces of the author and addressee;

3) between the cognitive spaces of a society in different countries and cultures;

4) between the communicative competence of different cultures in the intercultural aspects (linguistic, sociolinguistic, pragmatic, or discursive, sociocultural, strategic, etc.).

All these contradictions necessitate abilities and skills to create the authentic discourse.

Linguists study regularity of discourse creation on basis of knowledge of the processes of an image formation in human consciousness.

**4. Problems of coding/decoding of information from the point of view of the human brain`s physiology.**

The main task is to create a normalized discourse so that encoded and decoded information will be maximum identical. Rules in target language have to be kept.

For this process we understand “discourse” as the process of information formation with reflection of knowledge about the essence of being by human`s consciousness. Information is a definite amount of agreed concepts, knowledge and data that reflect the properties and conditions of objects and phenomena of the objective world in the natural, social and artificially created systems (including the abstract), the temporal and spatial coordinates that displayed and set up by the process of thinking in human`s subjective consciousness. [1]

The aim of discourse is creation and transmission of information for further transformations of communicants' “picture of the world”.

The existence of possible differences in the perception of a “picture of the world” of the author and the “world view” of the addressee should be taken into account.

**5. The main teacher's aims**

It is necessary to teach students to create discourse in a foreign language for improving the technology of interlanguage authentic transformations (translation) of information. It hasn't to be done by “word-for-word translation”. It is necessary to find the *vector of informational accordance (VIA) of information* as native speakers do(toencode and to decode information in the system of signs and symbols of the language).

**6. “Word” as an a*coustico-graphic code (AGC)* in the practice of interlanguage transformations**

The term “information” is more general than the concept of “AGC” (word) as reprezentator of reality. AGC acts as a “primary element” [2].

The biggest language differences are localized in the lexicon, namely in the linguistic sign *AGC of* information.

It is necessary to be very careful. *AGCs* in different languages look ​​equivalent deceptively. The *AGCs* as concepts, objects or phenomenons of the author's real world and addressee's real world are not identical mainly.

The main problem with the transmission of information is the discrepancy range of meaning ​​of units of a target language and a source language.

Expressed “images” are mostly the same, but the ways to express them, their groups, differentiations and unifications, their combinations in different languages ​​are different.

**7. Ways of optimal creation of a normalized discourse**

The process of discourse creation consists of:

- formation of strategic intent which is based on the use of “mental resources” of communicants – “mental correlate”;

- actualization of knowledge as a cognitive-psychological, individually marked process.

- formation of cognitive foundations;

- establishment of the scope of conceptualized knowledge that is sufficient;

- clarify of the discourse structure;

- development of speech strategies.

Development of speech strategieshas 7 stages:

-actualization of information in the individual consciousness;

- establishment of information scope, important for a single communication act;

- personal interpretation of actualised knowledge;

- using up-to-date information in the communication process;

- intention to use code system of signs and symbols of communicants for successful communication;

- systematization of means of up-to-date information representation;

- establishment of norms, standards, idealized models that stored in the human's consciousness as a ready-made examples.

The successful formation of discourse is impossible without realization of cross-language information transformation.

**8. Interlanguage transformation is a process of information transformation from one language to another.**

Losses are inevitable in the process of interlanguage transformations.

The “word-for-word translation” is insufficient because information is distorted or the language rules are violated or both.

Expression of **“What”** (information) and **“How”** (in what way or manner; by what means) is the most important. **“How”** must be subordinated to **“What”**.

We can say that the total sense of discourse cannot be equated to the sum of its components.

AGC is able to act as a unit of transformation. But this only applies to unambiguous AGCs but the number of them is very small in all languages.

The entire sentence as a whole could be translated at the level of AGCs. But it is possible only in a few cases. Usually it is very simple sentences.

**9. Analysis of semantic correspondences between lexical units of a target language and a source language**

Unambiguous decoding does not require monosemanticity of the AGC. Unambiguous decoding implies single meaning of the reverse transition from the images to the prototypes.

For the successful recognition of the meaning of AGC is necessary to know not only the meaning of AGC, but the sphere of existence of AGC.

We divide 4 types of semantic correspondences between AGCs of a target language and a source language:

1. full compliance, such as proper names and place names, scientific and technical terms etc. (Elizabeth, Kyiv, Italy, hydrogen, mammal, proton, equator, voltmeter etc);

2)AGCs of similar semantics, such as names of months and days of the week, numerals etc. (May, Sunday, seven);

3) a complete lack of compliance (culture-specific vocabulary). The corresponding concept could be expressed in one of the languages descriptively only (Ukr. доба – Engl. twenty-four hours or day and night);

4) partial compliance:

- the scope of the AGC in one language is generally wider or narrower than in the other language.

English “character” is wider compared to Ukrainian. Understanding “character” as *the mental and moral qualities distinctive to an individual* is presented in English and Ukrainian languages. But in Ukrainian language such meanings as:

1) *a printed or written letter or symbol;*

2) *a characteristic, especially one that assists in the identification of a species;*

3) *dated a written statement of someone's good qualities* are absent.

English “finger” is narrower than in Ukrainian. In Ukrainian *finger, thumb* and *toe* are expressed by one AGC “*палець”*.

The scope of the AGC in two languages coincides in their main meaning, but there ​​is also a special AGC to describe a certain kind of a given concept in one of the languages:

- English “table” and Ukrainian “стіл» coincide in their main meaning as *a piece of furniture*. But Ukrainian “*стіл*” also means *“desk”, “bureau”, “food provided in a restaurant or household”.* In Ukrainian language such meanings as “an area of fairly level high ground”; “a set of facts or figures systematically displayed, especially in columns”; “a horizontal moulding, especially a cornice”; “a flat, typically rectangular, vertical surface” etc. are absent;

- undifferentiated scope of the AGC in two languages:

Ukrainian “рука” corresponds to two AGCs in English *“*arm” (each of the two upper limbs of the human body from the shoulder to the hand) and “hand” (the end part of a person's arm beyond the wrist, including the palm, fingers, and thumb);

- intersection - a partial overlap of values ​​in two languages:

Ukrainian AGC “дім” has intersections with English AGCs “house”, “building”, “home”, “dwelling house”, “block of flats”, “apartment block”, “home”, “household”.

**10. Optimal ways of *a vector of informational accordance (VIA)* formation**

It was tested technology of *explanatory formula AGC*'*s meaning (EFWM)* creation, the technology of *informationaly correlation criterion of differentiation (ICCD*) of ambiguities and the variant of coding system were created.

*Incorrect* formation *of a vector of informational accordance (VIA*) causes misrepresentation of information.

**11. Example of vector of informational accordance (VIA) search**

Every person re-creates the information scope from the primary elements using well-known to him rules in every moment of his linguistic activity. Sense rules of a target language must also correspond with rules of similar meaning in a source language language.

Complex relations are founded between English and Ukrainian AGCs - names of parts of the day.

At first students establish the following AGCs: morning, day, evening, night. However, students will soon be convinced that the represents above are very approximate in comparison with Ukrainian language. These “equality” extremely simplify *VIA*, which in fact turns out to be much more difficult.

In fact one and the same “image” - space of time (24 hours) is divided in different ways in English and Ukrainian languages. English-speaking people divide this period into 3 parts: morning (from 0 to 12 o`clock), afternoon (from 12 to 18 o`clock, before sunset) and evening (from sunset to midnight, then again morning comes).

In Ukrainian language “day” is divided into 4 parts: morning (from sunrise to about 10 or 11 hours), day (from 10 or 11 hours before sunset), evening (from sunset to about 10 or 11 hours) and night (between the evening and morning, that is the time when people are sleeping).

The AGCs “day” and “night” already represent another division of the day, not three, but in two parts: the light (day) and dark (night).

The AGC “day” offers more difficulties. Ukrainian “day” corresponds to two English AGCs “afternoon” (which did not find a place in the above “equality”) and “day”.

**12. Conclusion**

Teachers should acquaint with all meanings ​​and nuances of lexical items using. It is not acceptable to transfer meanings of AGC of one language to AGC of another without correlation of their scopes for finding common scope.

It is necessary to look for VIA as native speakers do.

An error of AGC using leads to errors in the whole discourse.

Only correct choice of one of AGC's meaning *​​(for ambiguous AGCs, especially homonymous AGCs, the scope of which do not form a VIA; such VIA exists between the meanings of ​​polysemantic AGC)* can ensure the authenticity of human communication and interlanguage transformation.

The proposed approach to a problem of information formation (discourse) in a foreign language gives the opportunity to make the identical information on “ins and outs” and reduce the semantic losses in the interlanguage transformation.
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