

ing» is used (heading one five zero). But here the use of the preposition «to» is inappropriate. The phrase should have had the view: «Turning right heading one five zero».

The distortion of the meaning up to the opposite is illustrated also by the following examples: CONFLICT AT LEVEL 5000 < Clear of conflict, level at 5000; CONFLICT > TRAFFIC AT 5000 FEET < Clear of conflict, level at 5000; WE HAVE CONFLICT > Clear of conflict, WE HAVE CONFLICT LEFT < Clear of conflict, level at 5000; HOW POSITION < Hold position; ACCOMPLISH THE CHECK < I can't issue take-off clearance; ACCOMPLISH TAKE-OFF < I can't issue take-off clearance; HOLD DEPARTURE < Line up and hold, prepare for departure; READY FOR IMMEDIATE DEPARTURE < Ready 5 minute departure [5]. It is unnecessary to say that such kind of misunderstanding causes very serious and often irreversible aftereffects.

Studying such samples of air communication some authors (e.g., [5]) come to the conclusion that the communicants, especially in extreme situations, orientate themselves towards understanding the meaning of words, the purport and the information content of the message. They do not consider and finally miss the sounding of the phrase and fail to grasp the main idea of what was said misinterpreting the received message transforming it into a similarly sounding utterance: CROSSING 5000 FEET < passing 5000 feet; SPEEDBRID 937 WE HAVE PUSH BACK < Speedbird 937 is pushing back; CLEARED TO PUSH BACK < push back approved; TAXI TO HOLDING POINT FOR RW (Runway) 24 < taxi to holding point L3. It is stated that such interpretation may be explained by the specific feature of auditory perception characterized according to the following principles: 1) down-top perception (from sound to meaning) and 2) top-down perception (from meaning to sound). In case of «pilot-controller» radio communication, the latter type usually prevails, that is why the lexical changes pilots make often contain words or word combinations whose phonetic form has nothing in common with the original forms, as in: REPORT REACHING < call on reaching. Grammar characteristics of utterances are paid no or little attention to, as the pilots try to understand the lexical meaning first, and this fact is implied by the very essence and regulations of the radio telephoning procedure.

4. Inadequate speaking rate and response rate. The level of understanding of information even in situations, when the communicants are native speakers, has a certain threshold (about 275 words per minute), but the recommendation it is necessary to follow is 100 words per minute. Extremely high intensity of flights in some regions and zones does not allow to adhere to this recommended rate of speech that can cause misunderstandings. Sometimes, when a communicant cannot fully understand or make up his mind and find the words for response, he fills a pause using sounds expressing uncertainty (*ah, okay, yea, uh*) or gives a false information by mistake. These also contribute to inadequate results.

The study of typical mistakes in the speech of radio exchange communicants and the works devoted to their consideration can lead to some conclusions. In a short form, they contain the following:

Introducing the requirements to language proficiency ICAO specified the necessity of the use of standard phraseology adopted by this organization for all situations

for which it is intended. However, this requirement continues to be not complied with. Moreover, even the high level of the English language proficiency not always guarantees the adequate understanding of radio communication reports. In a non-standard situation, when the commands of ATC controller go beyond the usual limited set of commands of civil aviation radio exchange, there can be misunderstanding and incorrect perception of messages, resulting in catastrophic consequences.

Dialogic speech is a basic form of realization of the radio exchange sublanguage. Ineffective communication can be caused both by radio exchange structural features (including elliptical grammar structures, syntactic compressions, shortenings, abbreviated structures, special lexical and semantic forms) and by accidental, casual irregularities or unprofessional violations of special language rules (including irregular commissions, incorrect abbreviations, misunderstandings of lexical and morphological forms, numerals in particular, nonstandard pronunciation, speech disorders and the like). The training of pilots in radio exchange appears ineffective without good basic knowledge of English and a high level of personal discipline.

References

1. <http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5j-pmuuWDMz8rLmQ8Ca9FRtUe-KQ>
2. <http://www.deepsloweasy.com/HFE%20resources/FAA%20DOT%20HFE%20Accident%20Investigations.pdf>
3. Акимова О.В. Термин как единица терминологического поля и професс-сионального дискурса в разноструктурных языках (На материале терминологии макрополя «Радиообмен гражданской авиации» в русском и английском языках): Дис. ... канд. филол. наук: Казань: Казанский гос. пед. ун-т, 2004. – 254 с.
4. Wiech Thomsaz. The significance of interpreter's physical condition in the process of rendering// General and specialist translation/interpretation: theory, methods, practice. 5th International Conference Proceedings. April 6-7, 2012. – Kyiv: AgrarMediaGroup, 2012. – p.70-74.
5. Штетинина Н.А. Типичные ошибки пилотов при восприятии сообщений радиообмена гражданской авиации/ Н. А. Штетинина // Молодой ученый. – 2012. – №2. – С. 192-195.
6. Штетинина Н.А. Радиообмен гражданской авиации как профессиональный язык: векторы исследования // Иностранные языки: лингвистические и методические аспекты: Межвузовский сборник научных трудов. Выпуск 12. – Тверь: Тверск. гос. ун-т, 2011. – С. 119–124.
7. Ellis S., Genghly T. English for Aviation for Pilots and Air Traffic Controllers. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. – 96 p.
8. www.aviasafety.ru/aviationenglish/articles/hudson2