Abstract
The present paper is based on a wider research study (Válková 2012) aimed at language means used to regulate discourse, or, more specifically, signposting the discourse and creating “some space for social interaction” (Povolná 2005: 49). In my view, discourse markers (henceforth DMs) fall under the heading of interpersonal signposts, which are to be distinguished from textual signposts that give the interpretative clues to various text-shaping processes (cf. Figure 1 below). The study demonstrates the possibilities of using parallel English-Czech and Czech-English corpora to reveal quantitative differences in the ways the chosen English DMs co-occur with expressions of agreement and disagreement (narrowed in this analysis to *yes* and *no*) and gives evidence of the qualitative preferences of Czech equivalents along the syntagmatic axis.
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1 Introduction

With the increased interest in pragmatic aspects of interpersonal communication, the linguistic theorising about spoken and written discourse and the interpersonal level of its manifestation has been associated with the discussion of *communicatively regulative* units of language (Leech 1983), by means of which many aspects of face-to-face communication can be signalled to supply the interlocutors with interpretative clues to various facets of the multifaceted process of conveying thoughts, attitudes, judgements, empathy, solidarity, distance and many other diplomatic manoeuvres used to control facework and contribute to a ‘happy situation’ of communication (cf. also the term *interactive discourse items* used by Povolná 2005: 49).

Many studies related to the topic of the above-mentioned *communicatively regulative* units, to be more precise discourse markers, have been published in recent years, focusing mostly on individual discourse markers and their functions. Even after the decades of innovative tendencies, I have to admit that the pioneering monograph by Schiffrin on discourse markers (1987) still remains an invaluable source of inspiration, preceded by occasional studies of individual discourse markers, such as: *well* in Svartvik (1980) or Schiffrin (1984); *you know*