The morphological analysis of the term “competition” is performed in tab. 1.1.

**Table 1.1**

**Morphological analysis of the term “competition”**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Author**  | **Definition**  | **Genus**  |
| Economic Code of Ukraine [] | Contest between economic entities, which provides them with certain economic advantages by their own efforts, resulting in consumers and business entities are able to choose the desired product and thus separate business do not define conditions for the implementation of the goods on the market  | Contest  |
| A. Marshall [] | Contest of one person with another, especially when buying or selling anything  | Contest |
| L. Von Mises [] | The desire of individuals to take the most favorable position in the system of social cooperation, which in the market economy takes the form of cataclysmic rivalry, which is expressed in the desire of sellers to surpass each other, offering better and cheaper goods, and buyers - higher prices  | Desire |
| R. Fathutdinov [] | The process of rivalry of actors over realization of their own competitive advantages in a competitive market in a concrete time to win or to achieve other goals within the legislation framework or in natural conditions  | Process of rivalry  |
| G. Azoyev [] | The economic process of interaction, interconnection and struggle between enterprises operating on the market in order to provide better opportunities for the marketing of their products, to meet the diverse needs of customers | Process of interaction, interconnection and struggle |
| V. Knorring [] | The struggle between producers of goods, trade enterprises for more favorable conditions for the sale of products and obtaining maximum profits, an effective mechanism for regulating social production and pricing  | Struggle |
| P. Heine [] | The desire to best meet the criteria for access to rare goods  | Desire |

As we can see from tab. 1.1, there are different points of view on the concept of competition. Most of authors define it as contest or struggle, while G. Azoyev provides wider view, stating competition is the economic process of interaction, interconnection and struggle.

Indeed, competition can take different forms. Some authors, including E. Ries and J. Trout [], Ph. Kotler [] and others consider competitive relationships in an industry as a war with a purpose to capture the greatest possible market share. In order to succeed in the market, enterprise, according to these authors, should take an aggressive position towards competitors trying to weaken their market position, and ideally – to oust them from the market that would be considered as a complete success. Otherwise, the enterprise will be exiled out from the market by competitors who are a priori considered as violent. Thus, the competitive relationship considered as “zero-sum” game, where the success of one party is necessarily acenterprised by the failure of another.

But it doesn’t mean that the modern theory of competitiveness considers the process of market interaction of businesses only as a struggle. For example,
J.-J. Lambin identifies five types of competitive behavior []:

independent;

cooperative;

adaptive;

outrunning;

aggressive.

The scientist believes that competition may take the form of war only in some cases (e.g., on slow growing oligopolistic market), and even in such situations the decision on kind of interaction between competitors is not determined and depends on their strategies.

The same standpoint is articulated by M. Kyzym and Gorbatov [, p. 92 – 115], who differentiate three forms of the interaction between businesses: the struggle for existence, cooperation and neutralism. Thus, the struggle is not the only possible way of interaction among direct competitors.