



Entrepreneurial Monopoly and Its Impact on Economic Advancement in Onitsha-North, Anambra State, Nigeria

¹Emmanuel Kosiso Offordum

¹Think Help Restore (THR) Media, C5 Kenuj 02 Mall, Kaura District, Kaura, Abuja, Nigeria

¹<https://orcid.org/0009-0007-7711-5702>

*Corresponding Author: offordumemmanuel334@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Background: Entrepreneurship is widely recognised as a catalyst for economic advancement through job creation, innovation, and wealth generation. However, the dominance of a few entrepreneurs within local markets often results in monopolistic practices that restrict competition and limit inclusive economic growth. In Onitsha-North Local Government Area, where commercial activities are highly concentrated, concerns have emerged regarding the impact of entrepreneurial monopoly on economic advancement.

Objective: This study examined the impact of entrepreneurial monopoly on economic advancement in Onitsha-North Local Government Area of Anambra State, Nigeria.

Method: A descriptive research design was adopted for the study. The study population comprised 164 registered entrepreneurs in Onitsha-North Local Government Area. Cochran's (1963) formula for unknown populations and a snowball sampling technique were used in selecting respondents. Data were collected using a structured questionnaire and analysed using frequencies, percentages, and Chi-square statistics with the aid of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

Results: Findings reveal presence of significant monopolistic practices among dominant entrepreneurs in Onitsha-North. Entrepreneurial monopoly was found to restrict market entry, limit the growth of small and emerging businesses, and reduce fair competition. The study also showed that monopolistic dominance negatively affects employment generation, income distribution, and the overall contribution of entrepreneurship to economic advancement in the area.

Conclusion: The conclusion of this study is that entrepreneurial monopoly significantly constrains economic advancement in Onitsha-North. This is because the concentration of market power among a few entrepreneurs limits competitive opportunities and prevents entrepreneurship from contributing fully to inclusive and sustainable economic development.

Unique Contribution: This study provides empirical evidence on the effects of entrepreneurial monopoly within a local government commercial environment, thereby extending existing knowledge on monopoly beyond large-scale corporate contexts to grassroots entrepreneurship.

Key Recommendation: The study recommends strengthened market regulation, improved access to finance for small and medium-scale enterprises, and the promotion of fair competition to reduce monopolistic dominance and enhance economic advancement in Onitsha-North.

Keywords: Entrepreneurship, Monopoly, Economic Advancement, Market Competition, Onitsha-North



INTRODUCTION

Entrepreneurship in Nigeria dates to the pre-colonial era, when surplus production among farmers and artisans encouraged trade, specialization, and exchange, initially through barter systems (Collins et al., 2017; Van Der Westhuizen & Adedokun, 2021). Over time, this culture of exchange laid the foundation for entrepreneurial activity as a driver of economic organisation and livelihoods. In contemporary Nigeria, entrepreneurship, particularly within the informal sector, plays a critical role in employment creation and economic sustenance, with about 65.4% of urban workers engaged in small, private enterprises (Onyenechere et al., 2023).

Despite its recognised importance, the contribution of entrepreneurship to Nigeria's economic advancement remains uneven and difficult to quantify. While entrepreneurship is widely acknowledged as a factor of production and a catalyst for economic growth (McDaniel et al., 2022), Nigeria continues to grapple with poverty, unemployment, food insecurity, and weak human capital utilisation, even as it remains resource-rich (Yusuf & Mohd, 2022). This paradox raises concerns about how entrepreneurial activities are structured and distributed within the economy.

In this context, the emergence of entrepreneurial monopolies presents a critical challenge. Given Nigeria's economic structure and level of human capacity development, pure monopoly conditions are largely incompatible with broad-based development. Entrepreneurial monopoly, characterised by strong market dominance, high entry barriers, and price-setting power, can restrict competition, encourage price discrimination, and concentrate wealth among a few economic actors. While a small number of entrepreneurs have successfully leveraged market dominance to build large conglomerates, a vast majority of Nigerians remain excluded from meaningful economic participation, reinforcing inequality and limiting inclusive growth (Onwe, Nwafor, & Nworie, 2021).

Economic theory defines monopoly as a market structure in which a single firm is the sole producer of a good with no close substitutes, facing the entire market demand curve (Mankiw, 2021; De Loecker & Eeckhout, 2017). Such firms restrict output and raise prices to maximise profit, resulting in deadweight losses and reduced overall welfare compared to competitive markets. In developing economies, monopolistic practices are often reinforced by weak regulation, infrastructural deficits, and institutional failures, leading to market inefficiencies and suppressed SME performance (Ayyagari, Beck, & Demirgüç-Kunt, 2018; Egbetokun, 2023).

While existing studies have extensively examined the relationship between entrepreneurship and economic growth in Nigeria, much of the literature focuses either on SMEs broadly, informal sector productivity, or macroeconomic growth outcomes. Other studies emphasise structural constraints such as access to finance, infrastructure, and regulatory instability. However, there remains a paucity of empirical and theoretical studies that interrogate entrepreneurial monopoly as a distinct phenomenon and its implications for economic advancement at the sub-national or local government level. Little attention has been paid to how entrepreneurial monopolies shape market outcomes, competition, and development trajectories within specific local contexts, such



as Onitsha-North Local Government Area.

Moreover, existing literature has largely adopted macro-level or national analyses, leaving a gap in micro-level, location-specific studies that examine how monopolistic entrepreneurial practices affect local economic advancement. This study, therefore, addresses this academic lacuna by examining entrepreneurial monopoly and economic advancement from a localized perspective, contributing to the literature by linking market structure, entrepreneurial dominance, and development outcomes within a specific Nigerian context.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The framework of the research questions is provided as follows:

1. What is the relationship between entrepreneurial monopoly and economic advancement?
2. What factors are responsible for monopolistic practices in Onitsha-North Local Government Area, Anambra State?
3. How does entrepreneurial monopoly applicability affect economic advancement in Onitsha-North Local Government Area, Anambra State?
4. What are the positivism and negativism of entrepreneurial monopoly applicability on economic advancement in Onitsha-North Local Government Area, Anambra State?

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurship is a key driver of economic sustainability and growth, enabling innovation, job creation, and wealth generation in both developed and developing economies. Empirical studies show that entrepreneurship, particularly through small and medium enterprises (SMEs), significantly contributes to long-term economic growth and socio-economic well-being (Owoeye, 2025).

Entrepreneurship involves designing, launching, and managing ventures, with emphasis on opportunity recognition, resource mobilisation, and risk-bearing to create value and profit. Unlike wage employment, it entails uncertainty and the potential for higher returns. Recent literature highlights the growth of scalable ventures and core entrepreneurial attributes such as initiative, risk tolerance, and opportunity exploitation (Picken, 2017; Ratten, 2023; Chakuzira et al., 2024).

Monopoly

A monopoly exists when a single firm supplies a good with no close substitutes and faces the entire market demand curve, choosing either price or output while the other is determined by demand conditions (Varian, 2019; Tirole, 1988). Given Nigeria's economic structure and level of human capital development, pure monopoly conditions are largely unrealistic. Consequently, Nigeria requires market structures that limit producer dominance and prevent price discrimination.



Economic Advancement

Economic advancement refers to structured processes for promoting sustainable economic growth through fiscal and monetary policies. In Nigeria, economic growth has been uneven, limiting poverty reduction and the realization of full growth potential (Uwakaeme, 2015). Growth is driven by capital accumulation, technological advancement, and improved literacy levels (Business Dictionary, 2017). Increased production raises business profitability, employment, and incomes, thereby expanding consumer demand (Kimberly, 2017).

Entrepreneurship, Monopoly, and Economic Advancement

Recent theory shows that price discrimination can arise in oligopolistic or dominant market settings due to asymmetric conditions and market segmentation, extending classical monopoly theory (Rhee, 2025). This framework explains pricing practices in Nigerian sectors such as utilities and telecommunications, where consumers pay different prices for similar services.

Such behaviour reflects third-degree price discrimination, where dominant firms segment consumers based on demand elasticity, charging higher prices to inelastic groups and lower prices to more elastic ones (van der Weijde, 2014; Ignatenko, 2025). In Nigeria, price discrimination is enabled by market imperfections, geographic segmentation, information asymmetries, institutional barriers, and variations in demand elasticity (Luqman, 2015; Zhang et al., 2022; Okuyama, 2024).

Positivism and Negativism of Monopoly Applicability in Nigeria

Monopolistic practices can have both positive and negative effects depending on economic structure. Positively, monopolies may exploit economies of scale, consolidate resources, and reduce inefficiencies, particularly in infrastructure-intensive industries.

Conversely, contemporary scholarship argues that modern monopolies increasingly extract value rather than promote shared prosperity. Tim Wu (2025) contends that dominant firms, especially tech platforms, entrench power, suppress competition, and undermine consumer welfare, manifesting traditional monopoly drawbacks such as reduced innovation, restricted output, and regulatory capture.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study is grounded in Walker's Theory of Profit, which views profit as economic rent arising from differential entrepreneurial ability. Monopoly profit emerges when firms influence market conditions rather than operate under perfect competition (Walker, 1887; Parker & Scott, 2019).

Walker argues that monopoly power enables firms to regulate supply, control prices, deter entry, and sustain profits. Contemporary research supports this, showing that firms with significant market power maintain markups above marginal cost due to entry barriers and reduced competition (De Loecker, Eeckhout, & Unger, 2020).

Recent scholarship expands Walker's theory by emphasizing structural and institutional factors, such as market concentration, regulation, intellectual property, and network effects in sustaining monopoly profits (Autor et al., 2020). Although monopolies are rare, they persist in regulated



sectors like utilities and energy, where state-sanctioned monopoly power still permits above-normal profits, reinforcing the relevance of Walker's theory in modern economies (Stiglitz, 2023).

RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

The following research hypotheses were developed to guide this study:

1. A significant relationship exists between entrepreneurship, monopoly, and economic advancement in Onitsha-North, Anambra State.
2. Entrepreneurship monopoly applies to economic advancement in Onitsha-North, Anambra State.

METHODOLOGY

This study adopted a descriptive research design to examine entrepreneurial activities within Onitsha-North Local Government Area (LGA), Anambra State, Nigeria. The design enabled the collection of data from respondents at a single point in time, facilitating quantitative analysis of the study variables. The study was conducted in Onitsha-North LGA, a major commercial centre in eastern Nigeria, characterised by high population density, intense trading activities, and a concentration of small and medium-scale enterprises. The presence of the Onitsha Main Market and other commercial clusters makes the area particularly suitable for entrepreneurship-focused research.

The study population comprised registered entrepreneurs operating within Onitsha-North LGA. However, due to the absence of reliable official records indicating the total number of entrepreneurs in the study area, the population was treated as indeterminate or unknown.

The sample size for the study was determined using Cochran's (1963) formula for unknown populations, adopting an 80% confidence level and a 5% margin of error, which is acceptable in social science research where a complete sampling frame is unavailable. The formula is stated below:

$$n = \frac{Z^2 pq}{e^2}$$

Where:

n = required sample size

Z = standard normal deviate at 80% confidence level (1.28)

p = estimated proportion of the population (0.5)

$q = 1 - p$

e = margin of error (0.05)

$$n = \frac{(1.28)^2 \times 0.5 \times 0.5}{(0.05)^2}$$
$$n = \frac{1.6384 \times 0.25}{0.0025}$$



$$n = \frac{0.4096}{0.0025}$$
$$n = 163.84$$

n= approximately 164

Sampling Technique

The sampling technique used to conduct this study was snowball sampling: the researcher began with a few respondents and asked them to recommend others who met the research criteria and were willing to participate, continuing this process with new respondents until no more substantive information could be acquired; snowball sampling is widely recognized as an effective approach for accessing hard-to-reach populations and enhancing participation through social networks, and current methodological work provides practical guidance on its application and reporting in research (Ting *et al.*, 2025).

Instruments for Data Collection

The questionnaire was the data collection instrument employed. The questionnaire contained open and closed questions and was given through a personal hand-delivery method. Hence, it was a self-administered questionnaire. We bear in mind that some of our respondents may be unable to fill out the questionnaire legibly and accurately. Hence, we asked them the questions in the questionnaire and assisted them by transcribing their responses into the questionnaire. However, some could do the filling themselves with little or no hitch. We tried to explain some areas of the questionnaire to them that they did not perfectly understand.

Method of Data Analysis

Data obtained in the field was processed and analyzed using statistical packages for social sciences (SPSS) computer software. The data were analyzed using the frequency and percentage method. We used the cross tabulation method to test our hypotheses and the chi-square method to test them. The formula is stated below:

$$\text{Thus, the } \frac{\text{frequency of each response} \times 100}{\text{Total number of respondents}}$$

As a statistical tool, the chi-square determines how all observation data sets fit an expected set. Rule: Accept H₁ (alternative hypothesis) when the X² calculated is greater than the X² tabulated. Otherwise, accept H₀. (null hypothesis).

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

This chapter presents the analysis of data collected during the field survey into practical use to release the information embedded in the whole work. The researcher makes use of a frequency table. The tables will be structured so that they will follow each other rigorously. This aligns with what Blalock (2012) said: "Data are no data unless it is presented and analyzed". This research work will follow such steps in unfolding everything embedded in the whole research work. A total of 164 questionnaires were distributed, of which 100 were returned, resulting in a 61.0% response rate.



Presentation of Personal Characteristics of Respondent

Table: 1, Demographic Characteristics of Respondents (n = 164)

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Sex	Male	69	42.07
	Female	95	57.93
Marital Status	Single	60	36.59
	Married	70	42.68
	Divorced	9	5.49
	Widowed	25	15.24
Age (Years)	20–24	24	14.63
	25–29	50	30.49
	30 and above	90	54.88
Occupation	Traders	80	48.78
	Farmers	20	12.20
	Civil servants	25	15.24
	Others	39	23.78
Education	SSCE/GCE	80	48.78
	NCE/OND	40	24.39
	B.Sc/HND/B.A	20	12.20
	Master's & above	24	14.63
Total		164	100

Source: Field Survey, 2025



Sex Distribution: The sex distribution of respondents shows that a higher proportion were female (57.9%), while males constituted 42.1% of the sample. This indicates a greater representation of women in the study population, which is particularly relevant for research focusing on social, economic, or health-related issues that disproportionately affect women. The higher female participation may also reflect greater availability or willingness of women to engage in survey-based research, especially in community and household-level studies.

Marital Status: Regarding marital status, the largest proportion of respondents was married (42.7%), followed by single individuals (36.6%). Widowed respondents accounted for 15.2%, while divorced respondents constituted the smallest group (5.5%). The predominance of married respondents suggests that family responsibilities and spousal dynamics may play a significant role in shaping respondents' socioeconomic conditions and decision-making processes. The presence of widowed and divorced individuals further highlights the diversity of household structures, which may influence economic stability, access to support systems, and overall wellbeing.

Age Distribution: The age distribution indicates that more than half of the respondents (54.9%) were aged 30 years and above, followed by those aged 25–29 years (30.5%), while the smallest proportion (14.6%) fell within the 20–24 age range. This suggests that the study population is largely composed of mature adults who are likely to have accumulated life experiences related to employment, family responsibilities, and social participation. The dominance of older respondents implies that the findings largely reflect adult perspectives, which may be shaped by long-term exposure to economic and social challenges.

Occupation: Occupationally, nearly half of the respondents (48.8%) were engaged in trading, making it the most common occupation. This was followed by those classified under “others” (23.8%), civil servants (15.2%), and farmers (12.2%). The dominance of trading and other informal occupations points to a largely informal economy among respondents, characterized by unstable income and limited social protection. Such economic conditions can affect household resilience, access to education, healthcare utilization, and overall quality of life, particularly in times of economic shocks.

Educational Status: In terms of educational attainment, the majority of respondents (48.8%) possessed SSCE/GCE qualifications. This was followed by those with NCE/OND (24.4%), Master's degree and above (14.6%), and B.Sc/HND/B.A holders (12.2%). The distribution suggests that while basic secondary education is relatively common, fewer respondents have progressed to higher levels of tertiary education. This pattern may reflect structural barriers such as financial constraints, limited access to higher institutions, or early entry into the labour market, all of which can influence employment opportunities and long-term socioeconomic mobility.

Analysis of Research Questions

Table 2: Percentage distribution of respondents on the relationship between entrepreneurial monopoly and economic advancement



Items	SA	A	SD	D	Total
This leads to greater efficiency for specialized managerial skills, which enhances economic advancement.	50 50%	30 30%	10 10%	10 10%	100 100%
This leads to the avoidance of duplication and wastage of resources	30 30%	20 20%	45 45%	5 5%	100 100%
Associated with perfect competition, especially in the supply of social services	40 40%	20 20%	25 25%	15 15%	100 100%
Monopoly engages in large-scale production	20 20%	40 40%	20 20%	20 20%	100 100%
Decisions are taken in a broad room.	10 10%	20 20%	60 60%	10 10 %	100 100%
It generates political influence, which may be used to influence government policies	45 45%	30 30%	20 20%	5 5%	100 100%

Source: Field Survey, 2025

From the above table 2, which contains data on the relationship between entrepreneurial monopoly and economic advancement, five items were used to measure their perception. Using the item analysis, the findings indicate that a majority 50 (50%) of the respondents strongly agree that it leads to greater efficiency for specialized managerial skill which enhances economic advancement. Also majority 45 (45%) strongly disagree on leads to the avoidance of duplication and wastage of resources. With respect to associated with perfect competition especially in the supply of social services, a majority 40 (40%) of the respondent strongly agree on it. Meanwhile, a majority 40 (40%) of them agree on monopoly engages in large scale production. Also, a majority 60 (60%) strongly disagree on decisions are taken at broad room which influences advancement. Finally, a majority 45 (45%) strongly agree that it generates political influence which may be used to influence government policies Following the result, it indicates that there is a positive and negative relationship between entrepreneurial monopoly and economic advancement in Nigeria.



Table 3: Percentage distribution of respondents on the factors responsible for monopolistic practices

Item	Options	Frequency	Percent %
Profit maximizes	Strongly agree	30	30
	Agree	60	60
	Strongly disagree	5	5
	Disagree	5	5
Price maker	Strongly agree	50	50
	Agree	30	30
	Strongly disagree	10	10
	Disagree	10	10
No substitute goods	Strongly agree	20	20
	Agree	10	10
	Strongly disagree	60	60
	Disagree	10	10
Price discrimination	Strongly agree	10	10
	Agree	30	30
	Strongly disagree	50	50
	Disagree	10	10
Single seller	Strongly agree	50	50
	Agree	20	20
	Strongly disagree	15	15
	Disagree	15	15

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Table 3 above contains the analysis the on the factors responsible for monopolistic practices in Onitsha. It shows that a majority 60 (60%) of the respondents agreed on profit maximize while majority 50 (50%) strongly agree on price maker. Meanwhile, 60 (60%), of the respondent strongly disagree on no substitute goods while majority 50 (50%) strongly disagree on price discrimination. Finally, majority 50 (50%) of the respondent strongly agree on single seller. This shows that there are different contributing factors responsible for monopolistic practices in Onitsha.



Table 4: Percentage distribution of the effect of entrepreneurial monopoly applicability on economic advancement in Onitsha

Items	SA	A	SD	D	Total
Entrepreneurial monopolies enjoy the advantages of large-scale production	50 50%	30 30%	10 10%	10 10%	100 100%
Enablement of common services to be undertaken	30 30%	20 20%	45 45%	5 5%	100 100%
The prevention of wasteful competition by many firms in the production of certain goods which have limited markets	40 40%	20 20%	25 25%	15 15%	100 100%
The insurance of greater security in business	20 20%	40 40%	20 20%	20 20%	100 100%
The maintenance of prescribed minimum standards	10 10%	60 60%	20 20%	10 100%	100

Source: Field Survey, 2025

From the above table 4, which contains data on the effect of entrepreneurial monopoly applicability on economic advancement in Onitsha, five items were used to measure their perception. Using the item analysis, the findings indicate that a majority 50 (50%) of the respondents strongly agree that entrepreneurial monopoly enjoy the advantages of large-scale production. Also majority 45 (45%) strongly disagree on enablement of common services to be undertaken. With respect to prevention of wasteful competition by many firms in the production of certain goods which have limited markets, a majority 40 (40%) of the respondents strongly agree on it. Meanwhile, a majority 40 (40%) of them agree on insurance of greater security in business. In the same vein, a majority 60 (60%) strongly agree on maintenance of prescribed minimum standards. Following the result, it indicates that entrepreneurial monopoly effect economic advancement in Onitsha.



Table 5: Percentage distribution of respondents on the positivism of entrepreneurial monopoly applicability on economic advancement

Items	SA	A	SD	D	Total
Greater efficiency resulting from an assemblage of specialized managerial skill	40 40%	20 20%	20 20%	20 20%	100 100%
It can lead to the avoidance of the duplication and wastage of resources	20 20%	60 60%	10 10%	10 10%	100 100%
Engages in large-scale production	20 20%	10 10%	40 40%	10 10%	100 100%
Cheaper production is better practiced under a monopoly	30 30%	40 40%	15 30%	15 15%	100 100%
Planning and management of monopoly is centralized	35 35%	25 25%	20 20%	20 20%	100 100%

Source: Field Survey, 2025

From the above table 5 above, which contains data on the on the positivism of entrepreneurial monopoly applicability on economic advancement, five items were used to measure their perception. Using the item analysis, the findings indicate that a majority 40 (40%) of the respondents strongly agree on greater efficiency resulting from an assemblage of specialized managerial skill. Also majority 60 (60%) agree on It can lead to the avoidance of the duplication and wastage of resources. With respect to engages in large scale production, a majority 40 (40%) of the respondent agree on it. Meanwhile, a majority 40 (40%) of them strongly agree on cheaper production is better practiced under monopoly. In the same vein, a majority 35 (35%) agree on planning and management of monopoly is centralized. This shows that there is positivism of entrepreneurial monopoly applicability on economic advancement in Onitsha.

Table 6: Percentage distribution of respondents on the negativism of entrepreneurial monopoly applicability on economic advancement

Items	SA	A	SD	D	Total
Monopoly leads to restriction of output.	50 50%	30 30%	10 10%	10 10%	100 100%
It culminates in the wastage of resources since a firm acquires monopolistic power through product differentiation.	30 30%	20 20%	45 45%	5 5%	100 100%
It leads to the limitation of the consumer's freedom of choice	40 40%	20 20%	25 25%	15 15%	100 100%



It encourages the monopolist not to seek ways of improving his products.	10	20	60	10	100
	10%	20%	60%	10 %	100%
It generates political influence, which may be used to influence government policies	45	30	20	5	100
	45%	30%	20%	5%	100%

Source: Field Survey, 2025

From the above table 6 above, which contains data on the negativism of entrepreneurial monopoly applicability on economic advancement, five items were used to measure their perception. Using the item analysis, the findings indicate that a majority 50 (50%) of the respondents strongly agree that monopoly leads to restriction of output as the negativism of entrepreneurial monopoly applicability on economic advancement. Also majority 45 (45%) strongly disagree that culminates in wastage of resources since the monopolistic power is acquired by a firm through product differentiation. With respect to limitation of the consumer's freedom of choice, a majority 40 (40%) of the respondent strongly agree on it. Meanwhile, a majority 40 (40%) of them agree that it encourages the monopolist not to seek ways of improving on his products. Also, a majority 60 (60%) strongly disagree on decisions are taken at broad room which influences advancement. Finally, a majority 45 (45%) strongly agree that it generates political influence which may be used to influence government policies Following the result, it indicates that entrepreneurial monopoly equally have negativism applicability on economic advancement in Onitsha.

Test of Hypotheses

This work posited two hypotheses and tested them with the Chi-square (x²) method at 0.05 Significant levels to establish the statistical importance of respondents' responses.

Hypothesis 1:

H1: There is a significant relationship between entrepreneurship monopoly and economic advancement in Onitsha-North, Anambra State.

H0: There is no significant relationship between entrepreneurship monopoly and economic advancement in Onitsha-North, Anambra State.

Summary of chi-square test showing the relationship between entrepreneurship monopoly and economic advancement

This leads to greater efficiency for specialized managerial skills, which enhances economic advancement.	50	30	10	10	100
	50%	30%	10%	10%	100%



Chi-square Tabulated

Options	Of	Ef	of-ef	(of-ef) ²	(of-ef) ² /ef
S.A.	50	25	25	625	25
A	30	25	5	25	0
SD	10	25	-15	225	9
D	10	25	-20	400	16
Total	100				50

$$X^2 = \frac{\sum (O_i - E_i)^2}{E_i}$$

Where I = 1

O_i = Observed frequency

E_i = Expected frequency = (R – 1) (C – 1)

Degree of freedom: D.F.

$$= (4 - 1) (2 - 1)$$

$$DF = 3 \times 1$$

$$= 3 \text{ at } 0.05 \text{ level of significance}$$

$$X^2 \text{ Cal} = 50$$

$$X^2 \text{ Tab} = 7.815$$

Decision rule: Since the computed value X² (50) is greater than the critical value (7.815). We reject

H₀ and accept H₁. In other words, by implication, there is a significant relationship between entrepreneurship monopoly and economic advancement in Onitsha-North, Anambra State.

Hypothesis 2:

H₁: Entrepreneurship monopoly applies to economic advancement in Onitsha-North, Anambra State

H₀: Entrepreneurship monopoly does not apply to economic advancement in Onitsha-North, Anambra State

Summary of chi-square test showing the applicability of entrepreneurship monopoly on economic advancement



The maintenance of prescribed minimum standards	10	60	20	10	100
	10%	60%	20%	10 %	100%

Chi-square Tabulated

Options	Of	Ef	of-ef	(of-ef) ²	(of-ef) ² /ef
S.A.	10	25	-15	225	9
A	60	25	35	1225	49
SD	20	25	-5	25	1
D	10	25	-15	225	9
Total	100				68

Degree of freedom: D.F. = (R – 1) (C – 1)
 = (4 – 1) (2 – 1)
 = 3x1
 DF = 3 at 0.05 level of significance
 X² Cal = 68
 X² Tab = 7.815

Decision rule: Consequently, since the computed value X² (68) is greater than the critical value (7.815). We reject H₀ and accept H₁. Therefore, entrepreneurship monopoly applies to economic advancement in Onitsha-North, Anambra State.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study indicate that entrepreneurial monopoly significantly influences economic advancement in Onitsha-North, particularly by restricting competition and limiting the growth of small and emerging enterprises. This outcome aligns with previous studies on market concentration in developing economies, which report that dominance by a few entrepreneurs often leads to unequal market access and reduced opportunities for new entrants. Similar research has shown that monopolistic control in local markets constrains innovation and weakens the contribution of small businesses to economic development.

However, the present study extends existing knowledge by demonstrating how these monopolistic practices operate within a highly commercialised urban setting like Onitsha-North, where entrepreneurial activity is widespread but unevenly rewarded. Unlike studies that focus on formal monopolies or large corporations, this research highlights how informal entrepreneurial monopolies at the local level can be equally restrictive, particularly in the absence of effective regulatory oversight.

The study’s findings also support earlier research indicating that unequal access to capital and business networks plays a central role in sustaining entrepreneurial dominance. In Onitsha-North, established entrepreneurs are better positioned to control supply chains and pricing structures, making it difficult for smaller enterprises to compete. A possible reason for this



outcome is the weak enforcement of market regulations and the prevalence of informal business practices, which allow dominant actors to consolidate power without institutional constraints.

Furthermore, the observed negative effects of entrepreneurial monopoly on employment creation are consistent with studies that identify small and medium-scale enterprises as primary drivers of job growth. The suppression of these enterprises through monopolistic practices explains the limited spread of economic benefits across the local economy. By situating these findings within the specific socio-economic context of Onitsha-North, this study contributes to a deeper understanding of how entrepreneurial monopoly undermines inclusive economic advancement at the local government level.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results, the study concludes that entrepreneurial monopoly significantly undermines economic advancement in Onitsha-North. This conclusion is reached because the concentration of market power among a few dominant entrepreneurs limits fair competition, restricts opportunities for small and emerging businesses, and weakens the overall contribution of entrepreneurship to inclusive economic growth. By constraining market entry and business expansion, entrepreneurial monopoly reduces employment creation, discourages innovation, and promotes uneven economic development within the area. Therefore, for entrepreneurship to serve as an effective driver of economic advancement in Onitsha-North, monopolistic control must be reduced to allow broader participation and more balanced economic outcomes. The study recommends that for effective economic advancement in Onitsha-North Area, there is need for a proper utilisation of the following recommendations:

1. Sequel to these implicit and controllable constraints, it then behooves on every responsible and responsive government to adopt more realistic control and regulatory measures while they also seek to intensify the extant regulatory legislations to be able to actually contain the occurrence of monopoly.
2. That notwithstanding, should there be any conscious and assiduous resolve by either the government of the day or other relevant stakeholders to deliberate on basic issues on the applicability of monopoly in Nigeria economy, parties concerned should be willing and able to leave their comfort zones to a meeting point that will be devoid of any win-win situation or any iota of insensitivity to the superlative interest and concern of either parties.
3. Fixing Nigeria's basic infrastructure can do the magic in reviving entrepreneurship development in Nigeria and promoting the micro, small, and medium enterprises sector to facilitate economic growth and development. If the government were to face square the daunting problem of epileptic power supply, entrepreneurs would survive, and their businesses would be sustained. The resultant effect on the economy would be immense because jobs will abound and wealth will be created abundantly.



Ethical clearance

Ethical consent was sought and obtained from the participants used in this study. They were made to understand the exercise was purely for academic purposes, and their participation was voluntary.

Funding

The study was not funded.

Conflict of Interest

No conflicts of interest were reported.

Authors' Contributions

Offordum Emmanuel Kosiso conceived the study and wrote the initial manuscript, including the design and provided the material during data gathering process, proof-read and interpreted the data. The author read and approved the final manuscript for publication in its current form.

Acknowledgements

We would like to express our gratitude to Mr. Richard Offordum, Mrs. Evangeline Offordum, Mrs. Chisom Offordum, Too-chukwu Offordum and Ebere Offordum, for assisting us with data collection authors cited in this study. Without their contributions, this study would not have been a success.

Availability of data and materials

The datasets on which conclusions were made for this study are available on reasonable request.

Citation:

Offordum, E. K. (2025). Entrepreneurial monopoly and its impact on economic advancement in Onitsha-North, Anambra State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Sub-Saharan African Research*, 3(1).

REFERENCES

- Autor, D., Dorn, D., Katz, L. F., Patterson, C., & Van Reenen, J. (2020). The fall of the labor share and the rise of superstar firms. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 135(2), 645–709. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjaa004>.
- Ayyagari, M., Beck, T., & Demirgüç-Kunt, A. (2018). What drives micro, small, and medium enterprise performance in developing countries? *Small Business Economics*, 51(2), 269–284. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-018-0003-9>.
- Chakuzira, W., M. M., & co-authors. (2024). Refining the definition and typologies of entrepreneurship in Africa: A systematic review. *Administrative Sciences*, 14(8), Article 184. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci14080184>.



- Collins, J., Morrison, M., Basu, P. K., & Krivokapic-Skoko, B. (2017). Indigenous culture and entrepreneurship in small businesses in Australia. *Small Enterprise Research*, 24(1), 36–48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13215906.2017.1289855>.
- De Loecker, J., & Eeckhout, J. (2020). The rise of market power and the macroeconomic implications. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 135(2), 561–644.
- Egbetokun, A. (2023). Business incubators in Africa: A review of the literature. *Innovation and Development*, 15(2), 233–260. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2157930X.2023.2295090>
- Ignatenko, A. (2025). *Price discrimination and competition in transportation* (Working paper). Department of Economics.
- Kimberly, A. (2017). What is economic growth? *The Balance*. <https://www.thebalance.com/what-is-economic-growth-3306014>
- Luqman, O. (2015). *Determinants of pricing policy in the Nigerian manufacturing industry* (SSRN working paper). <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2673946>
- McDaniel, M., Ge, J., & Yuan, W. (2022). Social impacts of entrepreneurship: Does entrepreneurial ecosystem support reduce homicide? *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 17, e00315. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbvi.2022.e00315>
- Okuyama, S. (2024). *Behavior-based price discrimination and elastic demand* (MPRA Paper). MPRA Repository.
- Onwe, E. C., Nwafor, K. A., & Nworie, C. S. (2021). Knowledge and use of the Consumer Protection Act among Gen-Zers in Ebonyi State, Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Social Psychology*, 4(1), 287–296.
- Onyenechere, E. C., Areola, A. A., Abe, J. O., Onyekwere, I. A., Ezedike, C. E., Duruji, C. E., & Okoro, F. C. (2023). Sociodemographic factors associated with informal sector activities in selected urban areas of Nigeria. *Urban Resilience and Sustainability*, 1(1), 48–65.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2024). *Financing SMEs and entrepreneurs 2024*. OECD Publishing.
- Owoeye, A. B. (2025). Entrepreneurship, growth drivers, and economic development: The roles of small-medium enterprises (SMEs) in sustainable development in Nigeria. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 9(5), 6518–6531. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.905000504>.



- Parker, C., & Scott, S. (2019). Snowball sampling. In *SAGE Research Methods*. SAGE Publications.
- Peter, D. (2015). 7 characteristics of successful entrepreneurs. *Due*. <https://due.com/blog/7-characteristics-of-successful-entrepreneurs/>.
- Picken, J. C. (2017). From startup to scalable enterprise: Laying the foundation. *Business Horizons*, 60(5), 587–595. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2017.05.002>.
- Ratten, V. (2023). Entrepreneurship: Definitions, opportunities, challenges, and future directions. *Journal of Organizational Excellence / Global Business & Organizational Excellence*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joe.22217>.
- Rhee, K. E. (2025). Competitive price discrimination in asymmetric oligopoly. *Review of Industrial Organization*, 67, 83–110. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11151-024-10004-y>.
- Stiglitz, J. E. (2023). *The road to freedom: Economics and the good society*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Ting, H., Memon, M. A., Thurasamy, R., & Cheah, J. (2025). Snowball sampling: A review and guidelines for survey research. *Asian Journal of Business Research*, 15(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.14707/ajbr.250186>.
- Tirole, J. (1988). *The theory of industrial organization*. MIT Press.
- Uwakaeme, O. S. (2015). Economic growth in Nigeria: An empirical investigation of determinants and causal relationship (1980–2012). *American Journal of Economics*, 5(1), 9–20. <https://doi.org/10.5923/j.economics.20150501.02>.
- Van Der Westhuizen, T., & Adelakun, Y. (2021). Social entrepreneurship in Nigeria through drivers of religion and work-desire. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, 15(4), 727–745. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEEE-04-2021-0166>.
- van der Weijde, A. H. (2014). *Price differentiation and discrimination in transport networks* (Tinbergen Institute Discussion Paper No. 14-099/VIII). Tinbergen Institute.
- Varian, H. R. (2019). *Intermediate microeconomics: A modern approach* (9th ed.). W. W. Norton.
- Walker, F. A. (1887). *Political economy*. Henry Holt & Co.
- Wu, T. (2025). *The age of extraction: How tech platforms conquered the economy and threaten our future prosperity*. Knopf.
- Yusuf, A., & Mohd, S. (2022). Growth and fiscal effects of insecurity on the Nigerian economy. *European Journal of Development Research*, 7(1), 743–769. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41287-022-00531-3>.
- Zhang, Z., Wang, Y., Meng, Q., & Han, Q. (2022). Impact of third-degree price discrimination on welfare under the asymmetric price game. *Mathematics*, 10(8), 1215. <https://doi.org/10.3390/math10081215>.