

Chapter 7: Market Structures—How Competition Shapes Prices, Choice, and Innovation

Comic strip idea: The fewer the choices, the greater the power of the seller—and the greater the need for rules that protect the public.

In the previous chapter, we examined how demand and supply help determine prices and quantities in a market. However, markets do not all operate under the same competitive conditions. Some contain many small firms, while others are dominated by only a few companies or by a single provider. These differences influence prices, product quality, innovation, consumer choice, and the need for regulation. Economists study these patterns through the concept of **market structure**.

In economics, these patterns are studied through market structures. What does “market structure” mean? Why can consumers choose among dozens of restaurants, yet have only one electricity distributor in their area?

A **market structure** describes the competitive environment of an industry. It is determined by the number of buyers and sellers, the similarity or differentiation of products, the ease of entry and exit, and the degree of control firms have over prices and output.

A. Features of Market Structures

Economists commonly distinguish market structures using four features:

- 1. **Number of buyers and sellers.** A market with many participants tends to be more competitive because no single firm can easily influence price. When only a few sellers serve many buyers, each firm may possess greater market power.
- 2. **Market power.** Market power is the ability of a firm—or in some cases a buyer—to influence prices, output, product quality, or the terms of exchange.
- 3. **Barriers to entry.** These are legal, financial, technological, or strategic obstacles that make it difficult for new firms to enter a market.
- 4. **Product differentiation.** This refers to the ways firms distinguish their goods or services through quality, design, location, branding, or other features.

B. Types of Market Structures

Economists generally talk about four main market structures: perfect competition, monopolistic competition, oligopoly, and monopoly. Each has distinct characteristics and real-world examples. Understanding these structures helps us see why some products are cheap and widely available while others are expensive or hard to access. The following table summarizes the features of the various types of market structures.

Feature	Perfect Competition	Monopolistic Competition	Oligopoly	Monopoly
Number of firms	Very many small firms	Many firms	A few large firms	One firm

Type of product	Identical or standardized	Similar but differentiated	Identical or differentiated	Unique product with no close substitute
Barriers to entry	Very low	Relatively low	High	Very high
Control over price	None; firms are price takers	Limited	Considerable, but firms must watch competitors	High, although consumer demand and regulation still limit pricing
Level of competition	Very high	High	Limited	None within the market
Consumer choice	Many sellers, but similar products	Many brands and varieties	Limited to a few major providers	Very limited or no alternative
Role of advertising	Minimal	Very important	Important	May be limited or used to protect the firm's image
Typical Philippine example	Vegetable sellers in a large public market	Restaurants, cafés, salons, and clothing shops	Telecommunications, airlines, fuel companies	Local electricity or water distribution
Possible benefit	Low prices and efficient production	Variety, innovation, and consumer choice	Economies of scale and large investments	Efficient provision where one network is least costly
Possible concern	Producers may earn very low profits	Heavy advertising may raise costs	Risk of collusion and weak competition	High prices, poor service, and lack of consumer choice
Possible government role	Maintain fair market rules	Protect consumers and prevent deceptive practices	Prevent cartels and review mergers	Regulate prices, quality, and access

Moving from perfect competition toward monopoly generally involves fewer firms, higher barriers to entry, greater market power, and less consumer choice. As market concentration increases, the need for safeguards against abuse often becomes more important. No market structure is automatically good or bad. Competitive markets may offer lower prices but unstable incomes for small producers, while natural monopolies may reduce duplication of infrastructure but require regulation to protect consumers.

Perfect Competition

The important question to ask is not only how many firms operate in the market, but how the market structure affects prices, quality, innovation, access, and fairness.

In a perfectly competitive market, there are very many sellers, each so small that no single firm can influence the market price. All firms sell an identical product – their goods are *homogeneous* (indistinguishable from one another). Because of this, firms are **price takers**, meaning they must accept the market price determined by overall supply and demand. If any firm tries to charge more, consumers will simply buy from others. There are no barriers to entry, so new firms can freely enter (or exit) the market if they see an opportunity.

A typical wet market (*palengke*) in the Philippines, where many small vendors sell similar products. The fresh-produce section of a large public market provides a useful example. In the Philippines, for instance, the Farmers Market in Cubao (Quezon City) has over 50 stall owners selling fruits, vegetables, meat, and fish. Each vendor offers more or less the same kinds of goods as the others, so they have to accept the prevailing market price. If one vegetable seller at Cubao tries to charge double for a kilo of tomatoes, buyers will simply go to a neighboring stall. Because there are so many sellers with the same product, none can raise prices above the going rate. Public markets provide a useful approximation of perfect competition. In the fresh-produce section of a large market, many vendors may offer similar fruits, vegetables, meat, or fish. A seller who charges substantially more than neighboring vendors risks losing customers because buyers can easily compare prices and switch sellers. Individual vendors therefore have limited influence over the prevailing market price.

Table XX: Characteristics of a Perfectly Competitive Market

No. of Firms	Products	Entry and Exit	Market Power/ Price Influence
Numerous Small Firms: A large number of buyers and sellers participate, none of whom has a significant share of the market	Identical Products: The product is standardized or homogeneous across firms (for example, one farmer's corn is essentially the same as another's)	Free Entry and Exit: Firms can enter or leave the market easily since there are little to no entry barriers (no heavy cost or legal hurdles to start the business)	Price Takers: Individual firms cannot set prices; market forces determine a single equilibrium price. Each firm sells at that market price, as consumers won't pay more for the same product elsewhere

Monopoly

A monopoly exists when a single firm supplies the entire market for a product or service with no close substitute. In a monopoly, there is only one seller in the market. This single firm supplies 100% of the product, which has no close substitutes. Because it faces no competition, a monopolist is a *price maker*, which means it has the power to set the price for its product, usually by adjusting how much it produces.

However, A monopolist's pricing power is substantial but not unlimited. Demand still constrains the price it can charge because consumers may reduce purchases or seek imperfect alternatives. The price is still constrained by consumers' willingness and ability to pay. If the monopolist sets the price too high, people may stop buying (or find alternatives, even very inconvenient ones). The monopoly maximizes its profit by determining the quantity of goods it is going to sell. In the absence of effective competition, a monopolist may restrict output and charge a higher price than would prevail in a more competitive market.

Monopolies arise often due to barriers to entry that are extremely high – these can be *legal* (e.g., patents or government franchises giving exclusive rights), *natural* (a single firm can supply at lower cost than any potential competitor, as with utilities), or *because the firm controls a resource* (like having exclusive access to a raw material). Natural monopolies occur when it's most efficient for one company to provide a service. Utilities (power,

water, natural gas, railways) are often natural monopolies; instead of duplicating infrastructure, one firm handles it, but it is usually regulated by the government to prevent excessive pricing, poor service, or other forms of market abuse.

Table XX: Characteristics of a Monopoly

No. of Firms	Products	Entry and Exit	Market Power/ Price Influence
Single Seller: A single firm serves the entire market	Unique Product (No Close Substitutes): The monopolist's product is distinctive enough that consumers can't find a good replacement. If you need that product or service, you have to buy from the monopolist.	High Barriers to Entry: New firms cannot enter the market easily (often impossible in practice).	Price Makers: A monopolist can choose its pricing strategy to maximize profits (typically by producing where its marginal profit is highest, which results in a higher price and lower output than in competitive markets)

Examples of Monopoly

- Meralco or Manila Electric Company has long been the sole electricity distributor in Metro Manila and surrounding provinces for over 110 years. Households within Meralco's franchise area generally cannot choose among competing electricity distribution companies. This is a clear example of a monopoly in a utility service.

This exclusivity gives Meralco considerable power over the market. Because electricity distribution in its franchise area is not open to direct retail competition, Meralco possesses substantial market power. Its rates and service obligations are therefore subject to government regulation.

Electricity distribution is often treated as a **natural monopoly** because constructing several overlapping networks of poles, wires, and substations would be extremely costly and inefficient. For this reason, one firm may be granted the right to operate within a service area, while regulators oversee prices, quality, reliability, and access.

Monopolistic Competition

Monopolistic competition is also a market with many sellers, but unlike perfect competition, the products are *differentiated* or *heterogenous*. This means each firm sells a product that is similar but not identical to what others sell. Each firm attempts to distinguish its product by giving its product unique features, a brand image, or better quality. Because of product differentiation, firms in monopolistic competition do have some control over their prices – they are price makers to a small extent. Consumers may be willing to pay a premium for a preferred brand, location, quality, or product feature. However, since there are still many competitors and products that can substitute for each other, the market power of each firm is limited.

Fast-food restaurants illustrate monopolistic competition. Firms such as Jollibee, McDonald's, KFC, and Burger King offer broadly similar products but differentiate themselves through taste, branding, location, service, and menu design. Because alternatives are available, each firm has some pricing power, but that power remains limited.

Table XX: Characteristics of Monopolistic Competition

No. of Firms	Products	Entry and Exit	Market Power / Price Influence
Many Sellers: There are numerous firms, none of which can dominate the entire market. It's competitive, but not "perfectly" so.	Differentiated Products: Each firm offers a product or service that is slightly different from others – through quality, style, location, brand, or some other feature	Few Barriers to Entry: It's relatively easy for new businesses to set up shop. New firms can enter with differentiated products, although branding, location, and start-up costs may still create obstacles. This keeps the pressure on existing firms to innovate and market themselves.	Some Price Control: Firms possess limited pricing power because products are differentiated but close substitutes remain available. If there is too much increase in price, customers will switch to a competitor's similar product. This power is limited

Oligopoly

An oligopoly exists when just a few large firms dominate a market. The word "oligopoly" literally stems from Greek for "few sellers." In an oligopolistic market, you might have two to perhaps a dozen firms that control the vast bulk of production or sales. Because there are so few competitors, each oligopoly firm is very influential – their business decisions (like pricing, output, new products) can significantly affect the rivals. This creates a situation of mutual interdependence: oligopoly firms have to pay close attention to each other's moves. If one firm cuts prices or launches an aggressive marketing campaign, rival firms are likely to respond. In extreme cases, oligopolistic firms might even collude (work together secretly) to set prices or outputs, acting as a quasi-monopoly – for example, through cartels that fix prices. However, overt collusion is illegal in many countries. Often, oligopolies end up in a tense balance. Firms may avoid aggressive price competition because sustained price wars can reduce profits throughout the industry.

One example of oligopoly in the Philippines is the oil industry. Only a few firms import and refine most of the fuel: traditionally Petron, Shell, and Caltex (Chevron) have been the big three. They operate in an environment where global oil prices and supply play a huge role, and major fuel companies often announce price adjustments at approximately the same time. If Shell announces a price increase for gasoline, the others typically announce the same increase around the same time. This isn't necessarily outright collusion; it's partly that they face the same cost pressures. In an oligopoly, firms are strategically interdependent. Each company must consider how competitors are likely to respond to changes in price, output, advertising, or product design. A price cut by one firm may trigger similar reductions by its rivals, while a price increase may be followed across the industry. In some cases, firms may attempt to coordinate prices or output, but explicit collusion and cartel behavior are prohibited by competition law.

Table XX: Characteristics of an Oligopoly

No. of Firms	Products	Entry and Exit	Market Power / Price Influence
--------------	----------	----------------	--------------------------------

Few Dominant Firms. A few large firms control most of the market share.	Can be homogenous or differentiated. Products can be differentiated (branded, like cars or soft drinks), and firms often compete through advertising and branding. Oligopoly can happen in homogenous products like cement.	Entry is difficult due to high start-up costs, government regulations, or strong brand loyalty. Exit may also be costly because of large investments.	Firms have considerable control over prices, but they must consider rivals' reactions. They are interdependent. Each firm's decision can greatly affect others.
---	---	---	--

Case Study: How Policy and Technology Changed Philippine Telecommunications

For much of the twentieth century, the Philippine telecommunications industry was highly concentrated. PLDT was the dominant provider of fixed-line telephone services, and many households had few practical alternatives. Building a telecommunications network required extensive investments in cables, switching systems, telephone exchanges, and connections to individual homes. These high infrastructure costs created substantial barriers to entry.

The market began to change during the 1990s. Government reforms sought to open the industry to additional providers and make separate networks work together. Executive Order No. 59 of 1993 required authorized telecommunications carriers to interconnect their networks. Interconnection was essential because a new provider would have difficulty attracting customers if its subscribers could communicate only with others using the same network ("Executive Order No. 59," 1993).

Executive Order No. 109 also required telecommunications companies to expand telephone service, while the Public Telecommunications Policy Act of 1995 established a broader policy of promoting private investment, service expansion, and competition. Government reform alone, however, does not fully explain the transformation of the industry. Technological evolution changed the economics of telecommunications ("Executive Order No. 109," 1993).

From fixed lines to mobile networks

Traditional telephone service depended on physical lines connecting homes and businesses. Extending this network was expensive and slow, especially across an archipelagic country. Mobile technology reduced the need to install a separate wire to every subscriber. A cellular network could serve many users through towers, radio frequencies, and shared network facilities.

This did not eliminate infrastructure costs, but it changed them. Instead of extending a copper line to each household, companies could expand coverage by building cell sites and increasing network capacity. Mobile technology therefore made it more feasible for competing firms to reach large numbers of consumers. The expansion was rapid. An International Telecommunication Union case study reported that Philippine mobile subscriptions grew from roughly 100,000 in 1993 to 8.6 million by June 2001 (International Telecommunication Union, 2002).

Prepaid service and text messaging

Technology also changed the way telecommunications services were sold. Prepaid mobile credits allowed consumers to use telephone services without applying for a fixed-line connection or committing to a monthly contract. This made mobile communication accessible to households with irregular incomes and to consumers who could purchase small amounts of credit when needed.

Text messaging further reduced the cost of communication. Consumers could send short messages instead of making more expensive voice calls. Telecom firms competed through prepaid packages, promotional offers, network coverage, and text and call rates.

These innovations expanded the market beyond the relatively small group of households that could obtain and afford fixed-line telephone service.

From voice calls to mobile internet

As networks evolved from basic mobile service to 2G, 3G, 4G, and later 5G, telecommunications shifted from being primarily a voice and text service to becoming an internet-access industry.

Competition increasingly centered on:

- mobile-data prices;
- connection speed;
- network coverage;
- reliability;
- digital applications and services; and
- investment in newer network technology.

This technological transition also changed consumer expectations. A network was no longer judged only by whether it could complete a telephone call. Consumers increasingly expected reliable internet access for education, employment, banking, commerce, entertainment, and government services.

Technology can promote competition—and reinforce concentration

Technology can weaken the position of an established firm by allowing new providers to offer services through a different system. Mobile networks, for example, allowed competitors to challenge the dominance of the traditional fixed-line provider.

However, technology can also create new barriers to entry. Modern telecom competition requires:

- access to radio-frequency spectrum;
- thousands of towers and cell sites;
- fiber-optic backbone networks;
- submarine and international cable capacity;
- large investments in equipment and cybersecurity; and
- enough customers to spread high fixed costs across the network.

Telecommunications also display network effects: a service becomes more useful when more people and businesses use it. Established firms may therefore retain an advantage because they already have large subscriber bases, extensive infrastructure, and recognized brands.

The result was not perfect competition. The industry evolved from fixed-line dominance toward an oligopoly in which a small number of large firms competed through mobile services, prepaid products, data packages, network coverage, and technology.

The continuing role of government

Because telecommunications depends on shared and scarce resources, government remains important even after liberalization. Radio-frequency spectrum is a limited public resource that must be allocated and managed. The law assigns the National Telecommunications Commission responsibility for determining how spectrum is used and whether providers use it efficiently to meet public demand ("Republic Act No. 7925," 1995).

Government can also support competition through:

- interconnection rules;
- fair access to spectrum;
- infrastructure sharing;
- streamlined permits for towers and cables;
- competition review;
- consumer-protection standards; and
- policies that allow smaller providers to use essential network facilities on fair terms.

More recent reforms have emphasized open access and shared infrastructure, including fair and nondiscriminatory access to data-transmission networks, towers, poles, ducts, and fiber facilities ("Republic Act No. 12234," 2025).

What the Telecom Case Shows

The Philippine telecommunications experience demonstrates that market structures are not permanent. They can change when government policy reduces legal barriers, when interconnection makes competing networks possible, and when new technology changes the cost and method of serving consumers.

The shift from fixed-line telephones to mobile phones—and later to mobile broadband—expanded access and created new forms of competition. But technological progress did not remove market power. Large investments, spectrum scarcity, network effects, and control over infrastructure continued to favor a small number of large firms.

Economic Insight: Technology can disrupt an established monopoly by creating new ways to serve consumers. Yet the same technology may require such large investments and networks that the market eventually becomes an oligopoly rather than a fully competitive industry.

Critical-Thinking Questions

1. Why did fixed-line telephone technology create high barriers to entry?
2. How did mobile networks make it easier for additional firms to reach consumers?
3. Why were prepaid credits and text messaging important to the expansion of telecommunications access?
4. How did the shift from voice calls to internet access change the way telecom firms compete?
5. Why can technological innovation reduce some barriers to entry while creating new ones?
6. What government policies are needed to ensure that technological progress produces better prices, quality, coverage, and consumer choice?

Critical Thinking Questions

1. Why was PLDT considered a monopoly before 1995? What characteristics of a monopoly did it show? How did PLDT's monopoly affect ordinary Filipino households who wanted a telephone line?
2. What role did the government play in maintaining PLDT's monopoly? What role did the government later play in breaking it?
3. How might earlier competition have affected service quality, access, and pricing?
4. In today's context, do you think the Philippine telecom industry is more competitive? What factors might explain continuing concerns about internet speed, reliability, coverage, and price despite the entry of additional firms?

Monopsony: When One Buyer Has Most of the Market Power

A monopsony exists when there is only one major buyer—or only a few powerful buyers—in a market. While a monopoly involves one dominant seller serving many buyers, a monopsony involves one dominant buyer dealing with many sellers, suppliers, or workers. Because sellers have few alternative buyers, the dominant buyer may be able to influence the price it pays, the terms of contracts, or the wages offered.

A Simple Example

Imagine a remote farming community where many small farmers grow vegetables, but only one large trader purchases their harvest. The farmers compete with one another to sell their produce, while the trader can decide how much to buy and what price to offer. Even when vegetables are sold at much higher prices in urban markets, farmers may receive only a small share of the final price because they have limited bargaining power and few other buyers they can reach.

Monopsony in the Labor Market

Monopsony can also occur in employment. In a town where one company provides most available jobs, workers may have few alternative employers. The company may therefore have considerable influence over wages, working conditions, and hiring practices. Workers may technically be free to leave, but their choices can be limited by:

- the absence of other employers;
- transportation and relocation costs;
- limited information about available jobs;
- differences in skills or qualifications; and
- the need for immediate and stable income.

Government as a Monopsony Buyer

Government can also act as a monopsony when it is the main or only buyer of a particular good, service, or type of labor.

Examples may include:

- purchasing military equipment;
- buying medicines and vaccines for public hospitals;
- hiring public-school teachers;
- contracting major infrastructure projects; and
- purchasing crops for government food or buffer-stock programs.

Because government purchases can be very large, it may use its buying power to negotiate lower prices, require quality standards, or influence how goods and services are produced. This can benefit the public when government uses its power responsibly. Large-scale procurement may reduce costs, improve access to essential goods, and create common safety or quality standards. However, government monopsony power can also create problems. If procurement prices are set too low, suppliers may reduce quality, delay delivery, or leave the market. Workers employed mainly by government may also have limited bargaining power if few alternative employers exist.

Economic Insight: Monopsony power can be used to lower public costs, but excessively low prices or wages may weaken suppliers, workers, and the long-term quality of public services.

Why Monopsony Matters

Monopsony may result in:

- lower prices paid to farmers and small suppliers;
- lower wages for workers;
- unequal contract terms;
- reduced bargaining power;
- fewer market alternatives; and
- possible declines in quality or supply.

The market may contain many sellers or workers, but competition among them does not necessarily protect them when they all depend on one powerful buyer.

Monopoly and Monopsony Compared

Monopoly	Monopsony
One dominant seller	One dominant buyer
Many consumers depend on the seller	Many sellers, suppliers, or workers depend on the buyer

May charge higher prices	May pay lower prices or wages
Limits consumer choice	Limits sellers' or workers' alternatives
Often requires price and service regulation	Often requires fair procurement, wage, and competition rules

How Can Monopsony Power Be Reduced or Managed?

Possible responses include:

- organizing farmers and suppliers into cooperatives;
- strengthening unions and collective bargaining;
- improving access to transport and alternative markets;
- publishing transparent market and procurement prices;
- encouraging more buyers or employers to enter;
- enforcing competition and labor laws; and
- requiring fair, transparent, and timely government procurement.

Key Idea: Market power does not belong only to sellers. Private firms, large traders, major employers, and governments can also become powerful buyers when sellers or workers have few alternatives. When government is the main buyer of medicines, farm products, or labor, how can it use its bargaining power to protect taxpayers without unfairly weakening suppliers and workers?

Government and Different Market Structures

Markets do not operate in isolation. Even when prices are determined mainly by demand and supply, markets depend on laws, institutions, and public policies. Government defines property rights, enforces contracts, protects consumers, maintains competition, and responds when markets fail to produce efficient or socially desirable outcomes.

The appropriate role of government varies across market structures. In highly competitive markets, direct intervention may be limited because competition itself places pressure on firms to keep prices reasonable and improve quality. As market power becomes more concentrated, however, the need for oversight and regulation usually becomes greater. This discussion connects directly to the previous chapter's treatment of market failure, where government may intervene because of public goods, externalities, information problems, or excessive market power.

Perfect Competition: Limited Direct Intervention

In a perfectly competitive market, many small firms sell identical or highly similar products, entry is relatively easy, and no single firm can control the market price. Competition helps coordinate the decisions of buyers and sellers, so the government generally has a limited direct role in setting prices or deciding how much firms should produce.

However, limited intervention does not mean no government role at all. Competitive markets still depend on government to:

- enforce contracts and property rights;
- maintain accurate weights, measures, and product standards;
- prevent fraud and deceptive practices;
- provide roads, ports, market facilities, and other infrastructure;
- publish reliable information on prices and supply; and
- address externalities such as pollution or unsafe production.

For example, vegetable sellers in a public market may compete mainly through prices and product quality. Government does not need to dictate the price of every vegetable, but it still maintains sanitation rules, market facilities, weighing standards, and consumer protection.

Key point: In competitive markets, government usually supports the conditions for fair exchange rather than directly controlling market outcomes.

Monopolistic Competition: Consumer Protection and Fair Practices

In monopolistic competition, many firms offer similar but differentiated products. Restaurants, cafés, clothing stores, salons, and other businesses compete through branding, quality, design, location, and advertising.

Because firms have some control over prices and rely heavily on marketing, government has an important role in:

- preventing false or misleading advertisements;
- requiring truthful labels and product information;
- enforcing health and safety standards;
- protecting trademarks and intellectual property;
- addressing unfair business practices; and
- making it easier for new businesses to enter the market.

The goal is not to eliminate product differentiation. Variety and innovation are important benefits of this market structure. The government's role is to ensure that firms compete honestly and that consumers have enough information to make informed choices.

Oligopoly: Protecting Competition

In an oligopoly, only a few large firms dominate the market. Because each firm has significant market power, the decisions of one company can strongly influence its rivals. This creates a risk that firms may coordinate prices, divide markets, restrict output, or discourage new competitors.

Government therefore plays a stronger role by:

- prohibiting cartels and price fixing;
- investigating anti-competitive agreements;
- reviewing mergers and acquisitions;
- preventing dominant firms from excluding competitors;
- reducing unnecessary barriers to entry;
- monitoring prices and service quality; and
- ensuring that access to essential infrastructure is fair.

Telecommunications, airlines, fuel, banking, and cement may display oligopolistic features because operating in these industries requires large investments, specialized technology, licenses, or extensive distribution networks.

Government must be careful, however, not to assume that similar prices automatically prove collusion. Firms may change prices at the same time because they face the same costs. Effective competition policy requires evidence and careful investigation.

Key point: In an oligopoly, government intervention aims to preserve competition where possible and prevent firms from using their market power unfairly.

Monopoly: Regulation and Public Accountability

A monopoly exists when a single firm supplies the market for a product or service with no close substitute. Since consumers have few alternatives, the monopolist has substantial power over prices, output, and service quality.

Government may respond by:

- regulating prices or rates;
- setting minimum service and reliability standards;
- requiring universal or affordable access;
- monitoring investment and maintenance;
- preventing abusive or discriminatory practices;
- operating the service publicly; or
- opening parts of the industry to competition when feasible.

This role is especially important in a natural monopoly, where one provider may be more efficient than several competing firms because duplicating infrastructure would be costly. Electricity distribution, water systems, and some transport networks may fall into this category.

In such cases, government regulation attempts to preserve the efficiency of having one network while limiting the risks of excessive pricing, poor service, and restricted access.

Key point: When competition is not practical, regulation substitutes for some of the discipline that competition would normally provide.

Monopsony: Protecting Suppliers and Workers

Government must also consider monopsony, where one buyer—or only a few powerful buyers—deals with many sellers, suppliers, or workers. A large trader may dominate the purchase of farm products, a company may be the main employer in a locality, or government itself may be the principal buyer of medicines, infrastructure services, or specialized labor.

Possible government responses include:

- enforcing fair procurement and payment rules;
- publishing transparent buying prices;
- preventing abusive contract conditions;
- strengthening cooperatives and collective bargaining;
- improving access to alternative buyers and markets;

- enforcing minimum wage and labor standards; and
- ensuring that government purchasing power is not used to impose unsustainably low prices or wages.

Government can use monopsony power to negotiate lower prices for taxpayers, especially in bulk purchasing. But if prices are pushed too low, suppliers may reduce quality, leave the market, or become unable to invest.

Connecting Market Structure to Market Failure

Market structure becomes a public concern when it contributes to market failure.

- Market power may lead to higher prices, lower output, or weaker service.
- Information problems may allow firms to mislead consumers.
- Externalities may arise when businesses shift environmental or social costs to others.
- Public goods may remain underprovided because firms cannot easily charge all who benefit.

The form of government intervention should match the problem. A competitive market with adequate information may need only basic rules and enforcement. A concentrated market may require competition policy or rate regulation. A market that creates pollution may require environmental standards, regardless of the number of firms.

A Continuum of Government Involvement

Market structure	Typical market condition	General government role
Perfect competition	Many firms, little market power	Limited direct intervention; enforce rules, standards, contracts, and address market failures
Monopolistic competition	Many differentiated firms	Consumer protection, truthful advertising, safety standards, fair entry
Oligopoly	A few dominant firms	Competition enforcement, merger review, anti-cartel rules, monitoring
Monopoly	One provider	Rate and service regulation, access requirements, or public provision
Monopsony	One dominant buyer	Fair procurement, labor protection, bargaining support, alternative market access

Bringing It All Together

Government should not intervene simply because a market produces an outcome that some people dislike. Intervention should respond to a clearly identified problem and should be designed carefully because public policies can also create unintended consequences.

The central questions are:

- Is competition sufficient to discipline firms?
- Is market power harming consumers, workers, or suppliers?
- Is there a market failure that private transactions cannot solve?
- Will government action improve the outcome?

- Could the intervention create new costs, shortages, or barriers?

Economic insight: The role of government is not the same in every market. It is generally less direct when competition is strong and more active when market power, externalities, information problems, or public goods prevent markets from serving society well.

Let's Review

- Market structure describes how competition works in an industry. It depends on the number of firms, the type of products sold, barriers to entry, and the amount of market power firms possess.
- Perfect competition has many small firms selling similar products. Individual firms have little control over price, so government intervention is generally limited to enforcing fair rules, contracts, standards, and consumer protection.
- Monopolistic competition has many firms selling differentiated products. Firms compete through price, quality, branding, location, and service.
- Oligopoly exists when a few large firms dominate the market. Because firms closely watch one another, government may need to prevent cartels, review mergers, and protect competition.
- Monopoly exists when one firm serves the entire market and consumers have no close substitute. Natural monopolies may be efficient, but they often require regulation of prices, quality, and access.
- Monopsony exists when one buyer has significant power over many sellers, suppliers, or workers. Government itself may act as a monopsony when it is the main buyer of medicines, infrastructure services, farm products, or specialized labor.
- Greater competition generally limits market power and expands consumer choice. More concentrated markets may require stronger public oversight.
- Government's role differs across market structures. It is usually less direct in competitive markets and more active when market power, information problems, externalities, or other market failures are present.
- No market structure is automatically good or bad. The important question is how it affects prices, quality, innovation, access, workers, suppliers, and consumers.

Key Takeaway

Market structures shape how firms compete and how much influence they have over prices and choices. Competition can improve efficiency and innovation, but concentrated markets may require government action to prevent abuse and protect the public.

References

- Executive Order No. 59, Official Gazette / Lawphil Project (1993).
https://lawphil.net/executive/execord/eo1993/eo_59_1993.html
- Executive Order No. 109, Official Gazette / Lawphil Project (1993).
https://lawphil.net/executive/execord/eo1993/eo_109_1993.html
- International Telecommunication Union. (2002). *Pinoy Internet: Philippines Case Study*.
<https://www.itu.int/ITU-D/ict/cs/philippines/material/phl%20cs.pdf>
- Republic Act No. 7925, Congress of the Philippines (1995).
https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra1995/ra_7925_1995.html
- Republic Act No. 12234, Congress of the Philippines (2025).
https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2025/ra_12234_2025.html