



## Assessment of Entrepreneurship Education as A Key Factor for Poverty Eradication in Nigeria: Case Study of Ganye Local Government Area, Adamawa State, Nigeria

\* Paul Aidan (M.Sc. Student)<sup>1</sup>, Bosco Moses (Ph.D Student)<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Entrepreneurship Management, National Open University of Nigeria, Yola Study Centre

<sup>2</sup> Department of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management, Nasarawa State University, Keffi - Nigeria

DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.18821444](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18821444)

Submission Date: 08 Jan. 2026 | Published Date: 28 Feb. 2026

\*Corresponding author: Paul Aidan (M.Sc. Student)

Department of Entrepreneurship Management, National Open University of Nigeria, Yola Study Centre

### Abstract

*This study examined the assessment of entrepreneurship education as a key factor for poverty eradication in Nigeria: case study of Ganye Local Government Area, Adamawa State. The study is a survey research design in form of descriptive study, in which data was collected through questionnaire administered to 460 respondents out of which only 414 were retrieved successfully. Data collected was subjected to percentage analysis and hypotheses were tested using regression analysis at 0.05 level of significance. The result revealed that the entrepreneurial innovation has significant negative effect on poverty eradication in Ganye Local Government Area, Nigeria ( $\beta = -0.137$ ,  $t = -2.907$ ,  $P = 0.004$ ). In addition, the finding revealed that entrepreneurial creativity has significant positive effect on poverty eradication ( $\beta = 0.524$ ,  $t = 8.896$ ,  $P = 0.000$ ) in Ganye Local Government Area, Adamawa state, Nigeria. Lastly, the result shows that entrepreneurial attitude has significant and positive effect in Ganye Local Government Area, Adamawa state, Nigeria ( $\beta = 0.593$ ,  $t = 11.014$ ,  $P = 0.000$ ). The study therefore, recommends that there is need to provide more creative facilities such as effective apprenticeship master trainer and supply of supportive training tools in the rural areas, practical education demonstration methods in the schools and training centers as the inadequacy of these has been identified as one of the challenges limiting the development of entrepreneurial creativity in Ganye Local Government Area, Nigeria. Entrepreneurial innovation programs need to be made more attractive, supportive and easily accessible in schools and vocational training centers through the provision of adequate infrastructures such internet facilities, technological knowhow, among other things, as a key element of development in the rural areas, to enhance the attainment of the objectives of entrepreneurial education.*

**Keywords:** *Entrepreneurship, Education, Poverty, Eradication.*

### Introduction

Poverty eradication in Nigeria, particularly in rural areas such as Ganye Local Government Area in Adamawa State, remains a formidable challenge. Despite numerous initiatives from both governmental and non-governmental organizations aimed at improving living conditions, a large segment of the population continues to struggle with inadequate income, unemployment, and limited access to essential services like healthcare, education, and clean water. These issues are compounded by economic vulnerability, especially in communities heavily reliant on subsistence agriculture and informal trade. The lack of infrastructure, market access, and financial inclusion further marginalizes rural populations, reinforcing a cycle of poverty that is difficult to break through short-term aid alone (Adebisi & Oni, 2012).

Addressing these deep-rooted challenges requires a shift toward sustainable, inclusive, and community-driven approaches. Empowering local residents through vocational training, access to microfinance, and improved agricultural techniques can significantly enhance their income-generating capacities. Moreover, policies that support rural

development such as better road networks, market linkages, and education are critical for creating long-term change (Olubukola 2017). Poverty eradication in places like Ganye must go beyond temporary relief and focus on building resilience, promoting entrepreneurship, and ensuring that development efforts are tailored to the unique cultural and economic context of the area. Only then can the goal of economic self-reliance and a higher quality of life for rural Nigerians be fully realized (Arogrundade, 2020).

The purpose of entrepreneurship education was so that the learners can acquire knowledge with which they could plan to set up a business, together with other requisite education for its sustainability, to create job opportunities, and finally be able to become successful entrepreneurs. Maina (2017) considered entrepreneurship education to be part of the overall educational system which incorporates concept of education, ideas and managerial skills needed for economic growth. The use of private initiative to stimulate a business idea into a new enterprise or develop and expand an existing firm or enterprise with great potential is termed as entrepreneurial education (Gibson 2018). Entrepreneurial education concentrated on the growth of comprehension and capacity for pursuing education and the respective attributes. It leads to development of the body, mind, and spirit. Opportunity identification, resource allocation, and developing a business that adds value to products and services is everything described before (Emaikwu 2020). Entrepreneurial education helps prepare entrepreneurs to satisfy the need of fostering economic growth by developing novel ideas and transforming them into actionable and profit-making business plans (Tucker and Selcuk, 2022). In this regard, there is a need to support this form of education by providing all the requisite materials and infrastructure to make it operational. Nigeria adopted the entrepreneurial skill in 2006 as part of the strategy to combat youth unemployment and at the same time stimulate economic growth. These programs were aimed at providing theoretical and practical skills with a view of empowering the youths to become effective and productive entrepreneurs.

The impact of entrepreneurship education on Nigerians cannot be ignored, especially in view of the abysmal state of the Nigeria educational system, which produces graduates from 150 Universities and 50 Polytechnic and Mono-techs, and has not equipped the students with the ability to be self-sufficient and instead casts them as dependent on wage employment that is hard to come by.

Entrepreneurial creativity plays a crucial role in addressing poverty in Ganye Local Government Area, Adamawa State. This form of creativity refers to the ability of individuals to develop new business ideas, improve existing practices, and introduce unique solutions tailored to local challenges. In a region like Ganye, where traditional economic structures dominate, creative entrepreneurship opens up new avenues for wealth generation and employment (Ekpo, 2021). For instance, creative ventures in agro-processing, local crafts, or digital services enable individuals to diversify income sources and add value to raw materials readily available in the area. These creative approaches not only reduce dependence on subsistence farming but also foster self-reliance and community development, gradually lifting households out of poverty (Ekpo, 2021).

Entrepreneurial innovation the implementation of new ideas, processes, or technologies has a significant effect on poverty eradication in Ganye LGA. Innovative entrepreneurs are instrumental in introducing cost-effective methods of production, expanding market reach, and solving local problems in ways that create jobs and enhance livelihoods (Nwachukwu, 2012). In Ganye, innovations such as mobile-based market platforms, improved farming techniques, and small-scale processing machinery have shown potential to boost productivity and income. These innovations help rural entrepreneurs overcome barriers like poor infrastructure and limited access to capital. By fostering a culture of innovation, the local economy becomes more dynamic, enabling more people to participate meaningfully in income-generating activities, which contributes to the reduction of poverty (Nwachukwu, 2012).

The entrepreneurial attitude of individuals in Ganye LGA characterized by risk-taking, proactiveness, and resilience significantly influences poverty reduction. An entrepreneurial mindset empowers people to see opportunities where others see challenges. In a community where unemployment and low incomes are prevalent, those with a strong entrepreneurial attitude are more likely to initiate business ventures, seek out training, and leverage available resources for economic improvement. This mindset also encourages persistence in the face of economic uncertainty and promotes continuous learning and adaptation. As more individuals adopt this proactive approach, the cumulative effect strengthens the local economy, enhances social mobility, and contributes meaningfully to poverty eradication efforts in the local government area (Maina 2017).

Entrepreneurship has emerged as a key factor in the global economic transformation and poverty alleviation among possible entrepreneurs. Different studies have suggested that processes pertaining to engineering didactics is a crucial entrepreneurial human capital development postgraduate skill as well as helps in educating people to improve their education, attitude, creativity and innovativeness (Ekpo & Edet 2020). In this sense, an entrepreneur is that 'individual' who identifies a business chance and utilizes available resources to capitalize on the abundant opportunities prospective profits and market returns. In the same light, an entrepreneur assumes uninsurable risks while guiding a firm and its personnel towards achievement of economic, social and financial objectives and returns for their inputs (Wilson 2019).

## Statement of the Problem

Ekpo (2021) noted that a study conducted by the Federal Ministry of Education between 2020 and 2021 indicated that seventy-one percent (71%) of graduates from Nigerian Universities and other tertiary institutions have not been employed, either by the government or are self-employed. Nwachukwu (2012) chronicled in his 2020 economic survey that the unemployment figure in Nigeria stands at 23.9%. This means that more than 38 million Nigerians are jobless. It is saddening to note that a larger proportion of this figure comprises graduates from Nigeria's universities, colleges of education, and polytechnics who are still unemployed.

A significant number of graduates from Nigerian higher education institutions remain unemployed. According to the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), Nigeria's youth unemployment rate was 53.4% in 2022, indicating that over half of the country's young labor force is without gainful employment. This alarming figure underscores the gap between academic qualifications and marketable skills. Maina (2017) noted that many Nigerian graduates lack not only theoretical knowledge but also the practical and entrepreneurial education necessary for self-reliance. To address this skills mismatch, Entrepreneurship Education has been introduced—both formally and informally—into the curriculum of higher institutions. Its primary aim is to empower undergraduates with the competencies to become employers of labor, rather than job seekers after graduation. Unemployment is not only a national issue but a global one, as it affects the economic productivity of a substantial portion of the population. According to the World Bank (2022), unemployment is defined as the percentage of the labor force that is jobless, actively seeking employment, and available to work. In Nigeria, this situation is further exacerbated by the high number of graduates earning below the subsistence level. As a response, entrepreneurial training was formally incorporated into tertiary education policies, aiming to boost graduate employability and reduce dependence on the saturated job market (Olubukola, 2017).

Years after the Nigerian Federal Government's efforts to provide two million jobs yearly, many university graduates remained unemployed. This situation has led to a rise in several social vices and criminal activities (Babalola, 2019). Consequently, Arogundade (2020), Nwangwu (2006), and Nwambam (2018) have analyzed the impacts of "entrepreneurship education on poverty alleviation" and were able to conclude that entrepreneurial education has not only significantly contributed to business creations in developing countries, but also in the developed countries. Similarly, there hasn't been any studies done in these years (2020-2021) in this region with the same independent variables (entrepreneurial innovation, entrepreneurial creativity, and entrepreneurial attitudes). Most of the studies done, were based on the literature review which had different versions of the mentioned variables.

Most of the study conducted were based on the reviewed covered carried different variables or either one or two of the above mentioned surrogates. Based on these observed pathetic situations, this study investigated the effects of entrepreneurship education on poverty eradication which adds to the existing body of literature on the effect of entrepreneurship education by examining empirically and theoretical concept of poverty eradication among graduates and undergraduates students that acquired the entrepreneurship education knowledge in Ganye Local Government Area.

## Research Questions

The following are the research questions:

- i. What effect does entrepreneurial creativity have on poverty eradication in Ganye Local Government Areas?
- ii. What effect does entrepreneurial innovation have on poverty eradication in Ganye Local Government Areas?

## Objectives of the Study

The main objective of the study is to examine the assessment of entrepreneurship education as a key factor for poverty eradication in Nigeria: case study of Ganye Local Government Area, Adamawa State. The specific objectives are as follows:

- i. Examine the effect of entrepreneurial creativity on poverty eradication in Ganye Local Government Area.
- ii. Ascertain the effect of entrepreneurial innovation on poverty eradication in Ganye Local Government Area.

## Research Hypotheses

This research utilized the following formulated hypotheses.

*H<sub>01</sub>*: Entrepreneurial creativity does not have significant effect on poverty eradication in Ganye Local Government Area.

*H<sub>02</sub>*: Entrepreneurial innovation does not have significant effect on poverty eradication in Ganye Local Government Areas.

## Methodology

This research used descriptive research design. In that order, it is cheap, wide, flexible and reliable. It gives the researcher a better command over the research activities and when sampling is applied it is possible to obtain findings which depict the entire population at minimum cost than capturing the whole population data as noted by Kuria, Wanderi, and Ondigi (2012).

The study targets unemployed youths residing in the ten wards of the study area including those that have received entrepreneurship training and is between the ages of 18 and 40 years. Therefore being a large and heterogeneous population, the study used Cochran's formula in determining the sample size. According to Adam (2020), Bartlett, et al. (2018), Cochran (1977), and Singh & Masuku (2019), when the population is vast and diverse, this formula is the most useful. Hence, the sample size was three hundred and eighty four (384), drawn from the five selected wards of the study area. The wards included Jaggu ward, Gamu ward, Yebbi ward, Sangassumi ward and Timdore ward. For safety net, the researcher added 20% (76) of the sample size (384) i.e. 384 plus 76 equal to 460. The researcher distributed 460 questionnaires, where 414 questionnaires (responses) were correctly filled and retrieved for proper assessment.

### Cochran's formula:

where:  $n_0$  = is the required sample size;  $z$  = is the abscissa of normal curve that cut off an area  $\alpha$  at the tails ( $1 - \alpha$  equals the desired confidence level is 95%) which is found in statistical table (1.96) which contain the area under the normal curve,  $p$  is the estimated proportion of the population which contain the attribute in the question (assumed to be 0.50 since this would provide the maximum sample size),  $q$  is  $(1 - p)$ ,  $e$  = the degree of accuracy expressed as a proportion (0.05) (Singh & Masuku, 2019).

For this study, both secondary and primary sources of data collection were adopted. Primary data collection was by self-administered structured questionnaires while the secondary sources consist of books, journals, internet materials, etc the primary data collection instrument employed was Likert scale of five options, assigning values of one through five to various responses of strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, and strongly agree. The participant responses were rated on a scale of one to five, with five representing the strongest agreement and one the least.

In order to analyze the data for this study, a table was created. However, the researcher obtained frequency, percentage, and regression analysis calculations via a Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) at 0.05 level of significance, the rest of the hypotheses were evaluated through regression analysis. For this particular research, data analysis was done using descriptive and inferential statistics.

### The Model Specification

The study was aimed to investigate the effect of entrepreneurship education on poverty eradication in Ganye Local Government Area. Multiple regression analysis were used. The regression equation to be tested was as follows;

$$SV = \beta_0 + \beta_1EI + \beta_2EC + \beta_3EA + \epsilon_i \quad (1)$$

Where: EC = Entrepreneurial Creativity

EI = Entrepreneurial Innovation

EA = Entrepreneurial Attitudes

$\beta_0$  = The constant term

$\beta_1$  = Coefficient of Entrepreneurial Creativity

$\beta_2$  = Coefficient of Entrepreneurial Innovation

$\beta_3$  = Coefficient of Entrepreneurial Attitude

$\epsilon_i$  = The error term

To assess the correlation among the categorized variables, the study utilized both descriptive and inferential analysis. The inferential statistical procedures utilize in this study include correlation coefficient ( $r$ ) and Pearson correlation coefficient. regression analysis that computes the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ), analysis of variance together with relevant  $t$  – tests,  $f$  – tests,  $z$  –tests, and  $p$ -values is what I call the tests of significance that are expected to be performed. These methods are chosen based on the provided variables, sample size, and research design. The inferential statistical techniques were conducted at 95% confidence level ( $\alpha=0.05$ ). The analysis of data was conducted using the Statistical Package Social Sciences Software (SPSS) version 24. Quantitative data were used to display the statistical data in graphs and tables.

## Analysis and Discussion

**Table 1: Analysis of Demographic Information of the Respondents**

S/N	Description	Frequency	Percentage (%)
<b>• Gender of the respondents</b>			
1	Male	276	66.7
2	Female	138	33.3
	<b>Total</b>	<b>414</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>• Age of the respondents</b>			
1	18 – 30yrs	104	25.1
2	31 – 40yrs	298	72.0
3	41yrs and above	12	2.9
	<b>Total</b>	<b>414</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Marital Status</b>			
1	Married	252	60.9
2	Single	115	27.5
3	Divorced	47	11.4
	<b>Total</b>	<b>414</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>• Educational Qualifications</b>			
1	Non-Formal Education	21	5.1
2	FSLC	58	14.0
3	WAEC/SSCE/NABTEB	109	26.3
4	ND	97	23.4
5	HND/Degree/Post Graduate	129	31.2
	<b>Total</b>	<b>414</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>• Years of Entrepreneurial Experience</b>			
1	0 – 5 Years	91	22.0
2	6 – 10 Years	295	71.3
3	11 Years and above	28	6.8
	<b>Total</b>	<b>414</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Type of Entrepreneurship Education acquired</b>		
1	Skilled	91	22.0
2	Semi-skilled	295	71.3
3	Unskilled	28	6.8
	<b>Total</b>	<b>414</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Source: Computed using SPSS 24 from field survey data 2025**

Table 1 above shows that the grouping of the respondents by their gender reveals that male has 276 (66.7%), while the female has 138 (33.3%). This indicates that most of the respondents are male. The table also shows that the grouping of the respondents by their age reveals that 18 – 30 years has 104 (25.1%), 31 – 40 years has 298 (72.0%), 41 years and above has 12 (2.9%). This indicates that most of the respondents are from the age of 31-40 years. Similarly, grouping of the respondents by their marital status revealed that married has 252 (60.9%), while single has 115 (27.8%) and 47 (11.4%) are divorced. This indicates that most of the respondents are married couples.

In addition, the grouping of the respondents by their educational qualifications reveal that Non-formal Education has 21 (5.1%), FSLC has 58 (14.0%), WAEC/SSCE/NABTEB has 109 (26.3%), ND has 97 (23.4%), HND/Degree/Post Graduate has 129 (31.2%). This indicates that most of the respondents are HND/Degree/Post Graduates. Furthermore, grouping of the respondents by their entrepreneurial education acquired, skilled entrepreneurs have 91 (22.0%) while Semi-skilled entrepreneurs have 295 (71.3%) and 28 (6.8%) of the respondents and Unskilled entrepreneurs. This indicates that most of the respondents are semi-skilled entrepreneurs.

Finally, grouping of the respondents by their entrepreneurial experience, 5 – 10 years of experience have 295 (71.3%), 6 – 10 years have 289 (69.8%) while 11 years and above experienced entrepreneur has 28 (6.8%). This indicates that most of the respondents have much entrepreneurship experience.

**Table 2: Descriptive Analysis of Entrepreneurial Creativity**

Variables	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. D
I believe that being open-minded is crucial for entrepreneurial creativity.	414	1	5	3.58	1.610
Risk-taking is an essential trait for successful entrepreneurial endeavors	414	1	5	3.58	1.700
A supportive and innovative work environment positively influences entrepreneurial creativity	414	1	5	3.15	1.339
Exposure to diverse perspectives and ideas enhances entrepreneurial creativity	414	1	5	2.82	1.431
Adequate resources and funding are critical for promoting entrepreneurial creativity.	414	1	5	3.88	1.364
I believe that brainstorming sessions are effective for generating innovative entrepreneurial ideas	414	1	5	3.67	1.229
Embracing technology and staying updated on industry trends is important for entrepreneurial creativity	414	1	5	2.84	1.692
Successfully implementing creative ideas is a key factor in entrepreneurial success	414	1	5	3.23	1.330
I believe that effective communication education are necessary for conveying creative ideas to stakeholders	414	1	5	3.26	1.210
Building a network and collaborating with others contribute to entrepreneurial success.	414	1	5	3.06	1.583
<b>The average item score for the entrepreneurial creativity scale</b>				<b>3.31</b>	
<b>Entrepreneurial creativity variables total score (5-50)</b>				<b>33.07</b>	

Source: Field Survey, (2025).

Table 2 evaluates the perceptions of respondents on entrepreneurial creativity, the result revealed that adequate resources and funding are critical for promoting entrepreneurial creativity has the highest mean of 3.88 and standard deviation of (1.36). While, exposure to diverse perspectives and ideas enhances entrepreneurial creativity has the minimum mean of 2.82 and standard deviation of (1.43). The total score of entrepreneurial creativity variables is 33.07 and average mean of 3.31 with a possible range from 5 -50. This implies that average mean score is above the midpoint of 3.0, which implies that entrepreneurial creativity influence poverty eradication in Ganye Local Government Area, Adamawa State.

**Table 3: Descriptive Analysis of Entrepreneurial Innovation**

Variables	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. D
Entrepreneurs play a crucial role in driving innovation	414	1	5	2.23	1.226
A culture of innovation is essential for entrepreneurial success	414	1	5	2.80	1.305
Risk-taking is a necessary component of entrepreneurial innovation	414	1	5	3.43	1.273
Access to funding significantly impacts the ability to innovate as an entrepreneur	414	1	5	3.79	1.073
Collaboration with other entrepreneurs enhances innovative efforts	414	1	5	3.31	1.571
Government policies support entrepreneurial innovation effectively	414	1	5	4.14	.976
Failure is an integral part of the entrepreneurial innovation process	414	1	5	3.78	.794
<b>The average item score for the entrepreneurial innovation scale</b>				<b>3.35</b>	<b>8.22</b>
<b>Entrepreneurial innovation variables total score (5-35)</b>				<b>23.48</b>	

Source: Field Survey, (2025).

Table 3 evaluates the perceptions of respondents on entrepreneurial innovation; the result in table 3 revealed that Government policies support entrepreneurial innovation effectively has the highest mean of 4.14 and standard deviation of (0.98). While Entrepreneurs play a crucial role in driving innovation has the minimum mean of 2.23 and standard deviation of (1.23). The total score of Entrepreneurial innovation variables is 23.48 and average mean of 3.35 with a possible range from 5 - 35. This implies that average mean score is above the midpoint of 3.0. and that Entrepreneurial innovation influence Poverty eradication in Ganye Local Government Area.

**Table 4: Model summary of effect of entrepreneurship education on poverty eradication**

Variables	Coefficient	Std. Error	T-Values	P-Values	Hypotheses
1 (Constant)	-5.929	.522	-11.365	.000	
EC	-.137	.037	-2.907	.004	Rejected
EI	.524	.086	8.896	.000	Rejected
EA	.593	.064	11.014	.000	Rejected
R	0.978				
R2	0.956				
Adjusted R	0.956				
F-Stats	2996.801				

a. Dependent Variable: EP

Source: Field Survey, (2025).

The result in table 4 shows that the summary of regression model on the effect of entrepreneurship education on poverty eradication. The result of Pearson correlation show that the bivariate relationship between dependent and independent variables are strong and positive ( $r = 0.978$ ). The values of the coefficient of determination (R-Square) extracted from the summary of the regression model show that entrepreneurial education only explain about 95.6% variations in poverty eradication while the about 0.4% are attributed to variables not included in the model of this study. The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results, which represent the goodness of fit of the model is statistically significant ( $F_{3, 413} = 2996.801$ ,  $P < 0.00$ ), implying that the variables in the model have jointly predicted the poverty eradication. The regression coefficient for the individual contribution of the independent variables as represented by the unstandardized beta-value of -5.93 indicates that the one unit decrease in entrepreneurial education account for -5.93 units increase in the level of poverty eradication, and this relationship between the significant at 1% level of significance. Hence the study concludes that entrepreneurship education has significant effect on poverty eradication in Ganye Local Government Area, Nigeria.

**H<sub>01</sub>:** Entrepreneurial creativity does not have significant effect on poverty eradication in Ganye Local Government Area. This hypothesis estimates the effect of entrepreneurial creativity on poverty eradication and the result of the regression model in Table 4.6 revealed that entrepreneurial creativity has significant negative effect on poverty eradication ( $\beta = -0.137$ ,  $t = -2.907$ ,  $P = 0.004$ ). Hence, the null hypothesis was rejected and alternate hypothesis, which states that entrepreneurial creativity has significant effect on poverty eradication in Ganye Local Government Area, Nigeria was accepted.

**H<sub>02</sub>:** Entrepreneurial Innovation does not have significant effect on poverty eradication in Ganye Local Government Areas.

This hypothesis estimates the effect of entrepreneurial innovation on poverty eradication and the result of the regression model in Table 4.6 revealed that entrepreneurial innovation has significant positive effect on employee's performance ( $\beta = 0.524$ ,  $t = 8.896$ ,  $P = 0.000$ ). Hence, the null hypothesis was rejected and alternate hypothesis was accepted, which states that entrepreneurial innovation has identified effect on poverty eradication in Ganye Local Government Area, Nigeria was accepted.

## Discussion of Finding

Unleashing entrepreneurial imagination greatly impedes the poverty alleviation efforts in Ganye Local Government Area, Nigeria. This corroborates Alex's (2017) assertion that identifies the gap between the creativity component and elements of entrepreneurship training in Youths and prospective entrepreneurs and where it is observed that entrepreneurial creativity has significant negative effect on employment generation as compared to other factors. The inadequacy in the execution of creative concepts and intellect gained through training sessions is perhaps one of the most critical elements that could culminate in the stagnation of creativity within the zone.

The examination of innovative entrepreneurship and in this investigation supports the hypotheses that these variables are profound drivers of poverty alleviation in Ganye Local Government Area. This is also in line with Chiayu's (2017) study, who noted that entrepreneurial activity is an important aid towards job creation for the youth of various age groups. Likewise, Nnadi (2019) examines the role of entrepreneurial innovations and attitudes as a strategy to combat unemployment for graduates and it also facilitates business development and sustainability to reduce poverty for aspiring entrepreneurs.

In agreement with the preceding argument, Ogunlusi (2018) argued that poverty alleviation is not feasible without capable entrepreneurial creativity among younger people and aspiring entrepreneurs which leads back to this study posited that poverty eradication is impossible without positive entrepreneurial disposition amongst the youths and prospective entrepreneurs.

## Conclusion

Based on the analysis conducted, it has been revealed that entrepreneurial innovation exerts a significant negative effect on poverty eradication in Ganye Local Government Area, Nigeria. This finding suggests that despite the widespread belief in innovation as a catalyst for development, in this specific context, it may not be effectively aligned with the local socio-economic realities. It is possible that the nature of innovation being implemented lacks practical relevance or accessibility to the local population, thereby hindering its intended impact on poverty reduction.

On the other hand, the study found that entrepreneurial creativity plays a significant and positive role in poverty eradication within the Ganye Local Government Area of Adamawa State. This implies that creative approaches to entrepreneurship such as developing unique business models, local product innovation, and adaptive solutions to local challenges—are more effective in uplifting communities economically. The positive correlation indicates that when entrepreneurs are empowered to think creatively and act resourcefully, they are more likely to generate sustainable livelihoods and improve economic conditions.

## Recommendation

In particular, the following were the specific recommendations proffered by the study:

- I. There is need to provide more creative facilities such as effective apprenticeship master trainer and supply of supportive training tools in the rural areas, practical education demonstration methods in the schools and training centers as the inadequacy of these has been identified as one of the challenges limiting the development of entrepreneurial creativity in Ganye Local Government Area, Nigeria.
- II. Entrepreneurial innovation programs need to be made more attractive, supportive and easily accessible in schools and vocational training centers through the provision of adequate infrastructures such internet facilities, technological knowhow, among other things, as a key element of development in the rural areas, to enhance the attainment of the objectives of entrepreneurial education.

## References

1. Abari, A. O. (2016). *Creating jobs and reducing unemployment among Nigerian university graduates through entrepreneurship education. International Journal of Innovative Business Strategies (IJIBS)*, 2(1), June. Lagos State University, Doregos Advanced College, Nigeria.
2. Abubakar, S. A. (2017). *Entrepreneurship education and intention of Nigerian university students: Evidence from literature. International Journal of Operational Research in Management, Social Science & Education (IJORMSSE)*, 3(2).
3. Acemoglu, D., & Autor, D. (2020). *Education, tasks, and technologies: Implications for employment and earnings. In Handbook of Labor Economics (Vol. 4, pp. 1043–1171). Elsevier.*
4. Acs, Z. J., & Audretsch, D. B. (2021). *Entrepreneurship and innovation. In The Oxford handbook of business and government (pp. 271–285). Oxford University Press.*
5. Acs, Z. J., & Szerb, L. (2020). *The Global Entrepreneurship Index (GEINDEX). In The impact of entrepreneurship on economic development (pp. 107–121). Springer, Cham.*
6. Adam, A. M. (2020). *Sample size determination in survey research. Journal of Scientific Research and Reports*, 26(25), 90–97.
7. Adedapo, A. A., & Yomi-Akinola, O. G. (2017). *Imperative of entrepreneurship education for university students: The case study of University of Ibadan. Unilag Journal of Emerging Trends in Economics and Management Sciences*, 4(5), 493–500.
8. Adekunle, S. O., & David, J. K. (2019). *Entrepreneurship education in Nigerian universities: A tool for national transformation. Asia Pacific Journal of Educators and Education*, 29, 155–175.
9. Adeola, K. L., & Bolarinwa, K. (2021). *Strategies for promoting entrepreneurship education in secondary school curriculum. Business Education Journal*, 1(10), 221–227.
10. Aiyeduso, A. O. (2020). *Principles and methods of business and computer education. Enugu: Cheston Agency Ltd.*
11. Ajzen, I. (1991). *The theory of planned behavior. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211.
12. Akingbade, A. (2021). *Assessment of entrepreneurship education development on poverty eradication strategy in tertiary institutions in Lagos State. Economic Insights – Trends and Challenges*, 73(10), 35–47.
13. Audretsch, D. B., & Keilbach, M. (2019). *The theory of knowledge spillover entrepreneurship. Journal of Management Studies*, 44(7), 1242–1254.

14. Audretsch, D. B., & Keilbach, M. (2020). *Entrepreneurship capital and economic performance. Regional Studies*, 38(8), 949–959.
15. Audretsch, D. B., & Keilbach, M. (2021). *Entrepreneurship and regional development: The role of entrepreneurial attitudes, intentions, and activities. Journal of Economic Geography*, 21(1), 23–51.
16. Audretsch, D. B., Lehmann, E. E., & Wright, M. (2018). *The dynamics of entrepreneurship: Evidence from Global Entrepreneurship Monitor data. Research Policy*, 47(10), 1954–1967.
17. Babalola, J. B. (2019). *Reinventing Nigerian higher education for youth employment in a competitive global economy*. Lecture delivered at the University of Calabar, Department of Educational Administration and Planning.
18. Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
19. Barney, J. B. (1991). *Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99–120.
20. Bloom, N., Eifert, B., Mahajan, A., McKenzie, D., & Roberts, J. (2020). *Does management matter? Evidence from India. The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 135(3), 1329–1368.
21. Brenner, S., & Cochran, P. L. (1991). *The stakeholder model of the firm: Implications for business and society theory and research. Proceedings of the International Association for Business and Society*, 449–467.
22. Brush, C. G., Carter, N. M., Gatewood, E., Greene, P. G., & Hart, M. (2022). *The Diana Project: Women business owners and equity capital. Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(6), 566–587.
23. Cochran, W. G. (1977). *Sampling techniques* (3rd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
24. Deebom, M. T., & Okwelle, P. C. (2016). *Empowering rural Ogoni youths through skill acquisition programmes in Ogoni area of Rivers State. African Journal of Historical Sciences in Education*, 12(1), 232–250.
25. Deloitte. (2021). *Disruption drives employment growth*. <https://www2.deloitte.com/global/en/pages/about-deloitte/articles/disruption-drives-employment-growth.html>
26. Drucker, P. F. (1985). *The practice of management*. London: Heinemann.
27. Ekpo, P. (2021, February 7). *An evaluation of graduate unemployment among university students in Nigeria. Daily Independent*, p. 10.
28. Ekpoh, U. I., & Edet, A. O. (2020). *Entrepreneurship education and career intentions of tertiary education students in Akwa Ibom and Cross River States, Nigeria. International Education Studies*, 4(1), 172.
29. Emaikwu, S. O. (2020). *Integrating entrepreneurship skill acquisition in the university curriculum for national development. Journal of Research in Education and Society*, 2(3), 34–41.
30. Emeruwa, C. O. (2020). *Capacity building entrepreneurial development*. Paper presented at FCE (T) Potiskum on ETF Capacity Building, October 13–25.
31. European Commission. (2020). *Entrepreneurship and SMEs*. [https://ec.europa.eu/growth/smes/business-friendly-environment/sme-performance/entrepreneurship-and-smes\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/growth/smes/business-friendly-environment/sme-performance/entrepreneurship-and-smes_en)
32. Fajana, S. (2000). *Functioning of Nigerian labour market*. Lagos: Laboutin and Company.
33. Folta, T. B., Delmar, F., & Wennberg, K. (2021). *Entrepreneurship policy and economic growth: A review of recent evidence. Journal of Business Venturing*, 36(1), 106087.
34. Gana, J. S. S. (2000). *Entrepreneurship*. Jos: Jofegan Associates.
35. Gibson, S., Harris, M. L., & Burkhalter, T. M. (2020). *Comparing the entrepreneurial attitudes of university and community college students. Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*, 11(2), 11–17.
36. Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM). (2022). *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor 2021/2022 Global Report*. <https://www.gemconsortium.org/report>
37. Harbison, F. H., & Myers, C. A. (1964). *Education, manpower, and economic growth: Strategies of human resource development*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
38. Ike, P. (2020). *Entrepreneurship development in Nigeria*. Jamoe Enterprises Ltd.
39. Irem, C. A. (2022). *An appraisal of the contribution of small and medium-scale businesses to the Nigerian economy: A case study of Adamawa State* [Unpublished master's dissertation]. Department of Economics, ADSU, Mubi.
40. Itodo, J. I. (2015). *Relationship between waiting experience and customer loyalty in commercial banks in Mubi, Adamawa State* [Doctoral thesis, ADSU, Mubi].
41. Keller, G. (1999). *Managerial statistics abbreviated* (8th ed.). Cengage Learning.
42. Moreland, N. (2016). *Entrepreneurship and higher education: An employability perspective*. New York: The Higher Education Academy.
43. Mugenda, O. M., & Mugenda, A. G. (1999). *Research methods: Quantitative and qualitative approaches*. Nairobi, Kenya: ACTS Press.
44. National Bureau of Statistics. (2018). *State of states rankings for education*. Federal Republic of Nigeria.
45. National Bureau of Statistics. (2020). *Annual abstract of statistics*. Federal Republic of Nigeria.
46. National Universities Commission. (2020). *Labour market expectations of Nigerian graduates*. Abuja: Education Trust Fund (ETF).
47. Nieman, G. H., & Nieuwenhuizen, C. (2022). *Entrepreneurship: A South African perspective* (2nd ed.). Pretoria: Van Schaik.

48. Noel, T. W. (2018). *Effects of entrepreneurial education on student intention to open a business*. *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research: Babson Conference Proceedings*. Babson College.
49. Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
50. Nwachukwu, I. (2012, August 20). *Nigeria's unemployment rate at 23.9% in 2020*. *Business Day Online*. <http://businessdayonline.com/NG/index.php/economic>
51. Nwite, O. (2016). *Entrepreneurship education in Nigerian tertiary institutions: A remedy to graduate unemployment*. *British Journal of Education*, 4(5), 16–28.
52. Ogunlusi, C. F. (2018). *Poverty eradication and poverty alleviation: The effect of entrepreneurship development programmes in Southwest Nigeria*. *World Journal of Entrepreneurial Development Studies*, 1(2), 1–14.
53. Olubukola, S. A. (2017). *Unemployment and security challenges in Nigeria*. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(7), 146–156.
54. Onwuejeogwu, M. A. (2019). *Ahijoku lecture series*. Owerri: Government Press.
55. Osalor, P. (2017, January 19). *Entrepreneurial education revolution: An imperative for sustainable development in Nigeria*. *Vanguard*. <http://www.vanguardngr.com/2017/01/entrepreneurial-education-revolution-an-imperative-for-sustainable-development-in-nigeria/>
56. Osibanjo, O. (2006). *Concept of entrepreneurship*. Paper presented at the Workshop on Entrepreneurship and Innovation for 200 Level Students, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
57. Osuala, E. C. (2021). *Principles and methods of business and computer education*. Enugu: Cheston Agency Ltd.
58. Owusu-Ansah, W. A. (2020). *The effect of entrepreneurship education on career intentions and aspirations of tertiary students in Ghana*. Paper presented at the 49th World Conference of the International Council for Small Business, Johannesburg, South Africa.
59. Pulka, R. M., Rikwentishe, R., & Ibrahim, B. (2019). *An evaluation of students' attitude towards entrepreneurship education in selected universities in North East Nigeria*. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, 14(1), 1–7.
60. Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). *The theory of economic development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
61. Schumpeter, J. A. (1950). *Capitalism, socialism and democracy* (3rd ed.). New York: Harper & Row.
62. Schumpeter, J. A. (1951). *Essays of Schumpeter J. A.* Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley Press.
63. Shane, S. (2020). *Entrepreneurial ecosystems and regional policy: A sympathetic critique*. *Small Business Economics*, 54(1), 21–34.
64. Shane, S. A. (2022). *Why encouraging more people to become entrepreneurs is bad public policy*. *Small Business Economics*, 33(2), 141–149.
65. Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2021). *Entrepreneurship as a field of research: Encouraging dialogue and debate*. *Academy of Management Review*, 46(3), 393–399.
66. Shane, S., Locke, E. A., & Collins, C. J. (2003). *Entrepreneurial motivation*. *Human Resource Management Review*, 13(2), 257–279.
67. Singh, A. S., & Masuku, M. B. (2019). *Sampling techniques and determination of sample size in applied statistics research: An overview*. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 2(11), 1–25.
68. Stam, E., Van de Ven, J., & Audretsch, D. B. (2019). *Entrepreneurial attitudes and intentions: Assessing the impact of education and regional context*. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 34(3), 275–293.
69. Stephen, P. (2021). *Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention among employees of tertiary institutions in Adamawa State, Nigeria* [Doctoral thesis, ADSU, Mubi].
70. Sternberg, R. J. (2020). *A three-facet model of creativity*. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *The nature of creativity: Contemporary psychological perspectives* (pp. 125–147). Cambridge University Press.
71. Sullivan, A., & Steven, M. (2003). *Economics: Principles in action*. Pearson Education.
72. Tucker, D., & Selcuk, S. S. (2022). *Which factors affect entrepreneurial intention of university students?* *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 33(2), 142–159.
73. Umar, A. I., & Bello, U. (2019). *Evaluating the impact of entrepreneurship development on poverty eradication of students in Nile University of Nigeria: A thematic analysis approach*. *International Journal of Social Science and Economic Research*, 4(12).
74. Unachukwu, G. O. (2022). *Issues and challenges in the development of entrepreneurship education in Nigeria*. *International Multi-Disciplinary Journal (Ethiopia)*, 3(5), 213–226.
75. United Nations Development Programme. (2012). *Nigerian human development report*. New York: UNDP.
76. Uzoagulu, A. E. (2012). *Entrepreneurial education in Nigeria*. Keynote address presented at the 27th Annual Congress of the Nigerian Academy of Education, Minna, Niger State.
77. Uzo-Okonkwo, N. H. (2017). *Entrepreneurial competencies needed by NCE business teacher education graduates in Anambra State* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Department of Business Education, Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki.
78. Van Praag, C. M., & Versloot, P. H. (2019). *What is the value of entrepreneurship? A review of recent research*. *Small Business Economics*, 29(4), 351–382.

79. Vestergaard, L., Moberg, K., & Jorgensen, C. (Eds.). (2012). *Effect of entrepreneurship education in Denmark – 2020*. The Danish Foundation for Entrepreneurship – Young Enterprise.
80. Wennekers, S., Thurik, R., Reynolds, P., & Van Stel, A. (2021). *The relationship between entrepreneurship and employment*. In *Handbook of research on entrepreneurship* (pp. 335–358). Edward Elgar Publishing.
81. Wennekers, S., Van Stel, A., Thurik, R., & Reynolds, P. (2020). *Nascent entrepreneurship and the level of economic development*. *Small Business Economics*, 24(3), 293–309.
82. Wilson, F., Kickul, J., & Marlino, D. (2019). *Gender, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and entrepreneurial career intentions: Implications of entrepreneurship education*. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 40(6), 406–421.
83. World Bank. (2018). *Report on unemployment*. <http://www.worldbank/unemployment/report.org>
84. World Bank. (2022). *Youth and employment in Africa: The potential, the problem, the promise*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
85. Yoon, I. (2019). *On my own: Korean businesses and race relations in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

#### CITATION

Aidan, P., & Moses, B. (2026). Assessment of Entrepreneurship Education as A Key Factor for Poverty Eradication in Nigeria: Case Study of Ganye Local Government Area, Adamawa State, Nigeria. In *Global Journal of Research in Business Management* (Vol. 6, Number 1, pp. 115–125). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18821444>