DIJMS:
Dinasti International Journal of Management Science
E-ISSN: 2686-522X
P-ISSN: 2686-5211
DINASTI PUBLISHER
https://dinastipub.org/DIJMS dinasti.info@gmail.com +62 811 7404 455

DOI: https://doi.org/10.38035/dijms.v7i4.6650

Six Sigma in Electronics Manufacturing and the Formation of Consumer Quality Perception

Didit Darmawan[1], Jawahirul Maknuun[2]
[1]Universitas Sunan Giri Surabaya, Sidoarjo, Indonesia, email. dr.diditdarmawan@gmail.com
[2]Universitas Sunan Giri Surabaya, Sidoarjo, Indonesia, email. Maknuunjawahirul60@gmail.com

Corresponding Author: dr.diditdarmawan@gmail.com[1]

Abstract: This literature review examines the implementation of Six Sigma in electronics manufacturing and its relationship with consumer perception of product quality. The study employs a qualitative literature review method, synthesizing theoretical perspectives from operations management and consumer behavior literature. The analysis reveals that Six Sigma implementation contributes to manufacturing precision through the DMAIC methodology, which systematically identifies sources of variation, analyzes root causes, designs targeted improvements, and sustains achievements over time. Manufacturing precision manifests in tangible product attributes such as joint tightness, material quality, interface responsiveness, and long-term durability. Consumers interpret these attributes as evidence of quality through complex perceptual processes influenced by initial expectations, direct experience, cross-brand comparisons, and social interactions within user communities. The theoretical contribution lies in providing an integrated conceptual framework connecting production-level quality improvement with market-level quality perception. Practically, this review suggests that companies should design communication strategies translating technical Six Sigma achievements into meaningful value for consumers, ensure cross-departmental collaboration between production and marketing, and develop employee training programs connecting shop-floor work with end-user perception. Successful integration of technical excellence and communication strategy enables companies to build consumer trust and loyalty, creating sustainable competitive advantage in the competitive electronics market.

Keyword: Six Sigma, Manufacturing Precision, Product Quality, Consumer Perception, DMAIC, Electronics, Competitive Advantage.

INTRODUCTION

The contemporary electronics industry is characterized by escalating technological complexity and increasingly stringent consumer demands for quality. An electronic device has transcended its role as a mere functional tool to become an integral component of its owner's lifestyle and identity (Mohanty, 2017). Lifestyle factors significantly influence consumption patterns and purchasing decisions (Putri & Darmawan, 2025). Consumers acquiring smartphones, flat-screen televisions, or laptops are not solely purchasing the technical specifications enumerated in marketing brochures. They are, in essence, acquiring a promise of reliability, durability, and a seamless, uninterrupted user experience. This promise is embedded within every product detail, from the precision of casing seams to the clarity of emitted audio. When an electronic device performs flawlessly over an extended period, consumers tend to perceive this as the norm. However, the emergence of even a minor issue immediately directs attention toward the brand and its country of origin. Perceived quality is cultivated through an accumulation of positive experiences, yet it can be dismantled by a single negative encounter (Mustafaev et al., 2021).

Behind the scenes, the endeavor to fulfill this quality promise involves extraordinarily intricate manufacturing processes demanding high precision. Each electronic component must be produced within exceptionally tight dimensional tolerances, as deviations as minute as a micrometer can precipitate functional failure over time (Xu, 2024). Assembly processes must be executed with exacting accuracy, avoiding errors such as incorrect component polarity, imperfect solder joints, or contamination by foreign particles that could cause short circuits. Within a mass production environment pursuing efficiency, maintaining consistent quality across thousands of units daily presents a formidable challenge (Cang et al., 2024). World-class electronics companies recognize that production defects are intolerable, as the costs associated with after-sales repairs, erosion of consumer trust, and damage to brand reputation far exceed the investment required for defect prevention from the outset.

Six Sigma emerged as a systematic methodology to achieve near-perfect quality levels in manufacturing processes (Prakash, 2016). This concept, developed by Motorola in the 1980s, establishes an ambitious target of 3.4 defects per one million opportunities. This figure is not merely a statistical target but represents a philosophy asserting that quality must be the central focus in every facet of company operations (Ghelani, 2023). Six Sigma provides a structured framework known as DMAIC, an acronym for Define, Measure, Analyze, Improve, and Control, designed to identify defect causes, analyze root problems, design improvements, and ensure these improvements are sustained over the long term (Purwojatmiko & Ambarwati, 2023). This approach integrates statistical tools with systematic problem-solving methodologies, enabling organizations not only to detect defects but also to prevent their occurrence.

The application of Six Sigma within the electronics industry has demonstrably led to significant enhancements in manufacturing precision (Pangestu & Fahma, 2019). Pioneering Japanese and American electronics companies such as Sony, Toshiba, and Motorola were early adopters of this methodology to elevate their product quality. The outcome has been electronic products characterized by exceptionally high reliability, allowing consumers to utilize their devices for years without encountering significant issues. This high manufacturing precision is subsequently interpreted by consumers as tangible evidence of brand quality (Ghelani, 2023). A smartphone with a seamlessly fitted casing, a responsive display devoid of dead pixels, or a battery exhibiting prolonged longevity without rapid degradation, these are all concrete manifestations of manufacturing precision that shape the perception of quality in the consumer's mind.

The relationship between manufacturing precision and perceived quality in the eyes of consumers is not direct and mechanical but unfolds through a complex interpretative process (Ridwan et al., 2023). Consumers generally lack access to observe production processes within factory environments (Fieler & Loverro, 1991). They cannot witness how each component is meticulously assembled or how each unit undergoes testing prior to shipment. Their sole point of reference is the finished product presented in its appealing packaging. However, it is from this finished product that they extrapolate conclusions regarding overall quality. Device weight, material robustness, button responsiveness, and the precision of inter-component seams, all these minute details function as signals interpreted as quality indicators. Astute consumers decode these signals, forming judgments that ultimately determine whether they will remain loyal to the brand or switch to a competitor. Perceived value is a key determinant in the decision to repatronize a service (Rahayu & Darmawan, 2025).

The first issue resides in the gap between the technical achievements of Six Sigma on the production floor and consumer perceptions in the marketplace. Six Sigma is designed to reduce defects to exceptionally low levels based on objective measurements and technical standards defined by the company. However, consumers do not assess quality using statistical control charts or by calculating defect rates per million opportunities. They evaluate quality based on their subjective experience using the product, an evaluation influenced by various factors extending beyond technical specifications. A product deemed statistically perfect by Six Sigma standards might still be perceived as low quality by consumers if its design is ergonomically poor, its user interface is confusing, or its battery life fails to meet expectations. Conversely, a product with a marginally higher technical defect rate might still gain market acceptance if other strengths, such as innovative features or appealing design, compensate for its shortcomings (Suwanda, 2024). This disparity between objective measures and subjective perceptions raises critical questions regarding the actual relationship between the manufacturing precision achieved through Six Sigma and the quality perceptions formed within the consumer mindset.

The second issue pertains to the challenge of communicating technical quality achievements to consumers in a meaningful manner. Companies that have invested substantial resources in implementing Six Sigma naturally desire consumers to recognize and appreciate these efforts. Individual interest can fluctuate based on the prevailing level of trust (Cahyani & Darmawan, 2025). However, conveying messages about exceptionally low defect rates or the application of the DMAIC methodology is not straightforward. Average consumers may not comprehend the significance of 3.4 defects per million opportunities, nor why this metric should matter to them. The technical and statistical language inherent to Six Sigma is difficult to translate into value that consumers can directly perceive and experience (Nurprihatin et al., 2022). Consequently, substantial quality improvement efforts often fail to receive due appreciation from the market. Consumers may remain unaware of the reasons behind a particular brand's higher price point compared to ostensibly similar competitors, as they do not discern tangible quality differences. In this scenario, the link between manufacturing precision and perceived quality becomes severed, and the value meticulously engineered through superior production processes is not fully captured by the consumer. Superior products are generated by organizations that effectively integrate technical, managerial, and conceptual dimensions (Darmawan, 2024).

The contemporary consumer electronics market is marked by intense competition and progressively thinning profit margins (Choe, 2012). Manufacturers from various nations, including new entrants with lower production costs, are capable of offering products with technical specifications that superficially match those of established brands. Under such conditions, the ability to differentiate products based on quality becomes a critical determinant of long-term success. Consumers are confronted with a plethora of choices accompanied by diverse quality claims, prompting them to seek trustworthy signals to guide their purchasing decisions (Choe, 2012). A wide array of choices affords individuals the opportunity to align selections with their specific needs (Margareta & Darmawan, 2025). Consequently, understanding how manufacturing precision, achieved through methodologies like Six Sigma, can be translated into a robust perception of quality in the consumer's mind becomes paramount. Companies capable of bridging the chasm between technical accomplishments and consumer perceptions will possess a significant competitive advantage, as they not only produce high-quality goods but also effectively communicate that quality in a manner that is both meaningful and persuasive.

The evolution of digital technology and social media has fundamentally altered how consumers share product-related experiences (Wang et al., 2020). A consumer discovering a defect in a newly purchased electronic device can now easily disseminate this negative experience across multiple platforms, potentially reaching thousands or even millions of individuals within a short timeframe. A quality reputation, painstakingly constructed over many years, can be eroded in a matter of days by the viral spread of a consumer complaint. Conversely, positive experiences can also propagate widely, serving as valuable recommendations for other prospective buyers. Within this highly interconnected information ecosystem, the nexus between a product's actual quality and consumer perception becomes increasingly critical. Any discrepancy between the communicated quality promise and the consumer's lived experience will be rapidly detected and exposed. Prior experience can significantly motivate the intention to repeat a particular action (Nahar et al., 2025). Therefore, comprehending the dynamics of the relationship between manufacturing precision and perceived quality is no longer merely an academic pursuit but a practical imperative for business sustainability in the digital era. Organizations are compelled to manage sustainability as an integral component of their strategic framework (Mardikaningsih & Darmawan, 2021). A business strategy constitutes a structured set of decisions and actions aimed at leveraging the organization's core competencies to establish a sustainable competitive advantage (Ali & Darmawan, 2023).

This research aims to theoretically analyze the contribution of Six Sigma implementation to achieving precision in electronics manufacturing processes and to examine how this precision is subsequently interpreted by consumers as perceived quality. Through a systematic literature review, this study endeavors to construct a comprehensive understanding of the mechanisms linking quality improvement efforts at the production level with quality perceptions at the market level. The theoretical contribution of this research lies in enriching the operations management and consumer behavior literature by providing a conceptual framework that integrates technical manufacturing perspectives with consumer psychological perspectives. Practically, the findings of this study are expected to offer guidance for production and marketing managers in designing strategies that not only enhance the actual quality of products but also ensure that these enhancements can be effectively communicated and appreciated by consumers. Consequently, investments in quality improvement methodologies such as Six Sigma can yield optimal added value for the firm.

METHOD

This study is designed as a qualitative literature review aimed at constructing a theoretical understanding of the relationship between Six Sigma implementation in electronics manufacturing and consumer interpretation of product quality. The qualitative approach was selected due to its alignment with the research objective, which seeks to examine meanings, perceptions, and interpretative processes that cannot be measured quantitatively. Qualitative research constitutes an approach to exploring and understanding the meaning that individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem (Arshed & Danson, 2015). Understanding how manufacturing precision is interpreted as perceived quality by consumers requires exploration of the layers of meaning formed through the interaction between products and their users. This interpretative process is inherently subjective and profoundly influenced by various personal and social factors, rendering the qualitative approach, which enables researchers to delve into the depths of meaning, the most appropriate choice. Qualitative literature studies permit researchers to synthesize findings from diverse sources and construct a rich conceptual framework without undertaking primary data collection in the field (Gupta & Gupta, 2022).

The research process was executed through systematic stages, commencing with literature collection, data reduction, data display, and culminating in conclusion drawing. The primary data sources for this study comprise academic literature discussing Six Sigma implementation in the manufacturing industry, particularly electronics, as well as literature on consumer behavior and the formation of quality perceptions. Walliman (2021) emphasizes that in qualitative research, the principal instrument is the researcher themself, who must reflexively construct understanding from the collected data. The researcher acts as a critical reader who not merely aggregates statements from various sources but also interprets, compares, and synthesizes these ideas into a coherent and meaningful narrative. The analytical technique employed is thematic analysis, wherein the researcher identifies principal themes emerging from the literature, such as the DMAIC mechanism, manufacturing precision, quality signals, and consumer interpretative processes. These themes are subsequently organized to address the established research questions, thereby generating novel understandings that enrich the scholarly discourse in operations management and consumer behavior. By adhering to this procedure, this study is anticipated to offer significant theoretical contributions notwithstanding the absence of direct empirical data from the field

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Six Sigma Performance Measurement Indicators in Quality Management

Within the competitive electronics manufacturing industry, consistent product quality constitutes the fundamental foundation for building consumer trust and fostering positive perceptions. Any defect in an electronic device, regardless of its magnitude, can directly impair functionality and engender profound negative impressions. It is within this context that the Six Sigma methodology assumes critical importance, functioning not merely as a quality control tool but as a fundamental strategy to ensure that every product reaching the consumer exemplifies standards of excellence, thereby directly shaping robust and positive quality perceptions.

A seminal theory elucidating measurement indicators within Six Sigma originates from the approach developed by Mikel J. Harry and Richard Schroeder. They introduced Six Sigma as a quality management strategy aimed at reducing process variation and minimizing defects through a systematic statistical approach. This concept subsequently evolved into a quality management framework widely adopted across modern industries to enhance operational efficiency and product quality consistency (Harry & Schroeder, 2000). The application of this discipline within electronics production lines, such as circuit board fabrication or chip assembly, ensures that millions of units function with identical precision, thereby cultivating a reliable brand reputation in the consumer's perception.

Table 1. Key Indicators of Six Sigma Performance Measurement

No	Indicator	Conceptual Description	Measurement Focus	Expected Outcome
1	Defects per Million Opportunities (DPMO)	Measures the number of defects occurring in one million opportunities within a process.	Statistical defect frequency	Lower DPMO indicates higher process quality and reliability.
2	Sigma Level	Indicates the capability of a process to produce outputs with minimal defects.	Process stability and variability	Higher sigma levels reflect more stable and reliable processes.
3	Process Capability (Cp, Cpk)	Measures how well a process can produce outputs within specified tolerance limits.	Alignment between process variation and specification limits	Higher Cp and Cpk values indicate better process capability.
4	Defect Rate	Percentage of products or services that fail to meet quality standards.	Proportion of defective outputs	Lower defect rate reflects improved production quality.
5	Cycle Time	Time required to complete a full production or service cycle.	Operational efficiency	Shorter cycle time improves productivity and reduces error potential.
6	Cost of Poor Quality (COPQ)	Financial losses caused by defects such as rework, scrap,	Economic impact of quality failures	Lower COPQ indicates improved operational

No	Indicator	Conceptual Description	Measurement Focus	Expected Outcome
		warranty claims, and customer dissatisfaction.		efficiency and quality performance.

Six Sigma constitutes a quality improvement methodology focused on reducing process variation such that error rates can be suppressed to approximately 3.4 defects per million opportunities (DPMO). This approach emphasizes the application of statistical analysis, systematic process measurement, and continuous quality control to enhance organizational performance (Montgomery, 2019). Within this framework, quality performance measurement is conducted using a range of indicators that describe process stability, defect rates, and the process capability to meet customer specifications. By controlling variation, electronics manufacturers can circumvent performance issues that engender consumer disappointment.

One primary indicator within Six Sigma is Defects per Million Opportunities (DPMO). This indicator quantifies the number of defects occurring within one million opportunities for a defect to arise in a process. DPMO furnishes a statistical metric enabling organizations to objectively evaluate process quality levels and compare them against expected quality standards (Pyzdek & Keller, 2018). The lower the DPMO value, the higher the resultant process quality level. For consumers, a low DPMO signifies a reduced probability of receiving a defective electronic product, representing a quality assurance that reinforces their trust in the brand.

The subsequent indicator is Sigma Level, which describes a process's capability to produce output conforming to specified requirements. Sigma level is calculated based on process variation and the number of defects occurring. The higher the sigma level value, the lower the probability of defects arising in production or service processes. Organizations successfully implementing Six Sigma optimally typically achieve levels of five to six sigma, indicating exceptionally high process stability (Harry & Schroeder, 2000). Electronic products manufactured at this sigma level, such as computer processors or memory modules, exhibit extremely low failure rates, thereby cultivating perceptions of long-term reliability in the user's cognition.

Furthermore, another critical indicator is Process Capability, which demonstrates the extent to which a process can produce products conforming to established specification limits. Process capability measurement is typically conducted using Cp and Cpk indices, which describe the relationship between process variation and permissible tolerance limits (Montgomery, 2019). High Cp and Cpk values indicate that the process exhibits low variation and is capable of meeting expected quality standards. Elevated process capability in electronics manufacturing, for instance in the production of microscopic components, ensures that all devices function with precision, thereby rendering consumer experiences consistently positive and uniform.

Another indicator frequently employed in Six Sigma measurement is Defect Rate, representing the percentage of products or services failing to meet quality standards. This measurement provides insight into process failure levels and assists organizations in identifying areas requiring improvement (George, 2003). By actively monitoring and suppressing defect rates, electronics manufacturers directly reduce the quantity of defective products that might reach consumers, thereby safeguarding their quality reputation.

Additionally, Cycle Time constitutes an important indicator in process performance evaluation. Cycle time measures the duration required to complete one production or service cycle. Within the Lean Six Sigma approach, cycle time reduction is considered important because more efficient processes tend to yield more consistent quality and enhance customer satisfaction (George, 2003). In the fast-paced electronics industry, shorter and more efficient cycle times help maintain component freshness and mitigate damage risks from excessive handling, ultimately contributing to more reliable final products.

Another indicator pertaining to economic aspects is Cost of Poor Quality (COPQ). COPQ quantifies costs arising from quality failing to meet standards, such as product rework expenses, raw material wastage, customer returns, and lost business opportunities. COPQ reduction constitutes a primary objective in Six Sigma implementation because process quality improvement directly enhances organizational efficiency (Antony, 2014). Moreover, by minimizing poor quality costs, companies can reinvest these resources into research and development, leading to product innovation and reinforcement of future consumer quality perceptions.

All these indicators, when synergistically applied across electronics production lines, function as a comprehensive quality assurance system. Collectively, Six Sigma measurement theory emphasizes that process quality must be assessed through objective statistical indicators. Indicators such as DPMO, sigma level, process capability, defect rate, cycle time, and cost of poor quality enable organizations to evaluate process performance comprehensively and undertake continuous improvement to achieve optimal quality levels. Ultimately, this measurement discipline directly shapes consumer perceptions, associating an electronics brand with reliability, precision, and long-term value.

Six Sigma Implementation and the Attainment of Precision in Electronics Manufacturing

The implementation of Six Sigma within the electronics manufacturing industry commences with the establishment of an exceptionally ambitious quality vision. The target of 3.4 defects per million opportunities, which characterizes Six Sigma, is not merely a statistical figure but represents a philosophical statement that perfection constitutes a worthy objective (Kumar et al., 2023). In the production of electronic components numbering in the millions of units monthly, this target signifies that the company commits to detecting and eliminating nearly all sources of variation capable of causing defects. The attainment of high sigma levels necessitates a fundamental transformation in how organizations perceive quality, shifting from mere end-of-process inspection toward defect prevention efforts commencing at the design stage (Peng, 2024). Every employee, from production line operators to top management, must comprehend that quality constitutes a shared responsibility and that any deviation, regardless of magnitude, warrants serious attention. This ambitious vision serves as the primary driver for all improvement initiatives undertaken within the Six Sigma framework.

The DMAIC methodology, which constitutes the backbone of Six Sigma, provides a systematic structure for achieving high manufacturing precision (Çeliktaş et al., 2024). The Define phase compels project teams to clearly formulate the problem to be solved, the project scope, and the objectives to be achieved. Interpersonal relationships play a significant role in attaining shared goals (Darmawan, 2013). In electronics manufacturing, this phase is particularly critical because the complexity of production processes often causes teams to lose focus on the actual root problems. The Measure phase requires teams to collect accurate data regarding current process performance, identify critical quality characteristics, and ensure that the measurement systems employed are valid and reliable (Razali et al., 2018). The data collected during this phase constitute the foundation for all subsequent analyses, rendering their accuracy determinative of overall project success. Herein lies the strength of Six Sigma, namely its approach that strongly emphasizes decision-making based on data rather than on intuition or experience alone.

The Analyze phase within the DMAIC methodology constitutes the core of efforts to attain manufacturing precision (Tonoy, 2025). During this phase, project teams employ various statistical tools to identify factors most influential on process variation. In the electronics industry, analysis frequently involves techniques such as hypothesis testing, regression analysis, and design of experiments to comprehend relationships between process parameters and product quality. For instance, in printed circuit board production, teams may need to analyze how reflow soldering temperature, exposure time, and solder paste composition interact to affect joint quality. Profound understanding of these cause-and-effect relationships enables teams to identify root causes of problems rather than merely their surface symptoms. Consequently, designed improvements can be precisely targeted and permanently eliminate sources of variation, rather than merely temporarily mitigating their impacts.

The Improve phase within the DMAIC cycle represents the moment when improvement ideas are tested and implemented (Çeliktaş et al., 2024). Based on findings from the analysis phase, teams design a series of interventions aimed at optimizing process parameters and eliminating sources of variation. In electronics manufacturing, improvements may encompass machine calibration adjustments, work procedure modifications, product design alterations, or operator skill enhancement. Each proposed improvement must be tested through planned experiments to ensure that such changes genuinely yield significant enhancement without introducing unintended side effects (Tonoy, 2025). Managerial competence ensures that the dynamics of change remain controllable (Mardikaningsih & Darmawan, 2022). This scientific approach ensures that improvements are executed based on empirical evidence rather than merely on theory or speculation. Once improvements prove effective on a small scale, they are subsequently implemented broadly across entire production lines. This careful and measured process prevents unnecessary production disruptions and ensures that precision enhancement can be achieved without sacrificing efficiency.

The Control phase constitutes a critical element distinguishing Six Sigma from other quality improvement approaches. During this phase, monitoring systems are designed and implemented to ensure that achieved improvements can be sustained over the long term (Çeliktaş et al., 2024). In electronics manufacturing, the control phase typically involves developing statistical control charts, updated standard operating procedures, and training programs for operators. These systems enable companies to rapidly detect if processes begin deviating from optimal conditions, allowing corrective actions to be taken before defective products are generated. Without an effective control phase, all efforts expended during the define, measure, analyze, and improve phases may prove futile as processes gradually revert to their original states. The success of Six Sigma in creating consistent manufacturing precision depends heavily on the strength of control systems established during this final phase (Saimsakul & Chomsuwan, 2022).

The application of Six Sigma within the electronics industry also necessitates the existence of a supportive organizational infrastructure. The concept of Green Belt, Black Belt, and Master Black Belt roles, which characterize Six Sigma, creates a hierarchy of expertise ensuring that this methodology is applied consistently throughout the organization (Wang & Le, 2015). Green Belts are employees possessing foundational understanding of Six Sigma who lead improvement projects within their respective work units. Black Belts are full-time practitioners with profound statistical expertise who lead complex projects with substantial impact. Master Black Belts serve as internal mentors and consultants who guide Black Belts and ensure methodological consistency across the entire company (Tonoy, 2025). This role structure creates enduring organizational capability, wherein knowledge about quality improvement resides not merely with a select few but is disseminated widely throughout all organizational levels. Professional commitment reinforced by knowledge management supports product and organizational excellence (Eddine et al., 2023).

In the manufacturing of highly precise electronic components, Six Sigma has proven exceptionally effective for controlling complex process variation (Ghelani, 2023). Semiconductor production, for example, involves hundreds of process steps with extremely tight tolerances. Each step possesses potential to generate variation capable of affecting final component performance. Through the Six Sigma approach, semiconductor companies can identify critical steps most influential on final quality and focus control efforts on those steps. The result is significant improvement in production yield, namely the percentage of good components generated from each wafer. This yield enhancement not only improves quality but also drastically reduces production costs by minimizing material and time wastage (Obiako, 2025). This success demonstrates that manufacturing precision and economic efficiency can be achieved simultaneously through appropriate Six Sigma application.

Six Sigma implementation also drives the establishment of tighter process standardization across all production lines. Prior to Six Sigma introduction, variations in working methods often existed between shifts, between lines, or between factories, causing product quality inconsistencies (Prakash, 2016). Through Six Sigma projects, best practices are identified, documented, and standardized for adoption throughout the organization. This standardization does not imply that all personnel must work in precisely the same manner without flexibility. What become standardized are critical parameters proven to affect quality, while in other aspects, operators retain discretion to adapt to local conditions. This balance between standardization and flexibility enables companies to achieve quality consistency without sacrificing adaptability to potentially different local conditions across factories (Bagherian et al., 2023).

The role of leadership in the successful implementation of Six Sigma cannot be overlooked. Leadership plays an essential role in driving positive change (Hariani et al., 2025). Without strong commitment from top management, Six Sigma initiatives will lose direction and the resources necessary for success. Human resource development must adapt to changing times (Mardikaningsih & Werdoyo, 2024). Company leaders must actively engage in selecting priority projects, providing adequate budgets, and awarding recognition to teams successfully achieving targets. They must also serve as role models in employing data-driven approaches to decision-making, thereby demonstrating to the entire organization that commitment to quality is not merely a slogan (Thevnin, 2004). In leading electronics companies, top managers are often required to undergo Six Sigma training and obtain Green Belt or Black Belt equivalent certifications as part of leadership development. This ensures that leaders possess adequate understanding of the methodology employed and can effectively support their teams.

The success of Six Sigma in achieving manufacturing precision also depends on the availability of accurate data and reliable information systems. Every phase within DMAIC requires data, from baseline measurement, root cause analysis, improvement verification, to ongoing monitoring (Ghelani, 2023). Without robust data collection and processing systems, project teams will encounter difficulty in making appropriate decisions. In the modern electronics industry, investment in sensors, data acquisition systems, and statistical analysis software constitutes a prerequisite for successful Six Sigma implementation. Data generated by production machinery must be readily accessible to project teams, and systems must be capable of presenting information in formats facilitating analysis. The more sophisticated the production equipment, the greater the volume of data generated, and the more critical the role of information technology in supporting quality improvement initiatives.

Six Sigma implementation also engenders transformation in organizational culture, particularly regarding how employees perceive problems and errors. Within traditional cultures, problems are often concealed because they are associated with individual or team failure (Eadey, 2013). Within Six Sigma culture, problems are instead viewed as opportunities for learning and process improvement. When defects occur, the initial reaction is not to seek who is at fault but rather to analyze the process to discover its causes. This shift from a blame culture to a learning culture proves essential for long-term success. Employees become more willing to report problems because they understand that such reports will be utilized for improvement rather than for punishment. The trust cultivated between management and employees constitutes the foundation for continuous quality improvement efforts, wherein every individual feels ownership of the responsibility to continually seek ways to produce better products.

Industry growth is influenced by societal consumption patterns (Gani et al., 2021). Within the highly competitive consumer electronics industry, manufacturing precision achieved through Six Sigma becomes a source of competitive advantage that proves difficult to replicate (Akanmu & Nordin, 2022). Competitors may be capable of purchasing identical machinery, recruiting personnel with similar skills, and utilizing components from the same suppliers. However, they cannot readily imitate the quality management system that has become integrated within the corporate culture. Knowledge regarding how to control process variation, how to analyze data to discover root causes, and how to sustain improvements over the long term constitutes intangible assets accumulated through years of experience (Lee & Choi, 2006). Companies that succeed in building these capabilities will be able to produce products with consistent quality at competitive costs, cultivate strong consumer loyalty, and establish brand reputation that proves difficult to rival (Yeung et al., 2006). This explains why investment in Six Sigma, despite requiring substantial resources initially, yields exceedingly significant long-term returns.

The challenges in Six Sigma implementation should not be underestimated. Numerous companies fail to achieve expected outcomes for various reasons, such as lack of management commitment, inappropriate project selection, employee resistance to change, or inability to sustain improvements over the long term (Obiako, 2025). Within the electronics industry, these challenges are exacerbated by rapid technological change and short product life cycles. Six Sigma projects consuming months may become irrelevant by the time new products are launched (Wang et al., 2020). Therefore, companies need to adapt the Six Sigma approach to their industry characteristics, for instance by developing faster versions or focusing more intensely on specific areas. Flexibility in application, without compromising the core principles of the methodology, becomes key to maintaining Six Sigma relevance amidst continuously evolving industry dynamics (Obiako, 2025).

Six Sigma implementation contributes fundamentally to the attainment of precision in electronics manufacturing through its systematic, data-driven approach (Obiako, 2025). The DMAIC methodology provides a clear framework for identifying, analyzing, and eliminating sources of variation within production processes (Prakash, 2016). The supporting role structure creates enduring organizational capability, while the focus on the control phase ensures that improvements can be sustained over the long term. The cultural shift from blame to learning creates an environment wherein quality becomes a shared responsibility. The ultimate outcome is the capacity to consistently produce electronic products with exceptionally high precision, which constitutes the foundation for establishing quality reputation in consumer perception. Manufacturing precision achieved through Six Sigma represents not merely a technical accomplishment but rather a system of capabilities integrated within the organization and serving as a source of sustainable competitive advantage.

Manufacturing Precision and Consumer Interpretation of Electronic Product Quality

Manufacturing precision achieved through Six Sigma implementation creates a series of product attributes that can be directly observed and experienced by consumers (Kumar et al., 2023). When an individual holds a premium smartphone, they perceive the device's solid weight, the smooth texture of materials, and the perfect tightness of seams between components. All these physical characteristics constitute tangible manifestations of manufacturing precision. Consumers may be unaware that the casing seam tightness achieving IP68 standards for water and dust resistance is attained through rigorous process variation control. However, when they observe no discernible gap between the screen and body, or when the device continues functioning perfectly after exposure to rain, they unconsciously develop the conviction that this product is exceptionally well-made. This conviction subsequently becomes integrated into the quality perception associated with that brand, influencing future purchasing decisions and recommendations to others (Ghelani, 2023).

The consumer interpretative process regarding manufacturing precision does not occur in a vacuum but is instead influenced by a series of expectations formed prior to direct product interaction (Peng, 2024). These expectations originate from various channels, including technology website reviews, friend recommendations, previous experiences with the same brand, and brand image cultivated through advertising and marketing. Prior experiences can shape perceptions of risk (Hidayat & Darmawan, 2025). A consumer reading positive reviews about a laptop's battery durability will harbor specific expectations when first using the device. If the actual experience aligns with expectations, the quality perception strengthens. However, should a discrepancy occur, for instance if the battery depletes rapidly despite reviews indicating otherwise, the ensuing disappointment can significantly damage brand reputation. Products meeting expectations increase the likelihood of repurchase (Safira et al., 2025). High manufacturing precision must be capable of meeting or even exceeding consumer expectations, because in competitive markets, failure to fulfill promises can prove fatal (Purwojatmiko & Ambarwati, 2023).

One product attribute most sensitive to manufacturing precision is user interface responsiveness (Suwanda, 2024). In touchscreen devices, for example, touch detection accuracy, response speed, and scrolling smoothness are substantially determined by the quality of display module assembly with other components. Excessively loose tolerances can result in insensitive touch areas or false touch detection. Consumers experiencing such issues may not comprehend the technical causes, yet they will judge the product as low quality (L. W. Wang & Le, 2015). They might complain that the screen is "sluggish" or "frequently error-prone," unaware that these problems originate in inadequate manufacturing precision. In daily usage experiences, such minor attributes accumulate into an overall impression of product quality. A device functioning seamlessly in every interaction will cultivate trust, while a device frequently presenting minor issues will erode that trust incrementally (Teuku, 2022).

Long-term product durability constitutes a quality aspect highly valued by consumers, although it can only be perceived after months or years of use (Ivanov et al., 2024). High manufacturing precision contributes significantly to this durability through several mechanisms (Olu-lawal et al., 2024). Perfect solder joints ensure that electronic components will not detach due to vibration or temperature fluctuations. Materials processed with high precision possess more homogeneous structural properties, rendering them more resistant to wear. Protection against foreign particle contamination achieved through precision assembly prevents short circuits that could damage components. Consumers utilizing products for years without encountering significant issues will develop strong loyalty toward that brand (Moradinaftchali et al., 2016). They will recommend the product to family and friends, and tend to purchase other products from the same brand when requiring new electronic devices (Teuku, 2022). Thus, investment in manufacturing precision yields long-term returns through consumer loyalty.

Modern consumers exhibit increasing awareness of minute details serving as quality indicators. They attend to seam tightness, design symmetry, material quality, and surface finishing. Technology enthusiast communities across various online forums frequently discuss these details with remarkable thoroughness, even employing tools such as digital microscopes to compare manufacturing quality across brands. The utilization of online media constitutes an integral component of effective modern marketing strategies (Infante & Mardikaningsih, 2022). Their findings are subsequently disseminated widely and become consideration material for other prospective buyers. Within this highly transparent information ecosystem, manufacturers can no longer conceal manufacturing deficiencies behind appealing packaging or aggressive marketing campaigns. Every flaw will be detected and exposed by discerning consumers (Hoe & Mansori, 2018). Conversely, excellence in manufacturing precision receives appreciation and generates valuable recommendations. This creates powerful incentives for manufacturers to continuously enhance their manufacturing quality (Olu-lawal et al., 2024).

The premium price that consumers are willing to pay for high-quality electronic products is largely predicated on the belief that such products will deliver superior performance and long-term durability (Olu-lawal et al., 2024). This belief is constructed through both direct and indirect experiences with products. Revisit intention is influenced by consumer experience and satisfaction (Auliyah & Darmawan, 2025). Consumers who have utilized a particular brand's products for years without significant issues will possess internal justification for paying higher prices in the future (Sinclair et al., 2014). They perceive that the larger initial investment is recouped through reduced repair costs, replacement expenses, and inconvenience arising from malfunctions. This is because comfort factors play a significant role in shaping satisfaction (Fahriza & Darmawan, 2025). This value perception is substantially influenced by manufacturing precision, as precision constitutes one of the most visible indicators of overall quality. Products manufactured with high precision convey a sense of solidity and luxury, whereas products with coarse manufacturing appear inferior despite possessing equivalent technical specifications. Consequently, manufacturing precision becomes a crucial component in the formation of value perception that underpins purchasing decisions.

The consumer interpretative process regarding quality is also influenced by complex social and psychological factors. Psychology and emotions constitute important determinants of individual states (Irfan & Darmawan, 2021). Within consumer society, ownership of high-quality products frequently serves as a symbol of status and identity. An individual might select a smartphone from a particular brand not solely for its functionality but also for what that brand represents about themselves. Manufacturing precision yielding elegant design and premium materials becomes integral to this symbolism. When others observe and handle the product, the emanating quality impression simultaneously shapes their perception of the owner (Kern, 2017). Manufacturing precision functions not only functionally but also symbolically as a marker of personal quality. Manufacturers comprehending this symbolic dimension will design their products not merely to perform well but also to communicate specific values through visible precision details.

The unboxing experience, or the moment of opening a product package for the first time, has become a significant juncture in the consumer journey with new electronic products. Premium manufacturers expend substantial resources designing this experience, as that initial moment profoundly influences first impressions of quality. When consumers open the box and discover a neatly arranged product with precise protective layers, carefully placed accessories, and instructions printed on quality paper, they begin constructing positive expectations. When they subsequently handle the product and perceive its weight, texture, and perfect seam tightness, those expectations are confirmed. This multisensory experience creates a powerful and memorable quality impression (Makwena, 2024). Conversely, packaging appearing haphazard and products exhibiting coarse manufacturing will immediately disappoint, even before consumers have had the opportunity to test functionality. Manufacturing precision plays a crucial role in this critical moment, providing tangible evidence that the company genuinely cares about quality.

Cross-brand comparisons are frequently conducted by consumers directly when considering purchases. In electronics stores, prospective buyers can handle and compare multiple products side by side. In such situations, differences in manufacturing precision that might previously have gone unnoticed become strikingly apparent. Products with tight seams, responsive buttons, and robust materials will feel qualitatively superior compared to products with loose seams, wobbly buttons, and thin materials. Consumers may be unable to articulate technically why the first product feels superior, yet they perceive the difference intuitively (Zheng et al., 2023). This direct sensory experience often proves more influential than technical specifications enumerated in brochures. Within the consumer electronics market, where competitor technical specifications are frequently nearly identical, perceived quality deriving from manufacturing precision becomes the primary differentiator determining consumer choice (Zusrony, 2021).

Brand loyalty cultivated through positive experiences with manufacturing precision yields significant economic impact for firms. Loyal consumers not only engage in repeat purchasing but also tend to be more forgiving of occasional errors and more receptive to new products from the same brand. They further become brand advocates who voluntarily recommend products to others, provide positive reviews on online platforms, and defend the brand when subjected to criticism. Online customer reviews significantly influence consumer purchasing decisions (Riski & Darmawan, 2025). The lifetime value of loyal consumers substantially exceeds that of a single purchase, as they continuously generate revenue over many years and assist in attracting new consumers through recommendations. Investment in manufacturing precision that generates long-term consumer satisfaction yields exceptionally high returns through network effects and reputation reinforcement. Firms comprehending this dynamic will perceive the costs associated with achieving high precision not as expenditures but rather as investments in the most valuable intangible asset, namely consumer trust (Forslund et al., 2013).

In the digital era, consumer voices propagate with unprecedented speed and reach. A consumer disappointed with product quality can express their dissatisfaction through social media, discussion forums, or review platforms, and their complaints can be viewed by thousands or even millions within a short timeframe. Conversely, positive experiences can likewise generate highly effective recommendations. Manufacturing precision yielding problem-free products becomes a source of positive experiences that are subsequently communicated widely (Hajduk et al., 2024). Every satisfied consumer constitutes a credible marketing channel, because recommendations from actual users are far more trusted than advertisements. Within this highly interconnected information ecosystem, maintaining consistency of manufacturing precision across every product unit becomes critically important. A single defective product reaching a consumer can generate a wave of negative reviews that damages a reputation cultivated over many years. This pressure demands that manufacturers achieve exceptionally high precision consistently across all production lines.

Consumers across different market segments exhibit varying sensitivity to manufacturing precision. Premium consumers willing to pay higher prices generally harbor higher expectations and greater acuity in evaluating details. They will notice aspects that might escape the attention of ordinary consumers, such as connector port symmetry, color consistency across panels, or accessory dimensional accuracy. Manufacturers targeting premium segments must be capable of meeting these elevated expectations, because failure to satisfy premium consumers can prove fatal to brand reputation (Xu, 2024). Consumers in entry-level segments may be more tolerant of minor imperfections, provided the offered price remains competitive and basic functions perform adequately. Nevertheless, even in entry-level segments, excessively low manufacturing precision can precipitate serious functional issues, such as loose connectors or easily detachable batteries. Manufacturers must comprehend the minimum precision level necessary to ensure basic functions perform properly in each segment, as well as the optimal precision level for winning consumer hearts in higher segments (Park & Kim, 2023).

The evolution of manufacturing technology continuously pushes the boundaries of achievable precision (Kim et al., 2021). Automation, robotics, and machine vision systems enable the attainment of increasingly tight tolerances with ever-greater consistency (Umaras et al., 2023). Smart sensors and real-time analytics facilitate early deviation detection before defective products are generated. New materials with more stable characteristics ease process variation control. All these advancements open opportunities for manufacturers to achieve precision levels previously unattainable, creating products with increasingly superior quality. However, technology remains merely a tool; what ultimately determines success is the organization's capacity to integrate such technology into effective quality management systems. Six Sigma provides the framework for such integration, ensuring that every technological advancement is optimally utilized to enhance manufacturing precision and ultimately satisfy consumers (L.-W. Wang et al., 2022).

Manufacturing precision achieved through Six Sigma implementation is interpreted by consumers as tangible evidence of product quality through various perceptual and experiential mechanisms (Feng, 2008). Physical attributes resulting from high precision, such as seam tightness, material quality, and interface responsiveness, function as signals captured by consumers and translated into impressions regarding product reliability and excellence (Olu-lawal et al., 2024). Expectations formed prior to purchase, direct experience during product usage, cross-brand comparisons, and social interactions within consumer communities all participate in this interpretative process (L. W. Wang & Le, 2015). Over the long term, consistency in manufacturing precision cultivates trust and loyalty that constitute the most valuable assets for electronics firms. Manufacturers comprehending the relationship between manufacturing precision and consumer interpretation will be capable of designing strategies that not only enhance actual product quality but also ensure such enhancements are communicated to and appreciated by the market, creating a positive feedback loop that reinforces brand reputation over time.

This study enriches understanding of the mechanisms linking quality improvement efforts at the production level with quality perception formation at the consumer level, demonstrating that manufacturing precision is not only technically important but also possesses significant symbolic and psychological dimensions. For industry practitioners, the practical implication is the necessity of designing communication strategies capable of translating Six Sigma technical achievements into meaningful value for consumers. Every strategy must be adapted to the needs of the community or target audience (Musyafak & Darmawan, 2025). Marketing departments need to understand which product attributes are most sensitive to quality perception and ensure that advantages in manufacturing precision are communicated through those attributes. Production managers and marketing managers must collaborate to design products and user experiences that are not only functionally superior but also capable of communicating quality through visible precision details. Workers constitute key factors in producing quality products (Hariani et al., 2021). Employee training and development programs must also encompass understanding of how their work on the production floor ultimately affects consumer perceptions, thereby connecting each individual with end users and motivating them to maintain the highest quality standards. Firms successfully creating integration between technical efforts and communication strategies will possess strong positions for winning consumer hearts in an increasingly competitive electronics market.

CONCLUSION

This literature review demonstrates that Six Sigma implementation in the electronics manufacturing industry contributes fundamentally to achieving consistent production precision through a systematic, data-driven approach. The DMAIC methodology constituting the core of Six Sigma provides a structured framework for identifying sources of variation, analyzing root causes of problems, designing precisely targeted improvements, and sustaining achievements over the long term. The resulting manufacturing precision is subsequently translated into product attributes that can be directly observed and experienced by consumers, such as seam tightness, material quality, interface responsiveness, and long-term durability. Consumers interpret these attributes as tangible evidence of product quality through complex perceptual processes, influenced by initial expectations, direct experience, cross-brand comparisons, and social interactions within user communities. The firm's success in bridging the gap between technical achievements on the production floor and consumer interpretation in the marketplace determines the extent to which investment in quality improvement generates optimal added value. Well-maintained consistency in manufacturing precision builds long-term consumer trust and loyalty, ultimately becoming a source of competitive advantage difficult for competitors to replicate. Thus, the relationship between Six Sigma implementation, manufacturing precision, and perceived quality in the consumer's mind forms a value chain that closely connects production processes with market perceptions in a mutually reinforcing manner.

Future research can extend this investigation by conducting empirical studies to test relationships between specific manufacturing precision indicators and dimensions of consumer quality perception. Quantitative approaches employing large-scale surveys could be undertaken to measure the extent to which consumers notice and value various precision attributes in electronic products, and how these attributes influence purchasing decisions and brand loyalty. Experimental approaches could also be designed to test more controllably how variations in manufacturing precision levels affect consumer evaluations of product quality. Cross-cultural research would prove valuable for understanding whether differences in sensitivity to manufacturing precision exist among consumers across countries, given that cultural background and experience with electronic products may influence expected quality standards. Longitudinal studies tracking the evolution of consumer perceptions over time alongside manufacturer precision improvements could illuminate the dynamics of the relationship between actual quality and perceived quality. For firms, it is recommended to periodically conduct market research measuring consumer perceptions of their product quality and identifying which precision attributes most contribute to forming positive impressions. The findings from such research can provide valuable input for continuous improvement efforts within the Six Sigma framework, ensuring that technical quality enhancements always align with what consumers most value.

REFERENCE

Akanmu, D., & Nordin, N. (2022). Integration of IR 4.0 Into Six Sigma for Sustainability in Malaysia Manufacturing Industry. *Jurnal Intelek*, 17(1), 30–30. https://doi.org/10.24191/ji.v17i1.15849

Ali, R., & Darmawan, D. (2023). Big data management optimization for managerial decision making and business strategy. *Journal of Social Science Studies, 3*(2), 139–144.

Antony, J. (2014). Readiness factors for the Lean Six Sigma journey in higher education institutions. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 63(2), 257–264.

Arshed, N., & Danson, M. (2015). The literature review. Research methods for business and management: a guide to writing your dissertation, 31-49.

Auliyah, R., & Darmawan, D. (2025). Pengaruh Motivasi, Nilai yang Dirasakan, Hedonisme, dan Suasana Terhadap Niat Berkunjung Kembali Ke Pasar Tradisional Wonokromo Surabaya. Jurnal Manajemen dan Organisasi, 16(2), 130-145.

Bagherian, A., Gershon, M., & Kumar, S. (2023). Unraveling the key determinants of successful six sigma implementation: an empirical investigation. https://doi.org/10.1080/14783363.2023.2275213

Cahyani, Y. B., & Darmawan, D. (2025). Pengaruh Persepsi Resiko Terhadap Minat Membeli Emas. Jurnal Penelitian Multidisiplin Nusantara, 6(1), 37-56.

Cang, L., Chang, K., Zhu, K. J., Zhang, J., & Hu, Y. (2024). Research on inspection and quality control of electronic assembly process. 73–73. https://doi.org/10.1117/12.3052857

Çeliktaş, A., Alımlı, D., Haymour, M., & Tunaboylu, B. (2024). Application of DMAIC Methodology in Semiconductor Manufacturing for Yield Improvement. 262–274. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-53991-6_20

Choe, J. (2012). What are the Problems to Improve the Affective Quality using Six Sigma Process. Journal of The Ergonomics Society of Korea, 31(6), 793–800. https://doi.org/10.5143/JESK.2012.31.6.793

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

Darmawan, D. (2013). Prinsip Prinsip Perilaku Organisasi. Pena Semesta - PT. JePe Press Media Utama, Surabaya.

Darmawan, D. (2024). Distribution of six major factors enhancing organizational effectiveness. *Journal of Distribution Science*, *22*(4), 47–58.

Eadey, E. Mohd. (2013). Effectiveness of six sigma implementation in hard disc manufacturing company.

Eddine, B. A. S., Darmawan, D., Mardikaningsih, R., & Sinambela, E. A. (2023). The effect of knowledge management and quality of work life on employee commitment. *Journal of Human Sciences*, *10*(1), 87–100.

Fahriza, F., & Darmawan, D. (2025). The Effect of Waiting Time, Accessibility, Perception of Risk, Feeling Benefit on The Intention to Reuse Halodoc App. Jurnal Pamator: Jurnal Ilmiah Universitas Trunojoyo, 18(1), 37-47.

Feng, Q. (2008). Six Sigma: Continuous Improvement Toward Excellence. 43–60. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-47321-5_3

Fieler, P. E., & Loverro, N. (1991). Defects tail off with six-sigma manufacturing. IEEE Circuits & Devices, 7(5), 18–20. https://doi.org/10.1109/101.86129

Forslund, K., Karlsson, M., & Söderberg, R. (2013). Impacts of Geometrical Manufacturing Quality on the Visual Product Experience. International Journal of Design, 7(1), 69–84.

Gani, A., Khayru, R. K., & Darmawan, D. (2021). Minimalism trends in consumption behavior: Social inequality and industrial dynamics. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, *1*(1), 129–134.

George, M. L. (2003). *Lean Six Sigma for Service*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ghelani, H. (2023). Six Sigma and Continuous Improvement Strategies: A Comparative Analysis in Global Manufacturing Industries. International Journal of Scientific Research and Management. https://doi.org/10.18535/ijsrm/v11i08.ec05

Gupta, A., & Gupta, N. (2022). Research methodology. SBPD publications.

Hajduk, S., Venkateswaran, P. S., Paúl, M., & Divya, P. (2024). A Study on The Influence of Perceived Quality on Brand Trust and Loyalty Towards FMCG Products. 2(1), 42–52. https://doi.org/10.69888/ftstpl.2024.000229

Hariani, M., Mardikaningsih, R., Darmawan, D., & Irfan, M. (2021). Strategies for developing perceived support for employees in diverse work environments. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, *1*(2), 81–88.

Hariani, M., Mardikaningsih, R., Darmawan, D., Nuraini, R., & Halizah, S. N. (2025, October). Transformational Leadership, Student Participation, and Campus Digital Communication: A Systematic Review of Green Management Implementation in Higher Education. In Proceeding of International Management Conference and Progressive Papers (Vol. 3, No. 1).

Harry, M., & Schroeder, R. (2000). *Six Sigma: The Breakthrough Management Strategy Revolutionizing the World's Top Corporations*. New York: Doubleday.

Hidayat, R. T., & Darmawan, D. (2025). Pengaruh Persepsi Risiko Terhadap Keputusan Pengguna Pinjaman Online. Jurnal Penelitian Multidisiplin Nusantara, 6(1), 114-133.

Hoe, L. C., & Mansori, S. (2018). The Effects of Product Quality on Customer Satisfaction and Loyalty: Evidence from Malaysian Engineering Industry. 3(1), 20. https://doi.org/10.5296/IJIM.V3I1.13959

Infante, A., & Mardikaningsih, R. (2022). The Potential of Social Media as a Means of Online Business Promotion. Journal of Social Science Studies, 2(2), 45-49.

Irfan, M., & Darmawan, D. (2021). Improving psychological wellbeing through emotion management in daily life. *Journal of Social Science Studies, 1*(1), 179–184.

Ivanov, V., Evtuhov, A., Dehtiarov, I., & Trojanowska, J. (2024). Product Quality. *Springer Tracts in Mechanical Engineering*, 61–77. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-74360-3_4

Kern, G. A. (2017). Engineering the Intangible: Strategic Success Factors in the Luxury Watch Industry. 153–180. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-48938-4_11

Kim, H.-J., Jee, S. J., & Sohn, S. Y. (2021). Cost–benefit model for multi-generational high-technology products to compare sequential innovation strategy with quality strategy. PLOS ONE, 16(4), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0249124

Kumar, S. P., Kumar, S., Shiriraam, S., & Kumar, J. (2023). Enhancing Efficiency in Microcircuit Manufacturing Using Six Sigma. 189–200. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-1288-9_20

Lee, K. C., & Choi, B. (2006). Six sigma management activities and their influence on corporate competitiveness. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 17(7), 893–911. https://doi.org/10.1080/14783360600595351

Makwena, T. N. (2024). How Taste and Ambience Shape Consumer Perceptions — Sensory Marketing in Fine Dining. Frontiers in Management Science, 3(6), 42–45. https://doi.org/10.56397/fms.2024.12.07

Mardikaningsih, R., & Darmawan, D. (2021). Business sustainability strategies in the facing of regulatory uncertainty and managerial challenges. *Journal of Social Science Studies, 1*(2), 111–118.

Mardikaningsih, R., & Darmawan, D. (2022). Design and implementation of communication strategy in change management. *Journal of Social Science Studies, 2*(2), 237–242.

Mardikaningsih, R., & Wardoyo, D. T. W. (2024). The Role of Technology in Human Resource Development for Sustainability: A Literature Review on Digital Innovation. Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society, 3(3), 20-26.

Margareta, A., & Darmawan, D. (2025). Pengaruh Keragaman Produk Terhadap Keputusan Membeli dalam Pasar. Jurnal Penelitian Multidisiplin Nusantara, 6(1), 134-152.

Mohanty, R. (2017). Reliability; what's right for your business? 2017(1), 000624–000630. https://doi.org/10.4071/ISOM-2017-THA53_164

Montgomery, D. C. (2019). *Introduction to Statistical Quality Control* (8th ed.). Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.

Moradinaftchali, V., Song, L., & Wang, X. (2016). Improvement in quality and productivity of an assembled product. Computers & Industrial Engineering, 94, 74–82. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CIE.2016.02.003

Mustafaev, M. G., Mustafaeva, D. G., & Mustafaev, G. A. (2021). System of efficient functioning and organization of the production process of electronic equipment products. 2410(1), 020013. https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0069035

Musyafak, M., & Darmawan, D. (2025, October). Realizing Just Sustainability through Public Policies Responsive to Social Inequalities. In Proceeding of International Management Conference and Progressive Papers (Vol. 3, No. 1).

Nahar, M. Z., Al Maghrobi, A., & Darmawan, D. (2025). Pengaruh Promosi dan Citra Merek Terhadap Minat Beli Ulang Produk Kahf. Jurnal Strategi Bisnis dan Keuangan, 6(3), 57-77.

Nurprihatin, F., Young, M. N., Liman, S. D., Redi, A. A. N. P., & Prasetyo, Y. T. (2022). Integration of Net Promoter Score and DMAIC Approach to Measure Customer Satisfaction in Packaging Industry. 220–225. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCMSO58359.2022.00052

Obiako, E. C. (2025). Six Sigma and Continuous Improvement Strategies: A Comparative Analysis in Global Manufacturing Industries. International Journal of Scientific Research and Management, 11(08), 2858–2876. https://doi.org/10.18535/ijsrm/v11i08.el03

Olu-lawal, K. A., Olajiga, O. K., Ani, E. C., Adeleke, A. K., & Montero, D. J. P. (2024). The role of precision metrology in enhancing manufacturing quality: a comprehensive review. https://doi.org/10.51594/estj.v5i3.868

Pangestu, P., & Fahma, F. (2019). Implementasi Six Sigma dalam Peningkatan Kualitas Proses Produksi LED TV di PT Sharp Electronics Indonesia. 17(2). https://doi.org/10.20961/PERFORMA.17.2.30178

Park, S., & Kim, H. (2023). Investigating the Effect of a Brand Factor in Product Design Based on a Data-Driven Approach Using Online Reviews. https://doi.org/10.1115/detc2023-114966

Peng, F. (2024). Applying six sigma to improve the defect rate of electronic components: a six sigma case study. South African Journal of Industrial Engineering, 35(1). https://doi.org/10.7166/35-1-2899

Prakash, R. (2016). Six Sigma Implementation in Small and Medium Scale Electronic Industries: A Case Study. International Journal of Innovative Research and Development, 5(11).

Purwojatmiko, B. H., & Ambarwati, L. (2023). Implementation of DMAIC for Production Quality Control: Case Study of Power Supply Production in Indonesia. *Jurnal Teknika*. https://doi.org/10.37031/jt.v21i2.342

Putri, A. P. S., & Darmawan, D. (2025). A Literature Study: The Influence of Lifestyle on Fashion Purchasing Decisions. Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis dan Terapan, 3(1), 85-96.

Pyzdek, T., & Keller, P. (2018). *The Six Sigma Handbook* (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Education.

Rahayu, P. D., & Darmawan, D. (2025). Pengaruh Harga, Kemudahan Pembayaran, Waktu Tunggu, Kualitas Pelayanan, dan Keamanan Terhadap Niat untuk Menggunakan Kembali Suroboyo Bus. YUME: Journal of Management, 8(2), 1090-1106.

Razali, N. M., Kadri, S. M. M., & Ee, T. C. (2018). Six sigma approach to improve stripping quality of automotive electronics component - A case study. 319(1), 012026. https://doi.org/10.1088/1757-899X/319/1/012026

Ridwan, A. N., Sonda, A., & Amelia, A. (2023). Product quality control analysis using the six sigma method. Journal Industrial Servicess, 9(1), 53–53. https://doi.org/10.36055/jiss.v9i1.19044

Riski, M., & Darmawan, D. (2025). Pengaruh Ulasan Pelanggan Online Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian di Shopeefood. Pusat Publikasi Ilmu Manajemen, 3(1), 40-55.

Safirah, A. N., Rohmi, N. S. B., & Darmawan, D. (2025). Pengaruh Kualitas Produk dan Citra Merek Terhadap Kepuasan Pelanggan Produk Fashion. Jurnal Ilmu Pengetahuan Naratif, 6(2), 120-140.

Saimsakul, W., & Chomsuwan, K. (2022). Formation of Skill standards for Printed Circuit Board Assembly Inspection by Define-Measure-Analyze- Improve-Control method. 1291–1295. https://doi.org/10.1109/EDUCON52537.2022.9766647

Sinclair, R. N., & Lane Keller, K. (2014). A case for brands as assets: Acquired and internally developed. Journal of Brand Management, 21(4), 286-302.

Suwanda, S. (2024). The role of the six sigma method in controlling and improving product quality. *Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisiplin Indonesia*, 3(01), 34–42. https://doi.org/10.58471/esaprom.v3i01.3858

Teuku, T. R. K. (2022). The Influence of Samsung Smartphone Quality on Consumer Purchase Decisions. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Business Management*, 1(1), 32–42. https://doi.org/10.54099/ijebm.v1i1.121

Thevnin, C. (2004). Effective management commitment enhances six sigma success. Handbook of Business Strategy, 5(1), 195–200. https://doi.org/10.1108/10775730410494198

Tonoy, A. A. R. (2025). Optimizing Lean Six Sigma Methodologies for Electrical Equipment Manufacturing. https://doi.org/10.36227/techrxiv.175459443.39044829/v1
Umaras, E., Barari, A., Horikawa, O., & Tsuzuki, M. de S. G. (2023). Dimensional Tolerances in Mechanical Assemblies: A Cost-Based Optimization Approach. Applied Sciences. https://doi.org/10.3390/app13169202
Walliman, N. (2021). Research methods: The basics. Routledge.
Wang, C.-C., Chang, H.-T., & Cheng, K.-Y. (2020). Application of Six Sigma to Improve Smartphone Lens Holder Quality - An Empirical Study. https://doi.org/10.12792/ICIAE2020.008
Wang, L. W., & Le, Q. L. (2015). Six-Sigma and Taguchi Approaches to the Printed Circuit Board Quality Improvement. Research in World Economy, 6(4), 29. https://doi.org/10.5430/RWE.V6N4P29
Wang, L.-W., Chih-Hung, C., & Hsieh, C.-T. (2022). Enterprise Precision Marketing Strategy and Quality Management Mobile Information System Based on Customer Satisfaction. Mobile Information Systems, 2022, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/2105383
Xu, M. (2024). The Application of Quality Management in Chip Production. https://doi.org/10.54097/y508mg28
Xu, S. (2024). The Importance of Consumer Insights for Precision Marketing in the Era of Big Data. Advances in Economics, Management and Political Sciences. https://doi.org/10.54254/2754-1169/69/20231440
Yeung, A. C. L., Lai, K., & Cheng, T. C. E. (2006). An empirical model for managing quality in the electronics industry. Quality Engineering, 51(2), 203–206.
Zheng, G., Kang, W.-H., & Liu, S. (2023). Analyzing Factors Affect the Comprehensive Evaluation of Smartphones. Highlights in Science Engineering and Technology, 72, 1007–1014. https://doi.org/10.54097/37q91357
Zusrony, E. (2021). The Impact of Product Quality to Smartphone Buying Decisions. SMART Management Journal, 1(2), 89–99. https://doi.org/10.53990/smart.v1i2.256