ADVANCED MANAGEMENT CASE STUDY

Why Quality Management Fails in Garment Manufacturing

A Systemic Case Study of Process Variation, Leadership Failure, Office Politics, and the Recovery Path

Audience: Factory owners, general managers, quality leaders, production managers, industrial engineers, sourcing teams, and compliance professionals
Document type: Advanced management case study and transformation guide
Keywords:garment quality management, apparel manufacturing defects, factory quality culture, AQL, root-cause analysis, DHU, right-first-time, CAPA, quality transformation

AUTHOR

Sanjeewa Dehiwalage
Garment quality management and operational excellence

A practical guide to process control, trustworthy data, fair governance, corrective action, and cultural recovery in apparel factories.

Editorial note: *The scenarios in this case study are composites built from recurring garment-manufacturing failure patterns. They are diagnostic examples, not claims about a named factory. Any factory using the framework should replace the illustrative figures with verified internal data.*

Executive Summary

Garment quality rarely fails because one operator makes one mistake. It fails when a factory allows variation to travel through the value stream without being detected, contained, understood, and permanently removed.

The visible problem may be a skipped stitch, shade variation, measurement failure, seam puckering, pilling, or a broken attachment. The operating cause may sit elsewhere: an unstable wash recipe, an unapproved machine setting, inadequate incoming inspection, a weak technical file, or an unrealistic production plan. Beneath that, the deeper cause is often managerial: conflicting targets, unclear ownership, manipulated reporting, favoritism, fear of escalation, or a corrective-action system that closes paperwork without eliminating recurrence.

This case study uses an expanded **7M framework-People, Machine, Material, Method, Measurement, Management, and Culture-to explain why technically capable factories still experience repeated failures**. Its central conclusion is simple:

> **Quality is not an inspection department. It is the operating discipline by which the entire factory controls risk and learns from variation.**

An effective recovery therefore requires four changes at the same time:

1. Stabilize product and process controls.
2. Restore the integrity of quality data.
3. Align accountability and incentives across functions.
4. Create a speak-up culture in which problems are escalated early and solved without favoritism or retaliation.

The proposed 90-day roadmap combines containment, process control, governance, capability building, and cultural repair. It is designed to move a factory from reactive inspection to preventive quality management.

1. The Operating Environment: Why Garment Quality Is Fragile

Garment manufacturing is a high-variation system. A single style can combine fabric behavior, trim performance, pattern accuracy, machine settings, operator technique, washing chemistry, finishing standards, packaging requirements, and buyer-specific tolerances. Changes in color, size, construction, supplier lot, or wash route can create a new risk profile even when the product appears similar.

At the same time, factories operate under commercial pressure:

- short lead times and late approvals;
- low margins and aggressive efficiency targets;
- frequent style changeovers;
- seasonal labor and operator turnover;
- incomplete or changing buyer requirements;
- pressure to recover delays through overtime or accelerated output;
- fragmented responsibility across merchandising, technical, cutting, sewing, washing, finishing, and quality.

These conditions do not automatically create defects. They create **risk**. Defects become chronic when the management system fails to control that risk.

The quality system must therefore do more than inspect finished goods. It must translate customer requirements into controlled specifications, validate materials and methods before bulk production, maintain stable processes during production, react quickly to abnormal variation, and learn from every escape.

2. The Core Failure Pattern

Most serious quality failures follow a predictable chain:

Commercial pressure -> uncontrolled process change -> weak or delayed detection -> suppressed escalation -> large-volume production -> late containment -> rework, delay, rejection, or claim

This chain matters because it changes the management question.

The weak question is: **"Who made the defect?"** The stronger question is: **"Which control allowed the defect to be created, repeated, and shipped?"**

A mature factory still holds people accountable, but accountability is based on role clarity, evidence, and disciplined follow-through-not blame, status, or personal relationships.

3. The Expanded 7M Diagnostic Framework

3.1 People

People-related failures are often described too narrowly as "operator carelessness." That diagnosis is usually incomplete.

Common failure modes include:

- operators assigned without operation-level skill verification;
- training based on verbal instruction rather than demonstrated competence;
- supervisors promoted for output performance but not coaching ability;
- high turnover, absenteeism, or fatigue at critical operations;
- incentives that reward pieces produced while ignoring defect creation;
- limited understanding of critical-to-quality requirements;
- inspectors who can identify a defect but cannot classify or escalate it consistently;
- fear of punishment, causing operators and inspectors to hide abnormal conditions.

Control response: Build a live skill matrix by operation, certify competence through observed performance, use first-piece approval after every changeover, train supervisors in coaching and problem solving, and balance incentives across safety, quality, delivery, cost, and people.

3.2 Machine

Machine problems create both obvious and intermittent defects. Intermittent failures are especially dangerous because a machine may pass a setup check and then drift under speed, heat, vibration, or material change.

Common failure modes include:

- incorrect needle system or needle size;
- unsuitable thread-needle-fabric combination;
- unstable thread tension or stitch density;
- worn feed dogs, folders, guides, loopers, knives, or pressure components;
- inadequate preventive maintenance;
- machine settings changed without authorization or traceability;
- no defined reaction when repeated defects originate from one machine.

Control response: Use machine setup standards by style and operation, verify safety and quality-critical settings, identify machines uniquely, record maintenance history, trigger maintenance from defect trends, and require reapproval after repair or setting changes.

3.3 Material

Material variation can invalidate an otherwise capable process. Fabric and trims must be managed as engineered inputs, not merely received quantities.

Common failure modes include:

- shade, width, weight, bowing, skew, shrinkage, spirality, or strength variation;
- mixed fabric lots within garments or panels;
- unvalidated interlining, elastic, zipper, button, snap, label, or thread performance;

- relaxation time ignored before cutting;
- supplier approvals based on relationships or urgency rather than evidence;
- incoming inspection disconnected from actual product risk;
- test results received after bulk production begins.

Control response: Define risk-based incoming controls, lot segregation and traceability, shade-band approval, relaxation and shrinkage rules, trim compatibility testing, supplier scorecards, and a formal deviation process when production must begin before normal approval.

3.4 Method

Many factories have procedures, yet still lack standardized work at the point of use.

Common failure modes include:

- incomplete technical packs or conflicting specifications;
- outdated samples, patterns, work aids, or tolerances on the floor;
- no operation bulletin linking method, machine, attachment, and quality checkpoints;
- bulk production launched before pre-production risks are closed;
- inconsistent handling, bundling, numbering, or shade control;
- line balancing based on preference rather than verified skill and capacity;
- corrective actions that rely only on "retraining" or "be more careful";
- no error-proofing for recurring or high-severity defects.

Control response: Create one controlled source of product requirements, hold a risk-based pre-production meeting, approve first-off pieces, display visual standards at the operation, use process failure mode analysis for critical operations, and introduce physical or digital error-proofing where feasible.

3.5 Measurement

A factory cannot control what it defines inconsistently or records dishonestly.

Common failure modes include:

- unclear defect taxonomy and inconsistent severity classification;
- mixing defects, defective pieces, and rework quantities in one metric;
- no denominator, making comparisons misleading;
- delayed manual reporting that cannot support rapid action;
- measurement tools that are unverified or used inconsistently;
- altered data before a customer visit or management review;
- dashboards showing averages while hiding line, operation, machine, size, color, or lot variation;
- no traceability from a defect to its source conditions.

Control response: Establish operational definitions, train and periodically align inspectors, verify measurement equipment, automate timestamps where practical, preserve an audit trail, and review stratified data close to the point of production.

3.6 Management

Management determines whether quality is a real operating priority or a slogan.

Common failure modes include:

- production and quality targets that conflict;
- quality responsibility delegated entirely to QA;
- no named process owner for cross-functional failures;
- chronic firefighting normalized as leadership;
- decisions made without verified data;
- containment confused with corrective action;
- overdue corrective actions closed administratively;
- leaders overriding technical decisions without documenting risk acceptance;
- promotions, assignments, or resource allocation influenced by loyalty rather than competence.

Control response: Define process ownership, balance KPIs, establish escalation thresholds, review the cost of poor quality, require evidence of corrective-action effectiveness, and record any authorized deviation with owner, risk, quantity, duration, and disposition.

3.7 Culture

Culture is the behavior a system rewards, tolerates, and repeats-especially under pressure.

Warning signs include:

- defects are hidden until they become impossible to conceal;
- bad news travels slowly while good news travels quickly;
- QA and Production behave as opponents;
- data is adjusted to protect individuals or departments;
- suppliers or employees receive exceptions because of personal relationships;
- employees are punished for surfacing problems but not for concealing them;
- meetings focus on blame rather than causal evidence;
- high performers leave because standards are applied inconsistently.

This is not a "soft" issue. Culture changes the reliability of every technical control. A control plan cannot work if checks are skipped, data is manipulated, or employees believe escalation will damage their career.

Control response: Protect good-faith escalation, investigate retaliation, publish decision criteria, separate problem reporting from disciplinary judgment, recognize early detection, and apply standards consistently across hierarchy and departments.

4. Composite Failure Scenarios

Scenario A: Shade Variation After Washing

Event: A large portion of an order shows unacceptable shade spread after garment washing.

Immediate technical finding: Wash parameters drifted from the approved recipe.

Systemic chain:

1. Incoming fabric lots were not adequately segregated.
2. The wash recipe was adjusted to recover throughput.
3. Parameter changes were not authorized or electronically locked.

4. Early shade variation was observed but not escalated because the supervisor feared blame and delay.
5. Production continued until the variation became a shipment-level issue.

Why the first diagnosis fails: "Washhouse error" identifies a location, not a root cause.

Required corrective architecture: Reconfirm lot and shade controls; lock approved recipes; establish load-level parameter records; define stop-and-escalate limits; verify shade under controlled lighting; and review whether output pressure rewarded continuation after the first abnormal result.

Scenario B: Seam Failure After Wash

Event: Seams pass visual inline inspection but open or break after laundering.

Immediate technical finding: The thread, stitch formation, and seam construction were not robust to the product's wash and use conditions.

Systemic chain:

1. Thread and seam performance were approved without representative post-wash validation.
2. Machine tension varied between stations.
3. Inspectors were focused on appearance, not functional seam performance.
4. A warning was downplayed before a customer visit.
5. Final inspection detected the problem after significant value had already been added.

Required corrective architecture: Validate seam performance during development and pre-production; define machine setup limits; use first-piece and periodic destructive testing where appropriate; trend defects by machine and operation; and prohibit visitor-driven suppression of quality data.

Scenario C: Pilling and Surface-Durability Complaints

Event: The product meets visual approval at shipment but performs poorly in consumer use.

Immediate technical finding: Fabric performance was inconsistent with the intended end use.

Systemic chain:

1. Material risk was underestimated during sourcing.
2. Testing frequency did not reflect supplier, lot, or construction risk.
3. Commercial urgency overrode a technical concern.
4. The supplier relationship discouraged independent challenge.
5. Finished-goods inspection could not detect the latent performance failure.

Required corrective architecture: Link material tests to end-use risk; approve suppliers using performance evidence; strengthen change notification; quarantine unapproved lots; and require documented senior authorization for deviations without allowing the approver to erase technical dissent.

5. Why Office Politics and Favoritism Become Quality Risks

Office politics becomes operationally dangerous when informal power overrides defined process.

5.1 Distortion of decisions

When a manager's preference can overrule data without traceability, the real standard becomes personal influence. Technical teams then learn that evidence matters only when it supports the preferred conclusion.

5.2 Distortion of resource allocation

Favoritism may place strong operators on a manager's preferred line, assign training selectively, protect weak supervisors, or overload competent employees with every urgent recovery. The result is unstable capacity and a hidden dependency on a few individuals.

5.3 Distortion of data

If departments are punished for reporting defects, they will optimize the reported number instead of the process. This can appear as reclassification, delayed entry, inspection avoidance, selective sampling, undocumented rework, or pressure to accept borderline goods.

5.4 Distortion of accountability

In a political system, consequences depend on status. In a quality system, consequences depend on evidence, role, risk, and behavior. The two systems cannot coexist for long without damaging trust.

5.5 The required governance safeguards

- published criteria for promotion, training, and critical assignments;
- cross-functional approval for major deviations;
- immutable or traceable edits to quality records;
- confidential escalation with anti-retaliation protection;
- rotation or independent verification in high-risk decisions;
- periodic review of overrides, concessions, and repeated exceptions;
- documented conflict-of-interest rules for supplier and personnel decisions.

6. The Quality Control Architecture

Quality should be designed across the product lifecycle.

Stage	Primary risks	Minimum control set	Evidence
Product development	Unclear requirements, unfit construction	Technical review, tolerance agreement, risk assessment, sample testing	Approved technical file and risk register
Supplier/material approval	Unstable fabric or trims	Qualification, testing plan, lot rules, change notification	Test reports, approval status, supplier scorecard
Pre-production	Method or capacity not ready	PP meeting, pilot/size set, wash validation, operation bulletin, critical-operation plan	Signed readiness review and open-action log
Cutting	Shade mixing, shrinkage, pattern or ply error	Relaxation, marker/pattern control, numbering, bundle audit, cut-panel inspection	Lot traceability and cutting audit
Sewing	Repeated construction defects	First-piece approval, inline control, machine setup cards, defect reaction plan	Time-stamped defects by line/operation/machine
Washing/finishing	Recipe drift, appearance or measurement change	Locked parameters, load traceability, standard lighting, post-process measurement	Batch record and approval result
Final inspection	Shipment-level nonconformity	Risk-based final inspection and lot disposition	Inspection report and release authority
Post-shipment	Recurrence and customer impact	Complaint analysis, containment, CAPA, effectiveness review	Verified closure and lessons learned

Acceptance sampling can support lot disposition, but it does not make an unstable process capable. The current ISO framework for attribute sampling is **ISO 2859-1:2026**, which defines AQL-indexed sampling schemes and switching rules. Factories should use the applicable buyer requirement and a controlled sampling plan rather than treating "AQL" as a universal quality target.

7. Metrics That Drive the Right Behavior

No single metric can represent quality performance. A balanced view should include leading, process, outcome, and learning indicators.

7.1 Core operational measures

Defects per hundred units (DHU) `DHU = (Total defects found ÷ Total units inspected) × 100`

DHU counts defects, so one unit may contribute more than one defect.

Defective rate `Defective rate = (Units with one or more defects ÷ Units inspected) × 100`

Right-first-time (RFT) `RFT = (Units passing the defined process without repair or rework ÷ Units processed) × 100`

First-pass yield (FPY) `FPY = (Units passing a process at first inspection ÷ Units entering the process) × 100`

Cost of poor quality (COPQ) should include, where measurable, scrap, repair, reinspection, additional handling, downgrade, airfreight, delay penalties, claims, returns, and lost capacity.

7.2 Leading indicators

- first-piece approval completed before bulk run;
- critical material tests completed before release;
- preventive maintenance compliance;

- percentage of inspectors aligned on defect classification;
- corrective actions completed on time;
- corrective actions passing effectiveness review;
- number and age of unauthorized deviations;
- percentage of abnormal conditions escalated within the defined response time;
- recurrence rate by defect family.

7.3 Guardrails against metric manipulation

- define every metric, denominator, cut-off, and owner;
- separate "repaired" from "right first time";
- preserve original results after reinspection;
- stratify by style, line, operation, machine, color, size, supplier lot, and shift;
- audit data lineage from dashboard to source record;
- never reward output without a quality and safety gate;
- review suspicious discontinuities, zero-defect claims, and late entries.

The purpose of a dashboard is not to prove that the factory is performing well. It is to reveal where management attention is needed.

8. Root-Cause Analysis and CAPA That Prevent Recurrence

Weak corrective action treats the person nearest the defect as the cause. Strong corrective action examines why the system made the error possible and why controls failed to stop it.

8.1 Separate three actions

1. **Correction:** Fix the observed defective item.
2. **Containment:** Protect current work-in-progress, stock, and shipments from the same risk.
3. **Corrective action:** Eliminate the verified cause and prevent recurrence.

8.2 A disciplined investigation sequence

1. Define the problem precisely: what, where, when, extent, and requirement violated.
2. Protect the customer through containment and traceability.
3. Compare good and bad output to identify meaningful differences.
4. Map the process and changes preceding the event.
5. Use evidence-based tools such as 5 Whys, fishbone analysis, Pareto analysis, control charts, or designed trials as appropriate.
6. Verify the suspected cause by testing whether it explains the observed pattern.
7. Select actions using the control hierarchy: remove the cause, error-proof, control automatically, standardize, then train.
8. Assign an owner, due date, required evidence, and escalation route.
9. Verify effectiveness after sufficient time and production exposure.

10 Update standards, risk assessments, training, and similar products or processes.

"Operator retrained" is rarely sufficient unless the investigation proves that the standard was adequate, the environment was controlled, the person had previously demonstrated competence, and a knowledge or execution gap was the actual cause.

9. Leadership Model: Psychological Safety With Accountability

A zero-blame slogan can be misunderstood as zero accountability. The desired model is more disciplined:

- employees can report mistakes, risks, and bad news without retaliation;
- honest error triggers learning and system improvement;
- capability gaps trigger coaching, training, or reassignment;
- reckless disregard, deliberate concealment, retaliation, falsification, or repeated noncompliance trigger proportionate consequences;
- leaders are accountable for the systems, resources, priorities, and signals they create.

This distinction protects both trust and standards.

Leadership should visibly demonstrate five behaviors:

1 Ask for evidence before assigning blame.

2 Thank employees who escalate early.

3 Stop production when defined risk thresholds are reached.

4 Refuse undocumented concessions and political exceptions.

5 Review whether prior actions actually prevented recurrence.

10. The 90-Day Transformation Roadmap

Days 1-15: Contain and establish the truth

Objectives: Protect customers, expose current risk, and restore data credibility.

- create a cross-functional quality recovery team led by the factory head;
- identify top customer, style, material, and process risks;
- contain open orders and verify high-risk stock;
- standardize the defect taxonomy and metric definitions;
- validate gauges, inspection methods, and inspector agreement;
- freeze unauthorized changes to recipes, patterns, machine settings, and specifications;
- launch a daily 15-minute quality review focused on abnormalities and actions;
- publish anti-retaliation and data-integrity expectations.

Exit evidence: Risk register, containment status, verified baseline, clear escalation limits, and named owners.

Days 16-30: Stabilize critical processes

Objectives: Reduce variation at the points creating the most loss.

- establish first-piece approval and restart approval;
- introduce setup cards for critical machines and attachments;
- implement lot, shade, bundle, and wash-batch traceability;
- create visual standards at critical operations;
- apply Pareto analysis to the verified defect baseline;
- repair or remove unstable equipment;
- define stop-call-wait or stop-and-escalate rules;
- begin layered process audits led by operations, not QA alone.

Exit evidence: Critical processes operating within defined conditions and abnormalities receiving timely response.

Days 31-60: Build prevention and capability

Objectives: Replace dependence on inspection with controlled processes.

- deploy risk-based pre-production readiness reviews;
- certify operators, inspectors, mechanics, and supervisors for critical work;
- strengthen incoming material controls and supplier scorecards;
- establish a formal deviation and concession workflow;
- run verified root-cause analysis on the top recurring defect families;
- implement error-proofing and update standardized work;
- rebalance KPIs so output cannot outrank quality and safety;
- train managers in evidence-based coaching and corrective action.

Exit evidence: Fewer repeated defects, higher RFT/FPY, verified CAPA effectiveness, and reduced emergency rework.

Days 61-90: Institutionalize governance and culture

Objectives: Make improvement durable beyond the recovery project.

- review promotions, training, and key assignments against transparent criteria;
- audit data integrity and management overrides;
- integrate quality performance into business reviews and capacity planning;
- conduct cross-functional recurrence reviews;
- establish confidential escalation and retaliation investigation;
- publish a monthly COPQ and customer-risk review;
- assess quality-system maturity and define the next 6-12-month plan;
- recognize teams for early detection and verified prevention-not hidden defects or cosmetic numbers.

Exit evidence: Stable governance, trusted data, consistent consequences, and an approved long-term improvement portfolio.

11. Roles and Accountability

Role	Non-delegable accountability
Factory head	Quality culture, resource decisions, cross-functional alignment, and risk acceptance
Production	Process control, first-time quality, reaction to abnormalities, and standard work
Quality	Independent verification, system assurance, data integrity, and release governance
Technical/industrial engineering	Product and method readiness, operation design, capacity assumptions, and error-proofing
Maintenance	Equipment capability, setup reliability, preventive maintenance, and repair verification
Merchandising/planning	Requirement clarity, feasible timelines, change control, and commercial-risk escalation
HR	Competence systems, fair selection and promotion, grievance protection, and anti-retaliation controls
Supply chain	Supplier capability, incoming quality, change notification, and material traceability

Quality must remain independent enough to protect the customer, but it cannot own the quality of processes operated by other departments.

12. Quality Maturity Model

Level 1 - Reactive

Defects are found late, data is disputed, and success depends on inspection, rework, and heroic intervention.

Level 2 - Controlled

Standards exist, basic traceability is present, and major abnormalities trigger containment, but discipline varies by line or manager.

Level 3 - Capable

Critical processes are stable, employees are certified, suppliers are risk-managed, and decisions use stratified data.

Level 4 - Preventive

Risks are addressed during development and pre-production, error-proofing is common, and CAPA effectiveness is verified.

Level 5 - Learning

The factory shares learning across products and sites, detects weak signals early, applies standards consistently, and treats trustworthy reporting as a competitive advantage.

The objective is not to claim the highest level. It is to identify the current level honestly and remove the constraints preventing the next one.

13. Questions Senior Leaders Should Ask

1. Which three defect families create the greatest customer and financial risk?
2. Can we trace each major defect to style, operation, machine, material lot, shift, and process condition?
3. What percentage of output passes right first time, without hidden repair?
4. Which corrective actions have been proven effective, and which merely reached their due date?
5. Where can a manager override a technical control, and is the decision traceable?
6. Do employees receive a better response for reporting a problem early than for concealing it?
7. Are our strongest people deployed according to risk and capability or influence and preference?
8. Which output incentives could unintentionally increase defects or data manipulation?
9. What did the last customer complaint change in the system?
10. If final inspection disappeared tomorrow, which processes would become unsafe to ship?

Conclusion

Garment quality failure is not simply a technical problem and not simply a people problem. It is a management-system problem expressed through products.

Machines create variation, materials behave unpredictably, methods drift, and people make mistakes. A capable factory anticipates these realities. It establishes clear requirements, controls critical inputs and processes, detects abnormal conditions early, protects the truth in its data, and converts failures into verified learning.

Office politics, favoritism, and fear become quality issues when they interfere with those mechanisms. They delay escalation, weaken technical authority, corrupt resource decisions, and reward appearance over performance. No amount of final inspection can compensate for a system in which employees are afraid to report the truth.

World-class quality is therefore not the absence of problems. It is the presence of a system that makes problems visible early, responds proportionately, eliminates verified causes, and applies standards consistently-regardless of department, status, or personal relationship.

Standards and Further Reading

- ISO: ISO 9001 explained - overview of the process approach, risk-based thinking, leadership, measurement, and continual improvement in a quality management system.
- ISO 2859-1:2026 - current international standard for AQL-indexed acceptance sampling by attributes for lot-by-lot inspection.
- ILO: Better Work programme - garment-sector program connecting working conditions, workplace cooperation, productivity, and enterprise performance.
- ILO: Securing the competitiveness of Asia's garment sector - framework emphasizing worker engagement, workplace cooperation, and systematic process improvement.