

Why "Clean Code" Gets You Hired Faster Than "Correct Output."

REJECTED

```
function xfunction() {  
  // serroar says 'Correct Output';  
  const code_nodes = '123';  
  
  // mesy indentation  
  var color_variable_names = conolor(toor());  
  var variablenames = aoserconsstolorationstnames';  
  for (lmot == 0; s < < list) {  
    for (nex i> resco;li++) {  
      if (conectounde{[i]:''}) {  
        if (contubent1 == coliton.sstor}) {  
          system.outLino(uest + +.conies.cotteuat  
(Correct[]; ", 'not.correct);  
        }  
      } else if (no {  
        if (no != euy) {  
          system.outLinsisa(ontext');  
        }  
      }  
      system.outLine('correct');  
      return tools;  
    }  
  }  
}
```

OUTPUT: CORRECT

HIRED

```
function function() {  
  // Cleante variable covable and meangul stamments  
  var comcorname = colorsodor();  
  var variablenames = conolor(car());  
  var variablesmes = const.stadinstnames);  
  
  // Clear comments structure  
  public colorEntade(fargs, conottans: args) {  
    if (contnentors != sot) {  
      system.outLintinodiLessart));  
      return tooo;  
    }  
  }  
  
  // Clear modular  
  cunction contaioide() argas) {  
    return outine('codo: =', correct);  
  }  
  
  // Clear comments written for the comments  
  return tools;  
}
```

The "It Works" Trap

Two candidates. Same problem. Same solution. Same output.

ONE GOT HIRED <> ONE DIDN'T

The difference? It wasn't what their code *did*. It was how their code *looked*—and what that said about them as engineers.

If you're still celebrating when your code "just works," you're missing the point. In 2026, "working code" is the bare minimum. What separates the hired from the rejected is something far more telling:

CODE QUALITY

The Hidden Cost of "It Works"

Here's what every student needs to understand: When your code runs, you've solved a problem. When your code is clean, you've solved a problem *and* made it easier for the next developer—including your future self—to understand, modify, and extend.

The cost of ignoring clean code is staggering. According to a global enterprise study, **organizations spend an estimated \$56 million per year maintaining, updating, and integrating with legacy systems, and another \$58 million a year on time invested in failed legacy transformation initiatives** ^{[1][2]}. That's over **\$114 million annually** per enterprise—much of it caused by code that was never designed to last.

Even more telling: **78% of IT decision-makers agree that the time, money, and effort spent maintaining legacy applications could be spent more productively on other projects** ^[2].

When recruiters see clean code in your submission, they see someone who won't cost their organization millions in technical debt. When they see messy, undocumented, unmaintainable code, they see a future liability. And they'll choose accordingly.

What Recruiters Look For (And What They Reject)

78% of hiring managers turn away candidates who over-optimize algorithms but neglect readability ^[3]. Let that sink in.

Recruiters and hiring managers are evaluating code quality across specific parameters:

1. Readability

Can another developer—or you, six months from now—read and understand your code without a headache? Clean code uses meaningful variable names, consistent formatting, and clear structure.

2. Maintainability

Can your code be modified without breaking everything else? Modular functions, clear dependencies, and separation of concerns make maintenance manageable.

3. Scalability

Does your code handle growth gracefully? This means thinking about performance, resource usage, and how the code might evolve.

4. Security

Are there obvious vulnerabilities? Input validation, proper error handling, and secure practices are non-negotiable.

The interview rubric used by companies like NextByte evaluates clarity, modularity, and security on a 1-5 scale, generating a score that has a **0.78 correlation with performance after six months** ^[3]. That's a powerful predictor—and it shows that clean code isn't just aesthetic; it's a signal of engineering excellence.

Clean Code = Clean Career

A study conducted on 16,728 students using Litcoder assessments found that **every 1-point increase in Litcoder score was associated with a 1.43% higher probability of placement**. And code quality was a significant contributor to that score.

The data is clear: **Developers who write clean, maintainable code get better job offers and build more sustainable careers.**

Beyond the immediate hiring advantage, consider the bigger picture. **Nearly half of employers (45%) say it's harder to find tech talent than it was the previous year** ^[3]. With fierce competition for quality talent, candidates who demonstrate code quality stand out immediately.

Even AI agents are impacted by code cleanliness. A recent study from ArXiv found that while code cleanliness doesn't change an agent's pass rate, it substantially alters operational efficiency: agents working on cleaner code use **7-8% fewer tokens and reduce file revisitations by 34%** ^[4].

If AI tools are more efficient working with clean code, imagine how much more productive *you* would be—and how much more productive your team would be.

Before vs. After: What Clean Code Actually Looks Like

Let's make this practical.

Before (Messy Code)

```
```python
def calc(p,q):
 x=[]
 for i in p:
 if i in q:
 x.append(i)
 return x
```
```

What's wrong: No meaningful function name, meaningless variable names, no type hints, no comments, unclear purpose, no error handling.

After (Clean Code)

```
```python
def find_common_elements(list_a: List[int], list_b: List[int]) -> List[int]:
 """
 Find elements that appear in both input lists.

 Args:
 list_a: First list of integers
 list_b: Second list of integers

 Returns:
 List of common elements (preserves order from list_a)
 """
 if not list_a or not list_b:
 return []

 set_b = set(list_b) # O(n) conversion for O(1) lookups
 return [item for item in list_a if item in set_b]
```
```

What's improved: Clear function name, documented purpose, type hints, edge-case handling, performance optimization, meaningful comments.

5 Clean Code Habits to Start Today

1. Name Things Intentionally

Don't use `x`, `y`, `temp`, `data`. Use names that describe what the variable represents:

`user_id`, `transaction_amount`, `retry_count`.

2. Write Small, Focused Functions

If your function does more than one thing, break it down. A function should be readable in 10-15 lines.

3. Add Comments That Explain *Why*, Not *What*

Bad: `# Increment i by 1` (the code shows this).

Good: `# Using exponential backoff to avoid rate limiting` (explains reasoning).

4. Handle Edge Cases Explicitly

What happens with null inputs? What about empty lists? What if the input is too large? Think about failure modes.

5. Refactor Relentlessly

Good code isn't written perfectly the first time. It's written, reviewed, and improved. After your code works, spend 10 minutes making it better.

The SCAV Advantage

SCAV's Skills layer evaluates code quality across five dimensions: syntax control, data structure application, algorithmic implementation, edge-case handling, and **code quality implementation**—including scalability, maintainability, and readability.

When you invest in clean code, you're not just writing better code. You're building a skill that recruiters actively screen for—and that employers pay a premium for.

Your Clean Code Challenge

For your next coding assignment:

- Before submitting, spend 30 minutes refactoring
- Add comments explaining your reasoning
- Handle at least 2-3 edge cases explicitly
- Rename variables to make the code self-documenting
- Break long functions into smaller pieces

The result won't just be better code. It will be a better you.

Ready to Build Code That Lasts?

Take LNBE's SCAV assessment to discover your code quality score and receive a personalized roadmap to clean code mastery. Because in today's market, "it works" isn't enough—and "clean code" gets you hired.

References

1. <https://in.marketscreener.com/news/average-global-enterprise-wastes-more-than-370-million-every-year-through-technical-debt-says-rese-ce7d5ad9de80fe27>
2. https://www.nojitter.com/infrastructure/pega-survey-quantifies-costliness-of-tech-debt?recipe=popular-items&source_content_id=4857ab9dc3abfd358ab87e3e0b281011
3. <https://www.gloroots.com/blog/qualities-software-engineer-recruiters-look-for-in-top-candidates>
4. <https://export.arxiv.org/abs/2605.20049>