



**WORLD CUBE
ASSOCIATION®**

WCA EVENTS SURVEYS 2026

FEEDBACK SUMMARY

JUNE 2026

1. Introduction

In May and June 2026 surveys of WCA Volunteers and the WCA Community were conducted to identify attitudes around managing the WCA's list of recognized events. Other than differences in initial demographic questions and simplified wording in the Community survey to minimize the impact of language barriers, the questions in both surveys were the same. This document summarizes the results of these surveys.

For questions with a feedback range of "1 Strongly Disagree" to "5 Strongly Agree", responses spanned all options available and demonstrated strong individual opinions in both directions for all issues queried. Responses have been summarized with a favorability rating ("F") representing the average of all valid responses minus two so that F=0.0 represents an average "Neutral" response. F+2.0 is the highest possible outcome (corresponding to 100% "Strongly Agree") and F-2.0 is the lowest possible outcome (corresponding to 100% "Strongly Disagree") on this scale. Most summarized F scores fall in the range -1.0 to +1.0, with scores outside that range indicating particularly strong opinions.

2. Participation

266 WCA Volunteers participated in the Volunteer survey and 3,879 WCA Community members participated in the Community survey. Community demographics demonstrated engagement across the WCA Community. Europe (37%) and North America (34%) were most strongly represented. The majority of respondents (74%) were in the 14-18 or 19-24 age ranges. Stronger and weaker competitors were both well represented, with 49% of Community respondents having medalled at a WCA competition.

3. Adding Events

Should the WCA add new events?

Both WCA Volunteers (F+0.5) and the WCA Community (F+1.2) would like the WCA to recognize new events, with the Community strongly in favor.

Which of these new event(s) would you most like the WCA to add?

Face-Turning Octahedron (FTO) was by far the most popular event to add in both survey populations, with an outright majority of respondents (192 Volunteers, 2,712 Community members) selecting it as a preferred candidate for recognition. FTO was frequently mentioned as a promising candidate for addition in responses to the final free text input question.

Both WCA Volunteers and the WCA Community identified the same two events as the next-most preferred to add, although with a different order of preference.

- WCA Volunteers
 - Kilominx (75 responses)
 - 3x3x3 Team Blind (53 responses)
- WCA Community
 - 3x3x3 Team Blind (1,250 responses)
 - Kilominx (1,171 responses)

4. Removing Events or Reducing Event Status

Should the WCA remove any existing events, or reduce their status?

WCA Volunteers (F-0.1) were relatively neutral on this topic. In isolation, WCA Community (F-0.7) did not support the WCA derecognizing any existing events or reducing their status, although this preference was less strong than the strong preference to add new events.

Which WCA events do you think are most appropriate for removal or reduced status?

Both WCA Volunteers and the WCA Community identified the same three current events as the most suited to removal or reduced status, although with a different order of preference.

- WCA Volunteers
 - Clock (131 responses)
 - 5x5x5 Blindfolded (78 responses)
 - 7x7x7 Cube (75 responses)
- WCA Community
 - 5x5x5 Blindfolded (1,156 unique responses)
 - Clock (1,059 unique responses)
 - 7x7x7 Cube (657 unique responses)

Responses to the final free text input question also frequently mentioned these events. Clock was identified as being dissimilar to the other “twisty-puzzle” events recognized by the WCA. 5x5x5 Blindfolded and 7x7x7 Cube were identified as having a lower degree of uniqueness than other events when compared to 4x4x4 Blindfolded and 6x6x6 Cube respectively.

5. Compromise Approaches

Although interest in adding events is expected to be greater than interest in removing events, compromises may be required. How do you feel about the following?

Approach	Volunteer Favorability	Community Favorability
A) Don't add any events.	-0.6	-0.9
B) Add events only if no existing events are removed or reduced in status.	-0.3	+0.4
C) Add events while reducing the status of some existing events, for example by excluding them from championships.	-0.2	-0.3
D) Add events while removing some events or reducing their status.	-0.2	-0.5
E) Remove or reduce the status of events without adding new events.	-0.8	-1.3

A) Both WCA Volunteers (F-0.6) and the Community (F-0.9) disagreed with simply not adding new events in order to manage the compromise in the WCA's list of recognized events. This is aligned with the stronger preference to recognize new events (section 3) than derecognize or reduce the status of existing events (section 4).

B) WCA Volunteers (F-0.3) slightly disagreed that new events should be added without impacting existing events, although the Community slightly supported (F+0.4) this approach. This disparity is believed to align with greater Volunteer awareness of the compromises necessary to manage the WCA's list of recognized events, due to feasibility issues with this option.

C) WCA Volunteers (F-0.2) were relatively neutral around adding new events while reducing the overall status of other events, although the Community (F-0.3) slightly disagreed with this approach.

D) WCA Volunteers were also relatively neutral (F-0.2) about adding new events while removing other events or reducing their status, while the Community disagreed (F-0.5). The prospect of derecognizing events only slightly decreased the favorability of this approach relative to approach C.

E) WCA Volunteers opposed (F-0.8) removing events or reducing their status without adding new events and the Community (F-1.3) strongly opposed this approach. This is consistent with

the stronger preference to recognize new events (section 3) than derecognize or reduce the status of existing events (section 4).

Overall, no options were very strongly supported, with the strongest opinions reflecting the desire to add events (section 3) and the weaker preference not to remove or lower the status of existing events (section 4).

If a new lower tier of events with reduced status is introduced, how do you feel about the following approaches for treating those events at championships?

Approach	Volunteer Favorability	Community Favorability
<i>A) Do not hold lower tier events.</i>	-0.3	-0.7
<i>B) Hold separate championships.</i>	-0.2	-0.1
<i>C) Include these events on a rotating basis.</i>	-0.1	0.0
<i>D) Have stricter qualification requirements.</i>	+0.4	0.0
<i>E) Hold fewer rounds.</i>	+0.6	+0.2
<i>F) There should not be a lower tier of events.</i>	+0.1	+0.2

A) Neither WCA Volunteers (F-0.3) or the Community (F-0.7) supported a lower tier of events not held at championships.

B) Attitudes towards separate championship competitions for lower tier events were relatively neutral, with WCA volunteers (F-0.2) being slightly less supportive than the Community (F-0.1).

C) Both WCA Volunteers (F-0.1) and the Community (F=0.0) were neutral around an approach to hold lower tier events on a rotating basis at championships.

D) Volunteers (F+0.4) supported holding lower tier events with stricter qualification requirements although the Community (F=0.0) was neutral about this approach.

E) Volunteers (F+0.6) supported stricter championship qualification requirements for lower tier events, with the Community (F+0.2) only slightly in favor.

F) Volunteers (F+0.1) and the Community (F+0.2) were relatively neutral around the existence of tiering as an approach with the Community slightly more opposed to this concept.

Overall, the best supported approaches (D & E) were those not necessarily requiring a separate formal tier of events, and responses to the final free text input question frequently mentioned these that these approaches are already sometimes used in practice, particularly for events such as 3x3x3 Fewest Moves, 4x4x4 Blindfolded, 5x5x5 Blindfolded, 3x3x3 Multi-Blind.